

Consultation Statement

Executive Summary

Broxtowe Borough Council (the Council) has consulted widely throughout the Local Plan process and has exceeded the consultation requirements set by Regulation and our own requirements for public consultation as set out in the 2009 Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). Broxtowe have embraced different types of media to try and engage with a more varied demographic and have moved away from the more 'traditional' public presentation events towards the use of workshops to encourage active participation.

The Council has a culture of collaborative working with Councils across the Nottinghamshire Housing Market Area (HMA) (Ashfield District Council, Nottingham City, Erewash Borough Council, Gedling Borough Council, Rushcliffe Borough Council) and takes its obligation to the 'Duty to Cooperate' very seriously. This extends from Lead Members and Chief Executives down to the planning and monitoring officers who meet regularly to discuss issues, offer support and advice and attempt to align working practices across the HMA. The HMA Councils often jointly commission/ undertake evidence gathering to ensure consistency including (but not limited to); the Green Belt Review, a landscape and visual analysis assessments, a retail study and a gypsy and traveller needs assessment. Indeed the Aligned Core Strategy (part 1 of the Local Plan) was the first in the Country to see a National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) compliant Local Plan drawn up across a HMA and resulted in the plan winning the East Midlands Royal Town Planning Institute 'Plan of the Year' in 2014 (the year it was jointly adopted).

The Council has built strong working relationships with industry experts including the Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England and has actively engaged with them beyond the formal consultation process in order to rectify issues that have arisen and draft the most comprehensive and effective policies possible. The Council has liaised with developers and landowners throughout the process and has encouraged them to work closely with the local communities.

The Council has a commitment to empower local communities to plan for their own neighbourhoods and have actively encouraged Town and Parish Councils and local resident groups to plan for their own areas. There are currently 9 Neighbourhood Plans under production covering over 65% of the borough. The Council engaged with the groups through the process and has worked hard to amend and adjust site allocations, where possible, to align with the requirements and aspirations from the groups preparing Neighbourhood Plans.

Key Messages

The following table briefly outlines concerns relating to 'soundness' that have been raised to-date through the consultation process and how the Council has responded. This is detailed further throughout the rest of the document.

Duty to Cooperate body	
Issue Raised	Broxtowe Borough Council Response
Environment Agency (EA): During the 'Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation' the EA raised concern that the contaminated land policy may be removed.	The Council has retained a contaminated land policy.
The EA also had serious concerns regarding the	The Council worked in partnership with the EA

draft wording of the Flood Risk Policy.	following the consultation to ensure that concern the Flood Risk Policy was removed.
<p>Historic England (HE): In the 'Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation HE raised concerns regarding the level of development proposed at Kimberley Brewery.</p> <p>HE raised concern regarding the lack of reference to the Historic Environment in the document or in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).</p> <p>During consultation on the 'Green Belt Review Framework' HE Suggested amendments to the methodology to include non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p>During consultation on the 'Preferred Approach to Site Allocations (Green Belt Review)' HE raised concern regarding;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The scale and location of Green Belt changes in Brinsley. 2. The impact of the proposed Bramcote Green Belt release on the Conservation Area. 3. The lack of consideration of heritage issues. 4. That landscape was not properly considered. 5. SA scoping report omitted discussion on baseline data. 	<p>Through the planning application process the Council have addressed the concerns regarding Kimberley Brewery.</p> <p>The Council changed the methodology.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Brinsley site allocation has been substantially reduced in size and located away from the Listed Church and non-designated Headstocks. 2. The area proposed for residential development in Bramcote was moved away from the Conservation Area (from the south of the site to the north). 3. An independent heritage expert and in-house Conservation Officer were commissioned to assess heritage impact. 4. Independent landscape experts were commissioned to assess the Landscape and Visual Impact across the borough. 5.
<p>Natural England (NE): During the 'Site Allocations potential additional Sites consultation' NE raised concern to the potential allocation of 'land South of Blenheim Industrial Estate in Nuthall' due to the imp[act on the adjacent SSSI.</p>	The Council have not allocated the site for development and it will remain in the Green Belt.
<p>Ashfield District Council (ADC): Throughout the consultation process ADC raised concern about the coalescence of Brinsley and Underwood if development were to take place to the north of Brinsley (including Brinsley 'Option 2').</p>	The Council have not allocated a site to the north of Brinsley for development and it will remain in the Green Belt.
<p>Nottingham City Council (NCC): During the 'Site Allocations potential additional Sites consultation' NCC raised an objection to the potential allocation of 'land South of Blenheim Industrial Estate in Nuthall'.</p>	The Council have not allocated the site for development and it will remain in the Green Belt.
<p>Nottinghamshire County Council:</p>	

<p>The County Council have provided detailed responses throughout the consultation process and raised a number of issues.</p> <p>Policy protection for open space and open space requirements were considered ‘inadequate’.</p> <p>In response to the ‘Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites’ consultation the County Council stated that they would object to Bramcote Moor Grasslands Local Wildlife Site not being retained in its entirety.</p> <p>During the ‘Site Allocations potential additional Sites consultation’ the County Council raised an objection to the potential allocation of ‘land South of Blenheim Industrial Estate in Nuthall’.</p>	<p>The Council have addressed these issues in the policy and evidenced through the updated Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p> <p>Whilst this area is included in the allocation details of the design of the allocation are yet to be determined and the Council will look to consult further with the County Council on this matter in the future.</p> <p>The Council have not allocated the site for development and it will remain in the Green Belt.</p>
<p>Neighbourhood Planning Groups</p>	
<p>Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum (BNF):</p> <p>During the 2015 consultation on the ‘Preferred Approach to Site Allocations (Green Belt Review)’ Bramcote residents (prior to the formation of the forum) objected to the development to the south of the site and many stated that they would prefer development (if it had to happen) to the north off Coventry Lane. This also prompted a Village Green Application (from the now chair of the forum) on the land to the south which has subsequently been withdrawn.</p> <p>Since 2016 Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum have objected to any Green Belt release within the Parish.</p>	<p>The Council moved the location of the allocation to the north of the site.</p>
<p>Brinsley Parish Council (BPC):</p> <p>BPC have objected to Green Belt release through the consultation process. Notwithstanding this, at the 2016 site specific workshop they agreed that land to the north (behind the recreation ground) was the ‘least worst’ are to develop.</p> <p>Prior to the committee who were deciding which allocations were going into the Plan BPC proposed a new site which has since been their preferred location.</p>	<p>The Council moved the location of the allocation to the north (behind the recreation ground) of the site.</p> <p>The Council consulted on the BPC preferred site (Option 2) to the north of the settlement but have continued with the previous recommendation (Option 1) (see Duty to Cooperate objections to Option 2 above).</p>

Site Allocations Issues and Options (4th November 2013 – 10th January 2014)

Consultation documents: Suite of 7 documents including an introductory document, a document for each of the Key Settlements and the Main Built up Area (as set out in the Core Strategy) and one for the remaining other rural area.

Publicity:

- Press Release sent out to local papers.
- Notices were paid for in the local papers: Nottingham Post, Nottingham and Long Eaton Topper, Eastwood and Kimberley Advertiser and the Beeston Express.
- Documents were made available in the following locations: Electronically on the Councils website, Paper versions: in Main Council Offices in Beeston, Council Cash Offices in Eastwood and Stapleford and 6 Libraries throughout the borough.
- 1620 emails and 2105 letters sent directly to consultees on the Local Development Framework (LDF) database. This includes duty to cooperate bodies, Town and Parish Councils, Neighbourhood Planning 'qualifying bodies', statutory consultees, local interest groups and individuals/organisations who have expressed an interest in receiving notification of consultations including those who have previously responded to a planning policy consultation.
- Weekly Social Media Updates 11 in total on both Twitter and Facebook.
- All Town and Parish Councils were offered the opportunity to have a Planning Officer in attendance at their meetings. Planning Officer presented to (and answered questions at) 6 public Town and Parish Council Meetings and 2 public Community Action Team (CAT) meetings.
- Planning Officers held 2 public Drop-in Sessions in Beeston and Eastwood.
- Site notices were put up at each of the 117 sites.

Summary of responses: A full summary of the responses to the consultation was presented to the Cabinet on 21st July 2014. A brief overview of the issues can be seen below:

There was general opposition to the release of sites in the green belt with many respondents suggesting that green belt sites should not be released for development before previously developed brownfield sites. Even allowing for this general opposition there was some support for specific provision for specialist accommodation for the elderly and some support for specific sites in the green belt with the highest number suggesting land to the west of Kimberley. Other respondents suggested that the A610 to the south of Kimberley may be a defensible long term green belt boundary. Even allowing for the consistent opposition to development in the green belt the highest volume of opposition related to land east of Church Lane at Brinsley and land at Baulk Lane at Stapleford.

Nottingham City and Ashfield District have raised concerns about potential allocations close to their respective boundaries. Natural England, Historic England (formerly English Heritage) and the Environment Agency provided very detailed and helpful comments. These comments broadly relate to the updating of information and evidence including in the Sustainability Appraisal, and the more detailed analysis of flood risk together with the historic and natural environment when specific sites are selected.

Greater Nottingham and Ashfield Draft Green Belt Assessment Framework (4th August – 19th September 2014)

Consultation documents: A single document which included the proposed methodology for the Green Belt Review.

Publicity:

- Documents were made available in the following locations: Electronically on the Councils website, Paper versions: in Main Council Offices in Beeston.
- 80 emails and 73 letters sent directly to Duty to Co-operate bodies, Statutory Consultees, Town and Parish Councils throughout the Housing Market Area, house-builders, developers and land agents on the LDF database.

Summary of responses: A [full summary](#) of the responses to the draft Green Belt Assessment Framework consultation can be found on the Councils website. The responses were considered and the Green Belt Assessment Framework was refined before site assessments were undertaken throughout the autumn of 2014. A brief overview of the issues can be seen below:

There was support for the cross-boundary joint approach being taken by the Councils which would provide consistency. Some opposition to Green Belt release in principle and that local knowledge should inform the review. There was some concern about the two stage approach as some felt that by excluding broad areas the methodology would overlook smaller more appropriate areas with some suggestions on the size and locations of sites which should be reviewed under part 2. Some considered that defensible boundaries could be provided as part of a development and was not a necessary consideration for the review. Some suggested that the review was too residential orientated and that future employment development was not referenced enough. One representation suggested that land ownership or inclusion in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment should not be a constraint. Timescale for the review was a concern for some as they felt that it would lead to delay with Local Plan preparation.

Historic England (formerly English Heritage) suggested some text changes to include non-designated heritage assets and Scheduled Ancient Monuments into the assessment criteria. Natural England suggested landscape, ecology and Green Infrastructure should form part of the assessment criteria.

Preferred Approach to Site Allocations (Green Belt Review) (9th February 2015 – 23rd March 2015)

Consultation documents: Preferred approach to Site Allocations (Green Belt Review) consultation document, Executive Summary and a Sustainability Assessment Scoping Report.

Publicity

- Press Release sent out to local papers.
- Documents were made available in the following locations: Electronically on the Councils website, Paper versions: in Main Council Offices in Beeston, Council Cash Offices in Eastwood and Stapleford and 6 Libraries throughout the borough.
- 1767 emails and 3398 letters sent to consultees on the LDF database. This includes duty to cooperate bodies, Town and Parish Councils, Neighbourhood Planning 'qualifying bodies', statutory consultees, local interest groups and individuals/organisations who have expressed an interest in receiving notification of consultations including those who have previously responded to a planning policy consultation.
- All Town and Parish Councils were offered the opportunity to have a Planning Officer in attendance at their meetings. Planning Officer presented to (and answered questions at) 2 public Town and Parish Council Meetings and 8 public Community Action Team (CAT) meetings.
- Planning Officers held 2 public Drop-in Sessions in Beeston and Eastwood.
- Weekly Social Media Updates (Twitter and Facebook).
- Site notices were put up on each of the 6 'preferred' sites.

Summary of responses: A full summary of the responses to the Preferred Approach to Site Allocations (Green Belt Review) consultation can be found on the Councils website. A brief overview of the issues can be seen below:

There was general opposition to the release of sites in the Green Belt with many respondents suggesting that Green Belt sites should not be released for development before previously developed brownfield sites, some disagreed with the overall housing numbers. There were no new sites suggested in any locations that hadn't already been considered for development (many of which were already counted as contributing to the housing land supply). Some of the alternative suggestions to building in the Green Belt were in fact Green Belt sites. There was also a general misconception regarding the purposes of the Green Belt. Many representations made suggestions about omissions to the review methodology although many of their suggestions were included as part of the methodology.

Some felt that the scoring system subjective, overly simplistic and open to bias and that the points system doesn't take into account important features which need continued Green Belt protection. There were suggestions about how the methodology could be improved, for example through the inclusion of the 2004 Inspector's conclusions, the inclusion of landscape as a criteria, the inclusion of wildlife as a criteria and that weight should be given to previously developed land in the Green Belt.

The concern regarding the 2 stage process of refinement was maintained. Some considered that some of the purposes of the Green Belt could be designed in to a development e.g. defensible boundaries and the perception of gaps. Some considered that safeguarded land should be included in the Local Plan so that a further Green Belt Review would not be required.

Development Management Policies Issues and Options (9th February 2015 – 23rd March 2015)

Consultation documents: Development Management Issues and Options Discussion document, a list of the 2004 Local Plan Saved Policies and a Sustainability Assessment Scoping Report.

Publicity

- Press Release sent out to local papers.
- Documents were made available in the following locations: Electronically on the Councils website, Paper versions: in Main Council Offices in Beeston, Council Cash Offices in Eastwood and Stapleford and 6 Libraries throughout the borough.
- 1767 emails and 3398 letters sent to consultees on the LDF database. This includes duty to cooperate bodies, Town and Parish Councils, Neighbourhood Planning 'qualifying bodies', statutory consultees, local interest groups and individuals/organisations who have expressed an interest in receiving notification of consultations including those who have previously responded to a planning policy consultation.
- All Town and Parish Councils were offered the opportunity to have a Planning Officer in attendance at their meetings. Planning Officer presented to (and answered questions at) 2 public Town and Parish Council Meetings and 8 public Community Action Team (CAT) meetings.
- Planning Officers held 2 public Drop-in Sessions in Beeston and Eastwood.
- Weekly Social Media Updates (Twitter and Facebook)

Summary of responses

Strategic Location for Growth at Toton (12th October – 23rd November 2015)

As this was included as a Strategic Location for growth in the ACS the table below summarises the consultation undertaken on this issue prior to this Part 2 Local Plan consultation.

Date	Consultation	Purpose
15 th June to 31 st July 2009	Core Strategy Issues & Options	Area was option 1 of 5 specific sites (with Toton Sidings forming another 1 of the same 5)
15 th February to 12 th April 2010	Core Strategy Options for Consultation	Area was option 1 of 5 specific sites (with Toton Sidings now forming part of same option)
25 th July to 19 th September	Core Strategy Housing Position Paper	Toton was 1 of 2 identified strategic sites to be allocated in Core Strategy (alongside Field Farm in Stapleford)
11 th June to 23 rd July 2012	Core Strategy Publication Version	Toton was removed as an identified site from the publication version of the Core Strategy
18 th February to 3 rd April 2013	Core Strategy Proposed Changes in light of HS2 announcement	Toton proposed to be reinstated in the Core Strategy as a Strategic Location for Growth as a result of the HS2 announcement
June 2013 – Core Strategy Submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination.		
7 th November 2013 - Full day hearing session with an independent Planning Inspector	Core Strategy Hearing Session to discuss specific sites and locations for development – including proposed development at Toton.	
4 th November to 10 th January 2014	Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations Issues & Options	3 specific questions on mix and type of development and how it could best be accommodated at Toton
12 th February 2014 - Full day hearing session with an independent Planning Inspector	Specific Core Strategy Hearing Session for objectors of Strategic Location for Growth at Toton	
13 th February 2014 - Full day hearing session with an independent Planning Inspector	Specific Core Strategy Hearing Session to discuss proposed changes to the Strategic Location for Growth at Toton	
17 th March to 30 th April	Core Strategy: Main Modifications	Minimum development requirements at least 500 homes and 18,000 square metres of employment land included in the Core Strategy.
September 2014	Core Strategy Adopted - Notification + 6 week time period for legal challenge	
9 th February to 23 rd March	Preferred Approach to Site Allocations: Green Belt Review	Sets out proposed boundary for Strategic Location for Growth and initial masterplan of the area

Consultation documents: A draft Masterplan showing how the development requirements set out in the Core Strategy could be met. The outcome of an Open Design Review.

Publicity:

- Press Release sent out to local papers.
- Documents were made available in the following locations: Electronically on the Councils website, Paper versions: in Main Council Offices in Beeston and in Stapleford and Toton Libraries.
- 215 emails and 7136 letters sent to consultees on the LDF database. This includes duty to cooperate bodies, individuals/organisations who had previously responded in relation to Toton, every address in the database with a Toton postcode, all addresses within ½ km of the site (including those in neighbouring Erewash Borough, Town and Parish Councils and statutory consultees.
- Posters and leaflets advertising the consultation and meetings were given out to local councillors and to local interest groups as well as being distributed around the area in key locations.

- Stapleford Town Council was offered the opportunity to have a Planning Officer in attendance at their meetings. Planning Officer presented to (and answered questions at) 2 public Town Council Meetings, a Stapleford Advisory Committee meeting and a public Community Action Team (CAT) meetings.
- Planning Officers held 3 public Drop-in Sessions in Stapleford and Toton.
- A stakeholder workshop was also held during the consultation time period (this is detailed separately below).
- Weekly Social Media Updates (Twitter and Facebook)

Summary of responses: A full summary of the responses to the consultation was presented to the Cabinet on 15th December 2015. A brief overview of the issues can be seen below:

Tram Extension:

- Safeguarding the tram route for future extension was considered sensible including extending the tram further to Long Eaton and the East Midlands airport. There was concern about how the tram would cross the Toton/Stapleford Lane and the knock-on impact that this would have on traffic and the safety implications for differing/conflicting modes of transport using the roads.

Roads:

- Roads improvements in terms of layout and surface repair were considered important, Toton/Stapleford Lane is considered to be at capacity and congestion was a key concern.
- HS2 Access to the strategic road network (including the A52 and the M1) should be prioritised and should not come from Stapleford/ Toton Lane or through the new development.
- Impact on Stapleford should be considered.
- The integration of communities is important.

Walking and Cycling Routes:

- Provision of Cycle-ways and safe footpaths are essential and existing footpaths should be upgraded. Wider footpath/cycle network should be enhanced including pedestrian link to canal, HS2 and Long Eaton, safe crossing points and off-road cycle paths should be incorporated.

Public Transport:

- Comprehensive and regular self-funding bus service to link Stapleford, Toton (including Banks Road), Tram and HS2 should be priority. Important to ensure that existing bus services are not detrimentally impacted.

Community and Medical facilities:

- Focus should be on improving existing community and medical facilities and increasing usage rather than new provision.

School & Education Provision:

- Local school provision was a key concern with many considering that local schools (particularly junior schools) are at capacity. Providing enough space for George Spencer Academy to expand or relocate (to the eastern side of the road) was considered a priority although having a single 'super school' taking all age groups was not considered desirable.

Retail Provision:

- Most respondents considered that new retail should be of a local scale so as not to compete with nearby Town centres and that independent retailers should be encouraged.
- Sustainability (of new and existing facilities) and design should be key priorities including road frontage.

Green Spaces and Wildlife Corridor:

- Green Space was a particularly sensitive issue and it was considered that as much green space as possible should be retained.

- Green spaces should include allotments, new playing fields and recreation areas and protected trees should be retained. Green spaces should not include the tram and vehicular routes.
- North/South wildlife corridor should be a priority for amenity of local people and wildlife and should be densely populated with trees and should be as generous as possible in size.

Employment Opportunities:

- High quality business space to attract high-tech industry and job creation should be a priority, some suggested that 18,000 sqm of employment space wasn't enough, some suggested that the whole of the area should be employment development and that opportunities (including those for the wider area) from HS2 should be maximised. Although some felt that the employment development should be reliant on the completion of HS2.
- Some were concerned about a change in character of the local area (to business rather than residential) and that employment development would lead to additional housing development elsewhere. It was suggested that no large distribution/warehousing should be allowed and that commercial property should be limited to 3 storey office buildings.

Houses:

- There was concern that the developer would want to build a large proportion of 'executive homes' occupied by commuters and many considered that the development should include a high proportion of affordable and starter homes (although it was suggested that the developer would not want to deliver these).
- Some thought that 500 homes was not enough and suggested that we should be planning for 1000+ to reduce the need to build on Green Belt elsewhere.
- Some considered that the development should be high density and other suggested that the houses should be tall town-house style with small footprints to maximise green space.

Brownfield Sites:

- Some thought that brownfield sites should be used first and that the council wasn't trying hard enough to develop them however, some recognised that there were insufficient brownfield sites in the borough and if this site wasn't developed it would lead to less sustainable Green Belt development elsewhere.

Timing of development:

- There was the suggestion that because the area had been empty for years there was no rush to build on it now.

Green Belt:

- There was general opposition to building on Green Belt.

Workshop for key stakeholders (6th November 2015)

Economic Development:

- Maximising the economic benefit from HS2 was seen as a priority that would affect not just Broxtowe but the wider region and there was concern that the site be designed / developed appropriately and any early development should not hinder future investment in the area. Economic growth should be complementary and must not compete with other local authority areas.
- High quality, innovative, bespoke design expected 'designed' with end user in mind (possibly; start up business, universities). Complementary hotel and conference space would be welcome. Design considerations should cover a range of different land uses (used by different people at different times) and should incorporate green corridors.

Residential development

- Generally the 500 homes figure was seen as a maximum. Some thought that the density should be no higher than that of the existing housing at Toton. However, others felt that development should be of a distinct quality and with a higher density and a more 'urban' character.
- Many considered that housing should be part of a 'balanced' development to be sustainable: mix of uses, 30% green infrastructure, school site, etc. However some felt that a greater segregation between uses would be more appropriate.
- Notwithstanding opposition from some to the extent of the residential development there was some agreement that the proposed residential blocks (shown on the masterplan) are broadly in the right places within the strategic location.

Green Routes and Wildlife Corridors

- Many felt that the provision and enhancement of an east/west route/corridor was particularly important, around the existing 'ridge line' and that trees and hedgerows should be incorporated into the development. Where possible routes/corridors should be multi-purpose however, it was recognised that there may be potential conflicts in some cases between recreation and wildlife.

Transport Connections

- It was generally agreed that there needs to be integration between all forms of transport (including walking, cycling, buses, tram, conventional rail and HS2), across all elements of the development and linking to other local destinations including safe crossing points. Pedestrian and cycle links to the tram are particularly important. Connectivity between HS2 and the wider rail network also needs careful consideration. A route for NET to, and possibly beyond, the HS2 station should be 'future-proofed'.

School Provision

- The George Spencer Academy catchment will be retained and admissions made from the school's existing primary school 'family'. The Academy considers that the proposed land allocation for their school is acceptable, subject to access arrangements, and that any new provision should be made at the existing site, although others (not the school) felt that there might be benefits in considering options for local relocation. The potential for shared use with the Academy of existing and new facilities should be fully explored.

Community Uses

- New sports facilities are urgently needed, including for Stapleford FC. They should preferably be multi-use facilities for the whole community (could be shared with the school). New informal recreation facilities are also needed, with links to the wider area.

- Health services and shopping facilities should be readily accessible. Co-location of expanding schools should be considered. It was felt that a community building and enhanced medical facilities should be incorporated.
- It was suggested by some that the retail element may need to be larger than is currently envisaged, in order to be financially viable to a developer. Others suggested that it is correct to be of a small scale that does not compete with other nearby centres.
- Options could be considered for the possible 'relocation' of Bramcote Leisure Centre, which is nearing the end of its life.
- The overall development should have a local identity and a sense of place which can help to ensure that HS2 attracts people to the local area and to Greater Nottingham as a whole.

Timing/Phasing Issues

- There was the concern that the timing of development should not lead to piecemeal, isolated developments which, amongst other things, could threaten the funding and delivery of HS2 and associated potential economic gains.
- The housing is expected in the relatively short term, with demand for the economic development probably being on a longer time-scale once HS2 is built.

Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites (22nd August – 3rd October 2016)

Consultation documents: Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Discussion Document.

Publicity

- Press Release sent out to local papers.
- Documents were made available in the following locations: Electronically on the Councils website, Paper versions: in Main Council Offices in Beeston.
- 2015 emails and 3355 letters sent to; all consultees on the LDF database (this includes duty to cooperate bodies, individuals/organisations who had previously responded to planning policy consultations) and all addresses adjacent to the potential additional sites (including those located in within the City Council boundary).
- 20 Site Notices were put up at each of the 3 sites.
- Weekly Social Media Updates (Twitter and Facebook)

Summary of responses A full summary of the responses to the Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites consultation was reported to the Jobs and Economy Committee on the 26th January 2017 which can be found on the Councils website. A brief overview of the issues can be seen below:

Bramcote: There was general support for the allocation from the Duty to Co-operate bodies and statutory consultees. Other landowners and developers with land interest in Broxtowe generally opposed the allocation. Generally local residents and the Neighbourhood Forum oppose the release of the site from the Green Belt. There was concern about building on the park and the impact on local resident and wildlife. Many supported the schools ambition to build a new school within the existing campus but there was disagreement about whether the residential development was necessary to achieve this. There was concern that removing the area from the Green Belt made it vulnerable for other future development.

Chetwynd Barracks: There was general support for the allocation from the Duty to Co-operate bodies and statutory consultees. Other landowners and developers with land interest in Broxtowe generally supported the allocation but urged caution with regards to delivery assumptions within the plan period. Overall there was general support for the allocation however many supporters considered that the site should be allocated instead of others to the north of the borough (nearer to their own home).

Nuthall: There was general opposition to the allocation from the Duty to Co-operate bodies and statutory consultees relating largely to the proximity of the site to a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and the lack of connection to the wider area and services making the site unsustainable. The local Parish Councils and Councillors supported the allocation which was the preferred location in the Nuthall emerging Neighbourhood Plan. Other landowners and developers with land interest in Broxtowe generally opposed the allocation. There was concern from a local business with regards to development exasperating an already problematic vehicular route through Blenheim Industrial Park to access the estate. There was concern from others about the loss of Green Belt, traffic impact on Nuthall Island and a lack of access to local services and facilities.

Topic Based Workshops

During the summer of 2016 the Council held 6 topic based workshops for local and national stakeholders to tease out the key issues. Invitation to workshops was tailored to the issues being discussed and based on previous consultation responses however, the following groups were invited to attend all of the workshops; Town and Parish Councils, emerging Neighbourhood Forums, neighbouring planning authorities and Council Councils, members of the Planning Committee, Natural England, Historic England, Environment Agency, Seven Trent, Highways England, NHS and The Coal Authority. The discussion point's scheduled for the workshops and a brief summary of the main issues arising from the workshops are detailed below.

Workshop 1: Natural Environment, Open Space and Climate Change (19th July 2016)

Extract from the Agenda

Points for discussion:

- How should the part 2 plan address issues of green infrastructure, including local wildlife sites, nature reserves and wildlife corridors? What are particularly important local issues? Should there be an all-encompassing green infrastructure policy and/or specific policies on particular topics?
- How should landscape be protected? Most local authorities in Nottinghamshire have dropped the Mature Landscape Area designation; should Broxtowe retain it and/or place more emphasis on the 'Landscape Character Area' approach?
- Should some current designations (such as Protected Open Areas or Prominent Areas for Special Protection) become designated as 'Local Green Space'? Should this designation also apply to playing fields, parks, local nature reserves, local wildlife sites etc?
- Does the borough have any 'intrinsically dark landscapes', or would this designation only apply to more remote areas?
- Should the plan designate areas that are considered suitable (and/or unsuitable) for renewable energy generation, such as wind turbines or solar farms?
- Should there be policies on renewable energy in new developments, such as passive solar gain and/or on-site generation?
- How should policy address the need for open space in new developments – for example, by having local standards and/or by using evidence from the Council's Leisure, Green Spaces and Playing Pitch strategies?
- The current plan has several rarely-used policies on a range of environmental issues such as groundwater and contaminated land; could some of these policies be merged or removed?
- What approach should be taken to small-scale developments in areas protected from flooding by the Trent Defences? (The Council will be discussing the issue with the Environment Agency, with a view to enabling policy wording that may allow 'infill' housing development in areas such as Attenborough and the Rylands, subject to site-specific flood risk assessments being undertaken and mitigation measures being incorporated.)

Summary of discussion:

Green Infrastructure:

- Green open spaces, Green Infrastructure Corridors (2 Primary and 22 Secondary) and local environment protection and enhancement is a priority and detailed policies should be included in the Part 2 Local Plan.
- There should be a focus on making Green Infrastructure Corridors attractive to wildlife and the public for walkers/cyclists and we should be encouraging sustainable use (where appropriate).

- Public Rights of Way (whilst a Nottinghamshire County Council matter) should be recorded and included/publicised in the Part 2 Local Plan
- Trees were considered to be an important issue both in terms of retaining where possible and planting new trees within new developments which should contribute towards the Green Infrastructure.
- Planning obligations should be site specific.

Landscape:

- Landscape can include heritage assets including archaeology, geology and cultural heritage.
- Some landscape is integral to the character of a place and this should be reflected in planning policy. Cultural and natural characteristics are included in landscape character assessments.
- Local Green Spaces should be designated and shown on the policies map.

Renewable Energy:

- The provision of renewable energy generation was considered to be very important and should be provided on new development through policy. Design policies should reflect this in terms of consideration of issues such as orientation of buildings.
- Wind turbines were less popular and it was suggested that we need to consider Government policy on site allocation and wind availability and visual impact.
- Solar farms were considered to be less obtrusive than wind turbines.

Flood risk:

- Preventing flooding is an important issue and it is key that the evidence used is up-to-date and that sites are considered strategically across the borough to ensure that development is directed towards the areas least likely to be affected.
- It was considered important to have a groundwater policy to prevent localised flooding episodes including flash flooding and to consider impacts of incremental development including on the sewer systems.
- Trent defences are to protect existing rather than new development.
- The Environment Agency hold modelling data and include an allowance for climate change, some developments will need to provide mitigation. The Environment Agency does not cover surface water matters on applications of under 1 hectare. The Government allows local variation.

Workshop 2: Green Belt and Countryside Issues (22nd July 2016)

Extract from the Agenda

Points for discussion:

- The Council has recently granted permission for several changes of use in the Green Belt to the keeping of horses, where it was considered that there would be no adverse consequences for the area. However, in the absence of a local policy, it has been challenging to identify the 'very special circumstances' which outweigh the 'by definition' harm to the Green Belt. Would it therefore be helpful to have a local policy which was broadly supportive in principle of this kind of use?
- Recent appeal decisions in Broxtowe and elsewhere have upheld the refusal of permission for domestic moorings on rivers because of the 'by definition' harm, although there was little or no harm in terms of openness or the character of the area. Should Broxtowe continue to take this approach, or should local policy be slightly more 'permissive' than national policy in this regard?
- Until the publication of the NPPF in 2012, outdoor recreation, sports pitches and cemeteries had been acceptable in principle in the Green Belt. Should local policy re-establish this principle in Broxtowe?
- Should Broxtowe take a generally positive approach to some forms of renewable energy development in the Green Belt, or does the NPPF (as referred to above) provide sufficient guidance? Should the plan designate areas of the Green Belt that are considered suitable (and/or unsuitable) for renewable energy generation, particularly (in light of the ministerial statement referred to above) for wind turbines?
- The current Local Plan refers to a threshold of a 50% volume increase for what is likely to be considered a 'disproportionate' addition to a building; however this threshold is not included in the policy. Is this threshold appropriate? Should it be incorporated in policy, so as to provide greater clarity?
- An interim guideline on the approach to additions of more than 50% volume was approved in 2009, indicating that they could be acceptable 'if the design is considered to have taken account of the openness [of the Green Belt] in an acceptable way'. Should this guideline now be incorporated in the policy?
- Should local policy take a more supportive approach to certain kinds of built development in the Green Belt if it would, for example, help to promote the diversification of rural businesses or the expansion of community facilities?
- The Council has consistently taken a firm approach in refusing applications in the Green Belt for detached domestic garages and other outbuildings, even if very similar buildings could be built without the need for planning permission and if they would cause little or no harm to openness or the character of the area. These decisions have been upheld at appeal. Is this approach unduly restrictive to householders, or is it an essential aspect of protecting the Green Belt?
- Should the part 2 plan attempt to clarify how the Council intends to interpret terms in the NPPF such as 'sprawl', 'encroachment' and 'neighbouring towns' with regard to the specific local context of Broxtowe?

Summary of responses:

Green Belt Development:

- Broadly supportive about a change of use policy about what would be considered 'appropriate'. However, there was a disparity between the forms that the policy would take. Some considered that Broxtowe should have a permissive 'open' policy or a policy that outlines specific small scale developments that would be considered appropriate (although some opposed this as the list would be too long) so as not to constrain all development. Some felt that there should not be any

development allowed within the Green Belt and that by allowing development it would be harder to negotiate development on brownfield sites.

- There was general support for outdoor sports facilities at an appropriate scale and alternatively cemeteries although there was concern about additional effects e.g. an increase in traffic movement.
- There was concern that there may be a possible 'knock-on' effect of further alternative proposals to any identified appropriate uses.
- It was considered that a local definition of 'very special circumstances' and a definition of 'detrimental' would be useful. A "by definition" harm explanation would also be helpful.

Renewables:

- Generally supportive of renewables apart from wind energy with a focus on roof-mounted panels of a domestic scale rather than solar farms in the countryside/agricultural land which was not considered to be a good use of land.
- There was support for a criteria based policy possibly including a volume allowance, floorspace and design (particularly in the Green Belt).

Diversification in the Green Belt:

- Generally supportive of some diversification proposals to support rural business and the re-use of buildings to prevent dereliction however, there was no agreement as to what uses should be allowed and the consensus was that it would be difficult to draft a policy that was the right balance of permissive and restrictive that wasn't open to interpretation.
- There was also general support for a policy on outbuildings and extensions but there was concern that this would allow further re-development and so the policy should be restrictive.

Workshop 3: Design and Heritage (25th July 2016)

Extract from the Agenda

Points for discussion:

- Should there be separate design policies for housing (perhaps including garden sizes and amenity standards) and for other kinds of development?
- Should there be different policies for developments of different sizes?
- Should there be different policies for different parts of the borough?
- Should local character appraisals be undertaken? If so, should these involve parish/town councils and/or local amenity societies?
- How detailed should design policies be? Should we use 'design codes' in some areas?
- Should local policies include reference to 'Building for Life', 'Lifetime Homes', 'Manual for Streets' or other national guidelines or standards?
- Should there be specific policies on shopfront design, security and signage? If so, what should they say?
- Should design policy incorporate requirements relating to biodiversity?
- Should there be different heritage policies for different parts of the borough? Should there be specific policies for each Conservation Area?
- The Core Strategy refers to DH Lawrence heritage, Bennerley Viaduct and the Boots D6 and D10 buildings: what further details are needed regarding these assets in the Part 2 Plan? Do any other assets need specific attention in the Part 2 Plan?
- Should there be a policy on non-designated heritage assets? If so, should this be linked to the County Council's Historic Environment Record and/or a 'local list' for Broxtowe?
- What sort of policy should there be on archaeology? For example, should individual assets be identified in the Plan?

Summary of responses:

Design:

- It was considered important for the Part 2 Local Plan to have a design policy with the general consensus that it should be more of a framework of expectations without prescriptive measurements that could be used by 'Qualifying Bodies' to build more locally specific design policies in to their Neighbourhood Plans. However it was considered that specific allocations should have specific design requirements.
- There was also general support for detailed design guidance to be produced by the Council that is locally based but isn't too prescriptive and can have flexibility but that includes important aspects such as garden size, parking standards, amenity space standard in relation to adjacent properties (including minimum distance between dwellings), density of development, urban and rural differences, factoring in biodiversity, the need for specific development (e.g. bungalows) and variances across the borough.
- There was discussion regarding changing needs of occupiers over time, incorporating emerging technology/modern standards and the endurance of policies that were too specific that could be counter-productive.

Local character appraisals:

- Generally it was considered important to have character appraisals for both townscapes (which Historic England can offer support) and landscapes that recognise how the character has and will change over time and that there should be a focus on Conservation Area design.
- It was considered that it wasn't necessarily going to be useful to include too much detail in a Local Plan policy and that detail would come from Neighbourhood Plans, supplementary guides or design codes at a more local scale to include local knowledge. It was considered important to include illustrations and that they should be flexible and not too prescriptive.

- Security measure considerations and shop front design were considered important, it was suggested that Broxtowe could use Gedling's policies as a guideline. However it was considered important to allow shops to be adaptable and should relate to the age of the building and that policy shouldn't be too encumbering for small businesses and that we should allow creativity.

Design and biodiversity:

- Trees and biodiversity were considered to be an important aspect of good design and that a 'design and biodiversity' policy and a stand-alone 'biodiversity' policy would enhance the viability of development.
- There was concern that the Tree Preservation Order (TPO) system would not protect all the trees that people wanted protecting because TPOs are not used on public land. It was queried whether tree survey work could be added to the evidence base.
- There was an opinion that in biodiversity corridors there should be no homebuilding.

Historic Environment:

- The general consensus was that the Council should have a policy on designated and non-designated heritage assets and that this should include landscapes and areas of ancient woodland.
- The Council could develop criteria for non-designated heritage assets and invite nominations
- It was considered that sites with heritage assets should be master-planned.
- A policy on Buildings at Risk was suggested which could be cross matched with SA indicators for monitoring to check whether any improvements were made by policy.

Archaeology:

- The general consensus was that the Council should have a policy which should cover existing and undiscovered archaeological assets with a requirement for archaeological surveys to be undertaken at planning application stage.
- The Council needs to decide whether it is useful to identify sites in the local plan and whether it is useful to develop its knowledge.

Workshop 4: Employment and Retail (27th July 2016)

Extract from the Agenda

Points for discussion:

- What aspects of future business needs require particular attention in the Plan? For example: Is there a shortage of start-up units? Is a lack of suitable premises an impediment to inward investment? How important is access to the motorway?
- Should employment allocations in the Plan be for particular types of employment use (such as offices, as indicated by the Core Strategy and the ELFS) or should allocations continue to be for employment uses in general?
- What criteria should be used to decide which existing employment sites and allocations should be retained or released for other kinds of development? Which particular sites should be retained?
- Should the boundaries of the town and district centres be amended? Should a wider variety of uses be encouraged within the centres? Should there be different policies for different centres (perhaps with regard to food and drink uses)?
- Should limits be set on the growth of the borough's out-of-centre retail parks?
- Should the Plan define 'local centres' and/or 'centres of neighbourhood importance' (as suggested by the Core Strategy)? If so, what policies should apply to them?
- How should the Plan encourage the provision of small local shopping facilities whilst also protecting the vitality of the major centres and, perhaps, other local facilities?
- The Council has lost a high proportion of appeals against refusals of permission for takeaways outside centres: should we take a more 'permissive' approach on this issue and/or should we be more precise about the circumstances in which takeaways are unacceptable? Should we be more restrictive about takeaways near schools, for health reasons?
- What size threshold should apply to the requirement for impact assessments for edge-of-centre and out-of-centre retail developments? (The Retail Study, referred to above, proposes 500 sq m.)
- What particular measures should be taken to enhance the vitality and viability of Eastwood's and Stapleford's centres (as required by the Core Strategy)?
- What particular measures should be taken to enhance the vitality and viability of Beeston and Kimberley's centres?

Summary of responses

Employment:

- There was general consensus that policy should be pro-growth and flexible to accommodate changing ways of working, it should encourage new development and investment so as to keep the employment premises modern and desirable for business users. It was also considered desirable to encourage local employment and higher wages economy.
- It was recognised that the design of employment buildings would need to be flexible, adaptable, diverse and affordable and it was largely agreed that business premise should not necessarily fit in with the character of the surrounding area and should be more 'iconic' in design. Related infrastructure was also considered to be an important driver for business growth.
- Policy needs to fit in with wider conurbation (city-wide) in terms of the offer of all premises.
- There is a north/south split in Broxtowe, with some units in the north not being taken up and a lack of employment opportunities in the villages. There is a lack of units in south Broxtowe, especially Beeston but there is limitations in town centres for larger units.
- Unit size, location, rental cost and ability to use premises on short-term lets were considered to be the key barriers to the employment premises offer within the borough.

- Access to the strategic road (including the M1) and rail network were considered to be key drivers in location for business and parking was also a key factor.
- Maximising the opportunities from HS2 is a priority and the Park and Ride facilities at Toton should be publicised.
- Criteria for retention or release of existing employment should be based on if the site is well-located? Occupied? Term of vacancy with the presumption of re-allocation for homes if near residential areas. But should be done on a site by site basis and the running down of businesses premises in order to obtain change of use shouldn't be allowed.

Vision and objectives:

- Broxtowe should build on the Core Strategy objectives and take a proactive approach to attract and retain employment opportunities throughout the borough.
- To ensure that a range of different business requirements are met in the right location, with access to modern facilities with easy access to transport networks.

Town centres:

- General consensus that some boundaries need to be condensed (including Stapleford and Kimberley) and that new centres or extension of existing boundaries are required in areas such as Chilwell Road Beeston.
- It was considered that there should be opportunities for larger retailers
- Town Centres should be responsive to future opportunities (e.g. HS2) and that boundaries may need to change to accommodate this.
- Investment in the town centres in the form of new shopping centres is required.
- Residential uses in the centres were considered an important part of the mix and above ground floor residential use should be encouraged. There should be restriction on the amount of ground floor non-retail uses.

Out of centre:

- There was considered to be no additional benefit to extending the area of out of centre development as they compete with town centres and there was general consensus that the Part 2 Local Plan should include a policy to control it. The policy could restrict out of town development through a threshold on floor area to stop sub-division. Any out of town retail development should be accompanied by appropriate infrastructure development.
- There is a need for 'destination' retail sites but questioned whether A5 uses are appropriate on them.

Local shopping:

- There was considered to be a need for a policy to support and protect small scale local centres that are important for local communities. There could be a proximity test to other retail centres.

A5 uses:

- There are social issues involved- could be obesity related (see Gedling Borough local plan)

Workshop 5: Housing and Community Facilities (29th July 2016)

Extract from the Agenda

Points for discussion:

- What variations (if any) should there be across the borough from the Core Strategy's 30% target for affordable housing?
- What proportion of affordable housing should consist of 'starter homes', 'social rented', 'affordable rented' and 'intermediate' housing?
- What size threshold should apply to affordable housing requirements?
- Under what circumstances should affordable housing be provided on-site or off-site?
- Should there be targets for numbers of affordable dwellings, as well as percentages?
- Some London boroughs have recently introduced requirements that when applications are made for affordable housing below local plan targets, they should be accompanied by viability statements that are fully open to public scrutiny and are formally declared to be 'fair and true'. Should Broxtowe take a similar approach?
- What approach should be taken to housing density? Should required densities vary for different parts of the borough? To what extent should densities be based on public transport accessibility?
- What approach should be taken to standards for internal living space?
- What proportion of homes should be suitable for elderly people? Should sites be specifically allocated for 'extra care' homes?
- Are there steps that the plan can take to encourage higher and quicker rates of housing delivery on previously-developed sites?
- What approach should be taken to sites for gypsies and travellers?
- What approach should be taken to 'self-build' and 'custom-build' housing? Should land be specifically allocated for these purposes?
- What sort of community facilities (if any) should be designated as Assets of Community Value and/or protected by Local Plan policy?
- How should the need for community facilities in new housing developments be assessed?
- Are there particular kinds of community facility that need special attention in the Plan?

Affordable Housing:

- General consensus that national changes to grant scheme, definition of affordable housing, market conditions and move towards home ownership is making delivery harder.
- Developers think council policy should be flexible and open to negotiation on issues such as reducing contributions or accepting other formats of affordable housing although starter homes considered easier to deliver.
- Larger sites considered to be more viable for delivery of affordable housing and registered providers more likely to take them on.
- There was agreement that affordable housing target should not hinder development however, there was no agreement on threshold for provision with some suggesting that fixed % will lead to developers targeting development at the higher value areas in the South of the borough first and others thought that the flexibility within the national definition and land value differentiations would allow a fixed % across the borough.

Proportion of different types of provision:

- Generally the development industry considered that the Council's policy should be flexible and that the Council should be willing to reduce expectations so as not to make a development unviable both in terms of contributions and tenure split (it was considered that rental was hard to deliver).

Size Thresholds:

- Generally it was considered important for the council to have a policy (that was aspirational with flexibility) but there was no agreement as to the form that the policy should take.
- There was discussion about the merits of having a 3 tier approach with up to 5 dwellings having no contribution requirement, 6 – 24 having case by case assessment as to whether it would be viable (based on land contamination issues) and everything 25 or more would have to provide units or contribution (as existing policy).

On-site provision vs. off-site contributions:

- Generally the development industry considered that the Council's policy should be flexible and that the Council should be willing to use their discretion with regards to the viability of provision on-site (which generally links to the size of the development). 'Off-site' contributions should be an option open to all developments irrespective of size of site.

Target for numbers as well as %:

- Generally it was considered important to have a target in order to monitor the provision although the type and where they were required would be more useful. The target should not hinder delivery. Other suggestions included mechanisms for delivering homes and monitoring the commuted sum.

Viability:

- There was concern from the development industry about providing commercially sensitive information for public scrutiny and that this would lead to additional delay. However, others thought that it should only be needed publically if policy expectations not met therefore this would only be applicable in exception cases.

Density:

- It was generally agreed that there was no need for a policy on space standards as this is largely covered by Building Regulations and it would be difficult for a planning policy to not be too prescriptive. It was also deemed important that people have different requirements with regards to space.
- It was also generally agreed that the Council needs to take a pragmatic approach to housing density and that we should be aiming for higher density (40 dwellings / hectare) linked to good transport but that it would need to be assessed on a site-by-site basis.

Elderly People:

- It was considered important to have a policy on elderly person accommodation as it was perceived that there is under provision in the Borough and this is leading to people staying in houses unsuitable for them (often because of the size) as a result. Location and mix of accommodation type is considered key with easy access to transport and local facilities deemed a priority.

Care Home accommodation:

- Generally it was considered that the Council should try and keep people living independently (both elderly and disabled) rather than providing specialist care accommodation. The focus should be on affordable 'retirement villages' and adaptability in new builds which could be made more attractive for developers by offsetting the affordable housing requirement.

Higher volume & quicker delivery:

- It was considered that the Councils approach to communication and negotiation should be frontload during the application process to speed the process up. Although it was agreed that a shortage of skilled labour nationally is hindering delivery.
- Custom and self-build could be an attractive alternative form of development. Council should be encouraging innovation in building practices.

Gypsy and Travellers:

- There was no consensus on how suitable gypsy and traveller provision could be achieved without sites being promoted by the gypsy and traveller community. General consensus was that a criteria based policy is more likely to achieve a successful outcome.

Community Facilities:

- Often more important to protect and enhance existing facilities rather than building new, will be dependent on location and size of development. Villages have different requirements to towns and it is important to consider long term maintenance issue.

Assets of Community Value

- Do we need policies to protect them?
- Is it possible to use the inspector's criticism at the appeal we lost to craft into a policy?

Site Specific Workshops

During the autumn of 2016 the Council held 7 site specific workshops for local and national stakeholders to tease out the key issues that need to be addressed should the site be allocated for development. Invitation to workshops was tailored to the issues and site being discussed and based on previous consultation responses. The respective groups were invited to attend all of the relevant workshops; Town and Parish Councils and Neighbourhood Forums, developers and landowners, neighbouring planning authorities and Council Councils, members of the Planning Committee, Natural England, Historic England, Environment Agency, Seven Trent, Highways England, NHS and The Coal Authority. The discussion points scheduled for the workshops and a brief summary of the main issues arising from the workshops are detailed below.

Site Specific workshop 1: Chetwynd Barracks (17th October 2016)

Agenda:

Points for discussion:

Connection and Movement

- Well-connected development with strong linkages through the site and to the surrounding areas
- Promoting sustainable transport
- The provision of well located, safe and attractive access point for different modes of transport

Landscape

- Identify and strengthen key green routes to connect existing and new open spaces.
- Use of landscaping to enhance the streets
- Important areas of woodland to retain/ enhance
- SUDS strategy within an integrated drainage strategy

Heritage Assets

- Proposals to enhance the setting of the listed Memorial
- Consideration of other heritage assets

Neighbourhood Centre

- Appropriate scale/ land uses
- Provision of a primary school located on a main route

Delivery

- Essential infrastructure including Green and Social Infrastructure
- Delivery timescale
- Further work

Connections & Movement:

- Traffic was a key concern of all of the groups who were worried that the additional cars would make existing congestion on specific roads and junctions worse. Upgrading surrounding roads and the provision of new access routes (although done in a way that does not cause traffic issues on currently quiet streets), through routes and potentially even a 'relief road' were considered necessary.
- The provision of walking and cycling routes both through the site and to surrounding areas (including the tram Park and Ride and HS2) and the provision of pedestrian crossing points on existing routes was considered a key priority.
- Bus provision through the site was considered to be important

Conservation & Heritage:

- It was considered important to protect the heritage assets on the site, particularly the Listed Memorial and the Officers Mess (which could potentially be converted to another use). It was also considered important to make them publically accessible and to try and link them with green areas including the memorial garden. There was the suggestion of creating a new memorial/feature at the site entrance.
- The existing trees are an important part of the site and there are a number of mature trees which should be retained and incorporated into the site through a Boulevard approach to the street scene with large trees and grass verges.
- Retaining and enhancing existing Green Infrastructure assets is a priority for the site. Hobgoblin wood should be retained, the existing Council owned Open Space to the southeast should be incorporated into a green corridor from running across the site to the northeast and onwards west to the proposed HS2 station at Toton.

Neighbourhood Centre:

- It was considered important to have all of the new amenities and facilities located within one area as a 'hub' and that it would be a better use of land if the development could share services and be multi-function. It was also considered important for this area to be pedestrian orientated possibly with a 'car exclusion zone'. The hub could be located within the centre of the site or close to the playing fields to the south of the site.
- There will be the need to provide a primary school on site and there was the suggestion that this might be an opportunity to relocate the existing primary school (Chetwynd) which is adjacent to the site and provide a single bigger school.
- Secondary school provision needs to be considered as there may not be capacity in the local area.
- All schools should be located away from areas of high emissions.
- It was considered that shops should be included in the local centre but that provision should be limited so as not to take away from nearby town centres. It was considered that the shops should have main road frontage to make them more viable. There was also the suggestion that better connections and pedestrian access should be provided to encourage people to use small existing nearby shops (e.g. Woodstock Road) rather than providing new.

Delivery & Phasing:

- Suggestions for starting with previously developed buildings to the south of site or some of the currently undeveloped land.

Site Specific workshop 2: Land north of Moorgreen Eastwood (19th October 2016)

Agenda:

Points for discussion:

Connection and Movement

- Well-connected development with strong linkages to the surrounding areas and facilities
- Promoting sustainable transport
- The provision of well located, safe and attractive access point for different modes of transport

Landscape/ Green Routes/Open Space

- Identify and strengthen key green routes to connect existing and new open spaces.
- Use of landscaping to enhance the streets
- Vegetation / Mature Trees / Hedgerows / Boundaries to be retained / incorporated?
- Important areas surrounding Brinsley Brook retain/ enhance
- Sustainable urban Drainage System within an integrated drainage strategy

Heritage Assets

- Proposals to enhance the setting of the Grade II Listed Hall Farm
- Consideration of Key views from Eastwood Conservation Area

Delivery

- Delivery timescale
- Further work

Connectivity & Movement:

- Traffic was a key concern with worry that the additional cars would make existing congestion on specific roads and junction's worse, there was the suggestion that a bypass for Eastwood was required. The speed of traffic travelling along the existing roads and the ability to cross the roads for pedestrians (which was necessary to reach the existing bus stops) were key issues that needed addressing. Upgrading surrounding roads and the provision of new access routes were considered necessary.
- Enhancing existing and creating new public footpaths (possibly including the disused railway line) was considered important as the existing footpath network is well used and safety of schoolchildren using surrounding routes was considered paramount.

Heritage:

- Focus for heritage should be D H Lawrence landscape and the tourist offer could be enhanced through the extension of the 'blue line trail' via an urban greenway from Eastwood up to Brinsley Headstocks via 'Aunt Polly's Cottage' (described in '*Odour of Chrysanthemums*').

Flooding:

- Flooding issues from Brinsley Brook to the west, natural springs across the site and the topography were all considered to be issues. It was suggested that attenuation ponds next to the Brook could alleviate this and provide some public open space along this edge.

Open Space:

- Preference for unplanted open space if the form of an English meadow.

Form of development:

- There was discussion surrounding the part of the site which would be best suited for development. Some considered that the east of the site would be a natural extension to Eastwood and would ensure that the heritage assets to the west would be protected. Others considered that the east would be more suitable for development as this would impact less of the views from Eastwood Conservation Area and The Canyons (as described in D H Lawrence *Sons & Lovers*).

Site Specific workshop 3: Land east of Church Lane Brinsley (31st October 2016)

Agenda:

Points for discussion:

Connection and Movement

- New access points
- Route through the site
- Well-connected development with strong linkages to the surrounding areas and facilities (including the bus stop)
- The provision of well located, safe and attractive walking and cycling routes

Landscape/ Green Routes/Open Space

- Identify and strengthen key green routes to connect existing (including recreation ground) and new open spaces.
- Long views into open countryside from recreation ground
- Woodland / Mature Trees / Hedgerows / Boundaries to be retained / incorporated?
- Important areas surrounding Brinsley Brook to enhance
- Sustainable urban Drainage System within an integrated drainage strategy

Heritage Assets

- Proposals to enhance the setting of the Headstocks and disused railway line
- Relationship between Grade II Listed Church of St James the Great
- D H Lawrence landscape

Delivery

- Delivery timescale
- Further work

Connections & Movement:

- Access to the site was a key concern as the width of the existing access points were considered too narrow with concern regarding proximity to the bend. Slowing the speed of the traffic through the village (possibly through mini-roundabouts) is a priority to address the number of accidents and to make crossing the road as a pedestrian safer and easier.
- Existing footpaths in and around the village are well used, have seen recent improvements and have heritage links. Formalising a 'cut-through' at the back of the recreation ground would be desirable but would like to see it retained as informal in nature.
- Opening up the brook as a walking route and increasing the number of bridle ways in the village (through footpath upgrade) would be an aspiration for the landowner. However, there was concern that this would attract off-road motorbike and could cause conflict from differing types of users.
- Aspiration to see Brinsley Recreation Ground and the Brinsley Headstocks linked by a public footpath and bridleway.

Heritage:

- There are a number of designated and non-designated heritage assets that should be protected (including the views to and from them) particularly those referencing the mining heritage of the village and those linking to D H Lawrence.
- It was considered important to bring Vine Cottage into public ownership/use.

Flooding:

- It was considered that the site floods.
- Concern regarding the capacity of the existing sewage system in the village however the landowner didn't consider this to be an issue due to an 18inch mains pipe with capacity runs through the site.

Open Space:

- Improvements to the recreation ground should be the focus of the open space provision (such as new equipment for the children's play area and new changing rooms facilities) with less emphasis on the headstocks nature reserve which is more sensitive to human traffic, would however like to see enhancements for wildlife at the nature reserve. Provision of allotments would be welcome.

School/ Education Provision:

- Concern about the capacity/quality of the local school. Suggestion that school extension may not be required if school utilised all of its existing space (taking back lease from third party).

Affordable Housing/ Elderly Housing:

- Local need for suitable elderly accommodation is a key requirement for the village.

Form of development:

- The area behind the recreation ground was considered to be the 'least worst' place. With an adjacent area to also come out of the Green Belt to accommodate SuDs and open space.

Site Specific workshop 4: Land east and west of Coventry Lane Bramcote / Stapleford (2nd November 2016)

Agenda:

Points for discussion:

Connection and Movement

- New access points
- Routes to, from and through the site
- Well-connected development with strong linkages to the surrounding areas and facilities
- The provision of well located, safe and attractive walking and cycling routes

Landscape/ Green Routes/Open Space

- Identify and strengthen key green routes to connect existing and new open spaces.
- Formal / informal spaces
- Woodland / Park / Mature Trees / Hedgerows / Boundaries to be retained / incorporated?
- Important areas in and surrounding Bramcote Park, Bramcote Hill, Stapleford Hill and Boundary Brook to enhance
- Sustainable urban Drainage System within an integrated drainage strategy

Heritage Assets

- Sandstone cutting to Moor Lane
- Long views from Bramcote Hill
- Hemlock Stone

Delivery

- Delivery timescale
- Further work

Connections & Movement:

- Traffic was a key concern with worry that the additional cars would make existing congestion on specific roads and junction's worse (some of which were considered to be at capacity), upgrading surrounding junctions was considered necessary. Important to consider cumulative impact of other nearby development and dispersal of traffic. Access to both sites should come from Coventry Lane which should be re-designed to slow the traffic by changing the character of the road.
- Design of the site should minimise car dependency (including technology that allow people to work from home).
- Important to have safe and attractive pedestrian and cycling routes in and around the site that connect people to services, facilities, the countryside, adjacent developments and existing leisure routes. Key considerations were the safe access for children to walk to and from the school including safe crossing points in all directions.
- Providing a new bus route linking to adjacent development was considered important.
- Consideration should be given to the provision of a train halt (un-manned station) on the Nottingham railway line to the north of the site.

Form of development:

- There is a local need for retirement/specialist accommodation for the elderly.
- Redevelopment on the school land should be kept below the 'ridgeline'.
- High quality bespoke homes are expected (possibly incorporating modern methods of construction) and custom/self-build would be welcomed.
- Community would like high density 'affordable' homes.

Leisure Centre:

- It was considered important to retain the leisure centre within the site and its redevelopment was welcomed, a shared leisure facility with the school was suggested. Vehicular movement to and

from the leisure centre needs consideration including amendments to the A52 to prevent people accessing the leisure centre from the existing nearby residential roads.

School redevelopment:

- Generally the school re-development was welcomed however, there is concern that the housing development would be delivered in isolation and that school re-development would not be delivered. It was also suggested that the school should find the finances elsewhere without having to develop houses on Green Belt land.

Green Space / Green Infrastructure:

- Key to retain and enhance important wildlife corridor which crosses both sites and extends beyond the site on either side.
- There are a number of existing important open spaces and ridgelines which should be retained and protected from future development.
- New open space should be provided within the site and a buffer should be provided around the brook.

Delivery:

- West of Coventry Lane landowner is local housebuilder, no barriers to delivery in the short-term.
- East of Coventry Lane landowner is under time pressure to build new and housing delivery would be achievable within the short-term.

Site Specific workshop 5: Land west of Awsworth (inside the bypass) (7th November 2016)

Agenda:

Points for discussion:

Connection and Movement

- New access points
- The provision of well located, safe and attractive walking and cycling routes
- Route through the site
- Well-connected development with strong linkages to the surrounding areas and facilities

Landscape/ Green Routes/Open Space

- Identify and strengthen key green routes to connect existing (including recreation ground) and new open spaces.
- Woodland / Mature Trees / Hedgerows / Boundaries to be retained / incorporated?
- Sustainable urban Drainage System within an integrated drainage strategy
- Buffer to Shiloh Way

Heritage Assets

- Relationship with Grade II* Listed Bennerley Viaduct – pedestrian and cycle routes to and across
- Disused canal

Delivery

- Delivery timescale
- Further work

Connections & Movement:

- Access to the site was a key concern with no consensus on how this should be addressed. It was generally agreed that the site access should come from the bypass however, there was no consensus about whether access to the rest of the village should be emergency vehicles only or general access and whether this would improve things for existing residents [by giving them another 'way out'] and/or make things worse [by increasing traffic past existing homes] and encouraging 'rat-running'. Improvement would be needed to the bypass in order to slow the traffic and provide safe crossing points for pedestrians.
- Attractive new and enhanced walking and cycling links should be delivered (ideally inside site away from the Bypass) including links across Bennerley Viaduct, to existing recreation routes and Ilkeston Station, although they should be designed so as to deter off-road motorcyclists.
- Existing bus provision and route is unsatisfactory and greater permeability through the village linking through the new development (and Ilkeston Station) is required.

Open Space / Green Infrastructure:

- Open space with play equipment needed to the south east of the development so that the provision in the village is spread around, existing tree belt and hedgerows to be retained and enhanced and incorporated into a Linear Park adjacent to the bypass incorporating SuDs. Upgrade of the pocket park would be welcome. Landscaping adjacent to the existing housing is needed to soften the impact of development.

Form of development:

- Community consider it imperative that the new development integrates with the existing village and is not isolated. Mix of housing needed. Design of housing should incorporate the positive aspects of some of the older buildings in the village.
- There is a lack of medical facilities within the village and the school will need to be enlarged.

Heritage:

- It was suggested that White House Farm could be of heritage interest however, some residents would welcome it gone. It would be nice to see the Level crossing gate next to station re-instated as an original crossing gate.

Delivery:

- Would expect 50 a year build out rate from one or two developers starting early part of the 5 year supply.

Site Specific workshop 6: Land south of Kimberley (9th November 2016)

Agenda:

Points for discussion:

Connection and Movement

- The provision of well located, safe and attractive access point for different modes of transport
- Well-connected development with strong linkages to the surrounding areas and facilities
- Promoting sustainable transport

Landscape/ Green Routes/Open Space

- Identify and strengthen key green routes to connect existing and new open spaces.
- Use of landscaping to enhance the streets
- Vegetation / Mature Trees / Hedgerows / Boundaries to be retained / incorporated?
- Sustainable urban Drainage System within an integrated drainage strategy

Heritage Assets

- Links to Kimberley Conservation Area

Delivery

- Delivery timescale
- Land assembly issues
- Further work

Connections & Movement:

- Traffic was a key concern with worry that the additional cars would make existing congestion within the town worse given that roads are narrow, not suited to heavy traffic and only have on-street parking. There was the suggestion that the site could take direct access onto A610 however this was not considered desirable over concerns that it could create other traffic issues and create 'rat-runs'. Generally it was agreed that the access to the site could use the existing depot access or potentially the caravan site.
- Existing footpath system is good / well established, new footpaths should be provided through the site potentially including the disused railway line however there are gradient issues with the embankment and any development should not inhibit the possible future tram extension.

Form of development:

- Loss of employment from the depot could be off-set through small scale on-site B1 provision or live-work units. Consideration should be given to on-site affordable housing provision and self/custom-build. Preference for wildlife area to move development away from the existing housing although noise from A610 would be an issue.
- Aspirations for land beyond site to be provided as extended nature reserve although not in developer ownership.

Heritage:

- Landscape buffer should be provided adjacent to the Conservation Area.

Site Specific workshop 7: Land south of Blenheim Industrial Estate Nuthall (11th November 2016)

Agenda:

Points for discussion:

Connection and Movement

- The provision of well located, safe and attractive access point for different modes of transport
- Well-connected development with strong linkages to the surrounding areas and facilities
- Promoting sustainable transport
- Safeguarding HS2 route

Landscape/ Green Routes/Open Space

- Impact on ancient woodland (Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)) including buffers.
- Identify and strengthen key green routes to connect existing and new open spaces.
- Use of landscaping to enhance the streets
- Vegetation / Mature Trees / Hedgerows / Boundaries to be retained / incorporated?
- Views of the site from the M1
- Sustainable urban Drainage System within an integrated drainage strategy

Heritage Assets

- Stone railway tunnel / arch (non-designated heritage asset)
- Impact on New Farm (local interest building)

Delivery

- Delivery timescale
- Further work

Green Infrastructure, Open space and the SSSI:

- Parish Council would like development to provide a country park, although future maintenance could be an issue.
- The SSSI and Local Wildlife Site (LWS) were key concerns and a buffers would be required (15-50m was suggested for the SSSI) to protect the area and prevent problems from tree shading and overgrowth.
- Concern reading the Green Infrastructure (GI) corridor, including the provision of a new corridor and development severing an existing corridor. Proper connectivity to the wider area would need to be considered as site is currently very isolated.

Connections & Movement:

- Access to the site was also a key constraint with developer proposing access through the embankment (LWS) which may have contamination issues due to historic use or through the SSSI (not feasible). Site access would have to come through an existing industrial estate which would be unattractive and improvements would be limited as outside developer control.
- Public transport, walking and cycling routes important due to sites isolation however difficult to achieve due to sensitivity of the SSSI (with no public right of way). Links to Nuthall suggested as an alternative and bus route extensions would be needed.
- Developer would put infrastructure in early which would encourage house builders.

Mix and form of development:

- The key issue was in relation to the juxtaposition between the aspirations of the Parish Council who wanted residential development with a country park and the landowner who wants employment led development to take advantage of proximity to the M1 and to make the isolated site viable.
- Concern regarding the lack of evidence for employment provision and the impact on the desirability of residential units in close proximity.

- There was concern about the type of house that would be provided considering that to include industrial development would result in everything being compacted together. Parish Council had expected high quality houses spread out with plenty of green space and unsure about how everything would fit. Providing an attractive green environment was considered to be non-negotiable. Parish Council expected the east to be the 'green end'.
- Developer had done very early calculations and density was in line with current standards approx. 15 dwellings/acre (37 dwellings/hectare). Up until this point developer had not considered where areas of open space would be located but it was suggested that the open space would be compacted to accommodate development. Developer envisage that housing development would be located to the east of the site nearer to the woodland (SSSI) to include SuDs ponds and that employment would be best suited towards the proposed HS2 line to the west (which would act as a defensible boundary). There was concern that moving housing towards HS2 would impact on the saleability of the houses.
- Land surrounding the site in question is in the same ownership and so there is the potential to expand the site to accommodate all of the requirements up to HS2 and west of the motorway.
- Concern was raised about the future potential that development would eventually link the employment development proposed at the aerodrome.

Brinsley Alternative Site consultation (13th February - 24th March 2017)

Consultation documents: Discussion document outlining the two 'options' for sites in Brinsley. A letter from the Parish Council, an extract from the Tribal Sustainable Locations for Growth Report, relevant extracts from the Sustainability Appraisal and the Preferred Approach to Site Allocations (Green Belt Review) was also made available.

Publicity

- Press Release sent out to local papers.
- Documents were made available in the following locations: Electronically on the Councils website, Paper versions: in Main Council Offices in Beeston and at the Parish Council Offices in Brinsley.
- 310 emails and 730 letters sent to; duty to cooperate bodies, individuals/organisations who had previously responded to planning policy consultations with regards to issues at Brinsley and all addresses adjacent to the potential alternative site.
- Site Notices were put up at the alternative site.
- Weekly Social Media Updates (Twitter and Facebook)

Summary of responses: A [full summary](#) of the responses to the Brinsley Alternative Site consultation was reported to the Jobs and Economy Committee on the 6th July 2017 which can be found on the Councils website. A brief overview of the issues can be seen below:

There was a slight preference in numerical terms for Option 1 (east of Church Lane) rather than Option 2 (north of Cordy Lane) albeit a number of these respondents live outside of Brinsley.

There are three responses that are of particular significance due to being concerns expressed by a duty to cooperate partner or by being a neighbourhood plan group. These are from Ashfield District Council, Brinsley Parish Council and the Jacksdale/ Underwood/ Selston (JUSt) Neighbourhood Plan group.

Ashfield and the JUSt group have a preference for Option 1 as a result of concern relating to the reduction of the gap between Brinsley and Underwood if Option 2 were developed. Brinsley Parish Council prefer Option 2 having undertaken their own consultation over a number of months and referring to a reduction in the gap between Parish Boundaries in relation to Option 1.

Each of the respective site promoters refers to points in favour of their own site while questioning the delivery of their competitor site. None of the statutory consultees have concerns in principle regarding the ability to deliver homes on either site. Other landowners and developers with land interest in Brinsley supported their own site as an allocation, one in addition to 'Option 1' and one as a stand-alone development site.

Topic based workshop 7: Infrastructure (17th March 2017)

Agenda:

Points for discussion:

- Transport
- Utilities
- Flooding and Flood Risk
- Health Facilities
- Education Provision
- Emergency Services (Police, Ambulance, Fire & Rescue)
- Waste Management
- Community Services
- Green Infrastructure / Open Space
- Contamination
- Heritage Assets
- Other (inc. minerals extraction)

Any additional site specific requirements

- Awsworth
- Brinsley (Option 1 – East of Church Street)
- Brinsley (Option 2 – North of Cordy Lane)
- Bramcote (East of Coventry Lane)
- Stapleford (West of Coventry Lane)
- Kimberley
- Chetwynd Barracks
- Other non- Green Belt sites

Transport:

- Detailed transport assessments will be required for each site along with further assessment of the implications of clusters of development sites.

Heritage:

- It was noted that 'heritage assets' may be seen as 'infrastructure'. It was noted that a 'Heritage Lottery Bid' has been submitted in relation to Bennerley Viaduct.

Utilities:

- Western Power Distribution noted, in relation to 'electricity supply', that mainly 'reinforcement to the network' would be required. The Chetwynd Barracks site is located within the Derby Network Area. The Brinsley sites are not located within the attendees' Network Area.

Water:

- Nottinghamshire County Council is the Lead Local Flood Authority. It was noted that SUDS are required within a hierarchy of services. Infiltration, Greenfield run-off, and discharge all need to be considered. A 30% allowance for climate change needs to be included.

Health and Wellbeing:

- (NCC) Health noted that there are 3 themes. These are; Physical, Mental Health and Emotional Health (including Community Wellbeing)
- They noted that their work involves local authority commissions, school health services, disabilities, social care, and adaptations to homes.
- The health providers need information on the numbers of dwellings, especially for extra-care provision.

- Contributions will be required to fund social care, pre-school care, the provision of services for the elderly, school nursing and special needs. Considerable GP provision currently exists across the Borough.
- Not all sites are located within the area of the Nottingham West CCG; Nottingham North and East CCG will also need to be contacted. Contact details for this CCG can be provided.
- A new health centre is being considered for the Eastwood area.

Education:

- (NCC) Education: Contributions, including land requests, will be necessary to fund primary and / or secondary provision requirements arising from all sites. Requirements for new free schools may also need to be considered. Issues in relation to provision are likely in Brinsley (Ashfield area), the Beeston Rylands area, and the Beeston / Chilwell area more generally.
- From 2018/19, there will be growth in the numbers of secondary school pupils and therefore contributions towards secondary education will be sought. There are 'school space standards' for schools (including primary schools) and therefore expansion on site may be unachievable. As a result, the extension of secondary schools for partial primary school use has been considered. It was noted that George Spencer Academy has a 'constrained' site, but as it is an Academy, it is beyond LA control.
- As noted above, Academies are outside of the control of the local authority (NCC). There is a need for cross-boundary co-operation as some facilities are within the control of the education team that covers Ashfield District. Cross-boundary issues are important. These may involve Ashfield District, the City of Nottingham and Broxtowe Borough.
- Early years (including nursery) provision will need to be considered; this is not part of the same funding formula as for local schools. Private providers of such facilities may find information on the future plans for the Borough to be useful to their future planning for the area. It was stressed that 'universal provision' is the aim.

Waste:

- Contributions towards waste-related infrastructure will be required. There is not much capacity remaining at the Beeston facility; there is more capacity at the Giltbrook facility, but 'dry recycling' is near to capacity. There are some logistics issues. For example, there are some issues in relation to the loading 'output' to heavy goods vehicles.
- Contributions would be needed for a new waste transfer site. [Land for such a facility could be allocated within the Local Plan].
- In terms of waste management, there are now four different bin types in use in the Borough. Therefore, there will need to be storage facilities to store each of these bins, built into any future residential site development plans. Bin provision to new residents also needs to be considered.

Green Infrastructure:

- Green Infrastructure (GI) / open space requirements will need to be considered on a 'case-by-case' basis. Broxtowe BC has published a GI Strategy. There is also a new Playing Pitch Strategy. Future management of open space is an issue.

Minerals:

- Regard needs to be had to minerals development and the forthcoming Minerals Local Plan Examination.

Business:

- The areas of business development, employment, economic groups and apprenticeships will also need to be considered. There need to be mechanisms to 'pull-in' new businesses and 'match' jobs to new homes.

Public Transport:

- NCC (Transport) issues will include 'highways' (which will be a major area of infrastructure requirements), public transport, ensuring that development accords with the 6Cs planning guidelines, bus stop infrastructure, and networks of public footpaths and cycle ways. The tram

network is a significant area of public transport infrastructure, as HS2 will also be in the coming years.

- A Transport Assessment for each of the sites / developments will need to be prepared. Mitigating highway impacts / congestion will be necessary. It will be necessary to show the potential development impacts upon the strategic road network, including trunk roads within the Borough, including those which are currently busy at peak times (including the A52, A6005 (through Chilwell / Toton), A610 and in the proximity of the M1 junctions) and also to propose mitigation measures.
- NCC will revise its 'Planning Obligations Strategy' following the elections.

Site-specific Comments

Awsorth Site:

- The agent / developer for the Awsorth site provided a brief overview in relation to the site:
- Meetings have been undertaken with the Borough and Parish Councils on community services, including sports pitches and use of some of the developers' land for community use, and with regard to the Awsorth Neighbourhood Plan.
- Their consultants have investigated utilities including gas and electricity, and also flood risk. They have addressed highway issues and designed the scheme appropriately. They have undertaken studies in relation to Green Infrastructure, (both on site, and also linking to land at the Bennerley Disposal Point), and ecology. They have commissioned work relating to contamination and coal mining (Phase 1 Investigation).
- They have been in liaison with 'Sustrans' in relation to the Bennerley Viaduct project. They own the 'missing' land required for its completion as a new cycleway. They have offered the 'Bennerley Viaduct' land for £1. They are also happy to provide the materials for the required works.
- No discussion has taken place as yet on health and education. [A building is required in this Kimberley/Awsorth area, but not in isolation].
- The proposed development could provide the 'normal' level of developer contributions.
- They expect to submit a planning application in 2018. A 'Reserved Matters' application would follow in 2019. They expect to be providing housing on the site by 2020, and possibly in advance of this date.
- They have proposed a new access off Shilo Way. The Parish Council is in agreement with this approach.
- NCC Highways noted that other access options should first be considered and that Shilo way should be assessed 'as a whole'. Shilo Way should be the last resort as it is a 'by-pass' to the village. It may be that it will be the most suitable option for a new access, but all other options for accessing the site should first be considered.
- NCC Education noted that Awsorth and the two sites within Kimberley are considered to be within one 'planning area' for the purposes of education. There is a need to consider the cumulative effect. Land for a new primary school would be required between these three sites. NCC would seek 'full build recovery', (which is different to the usual formula).

East of Church Lane, Brinsley Site:

- The agent / developer for the East of Church Lane, Brinsley site provided a brief overview in relation to progress in bringing the site forward:
- Extensive background work and investigations have been undertaken to date. A highways / transport 'pre-application enquiry' has been undertaken. This revealed that the highways infrastructure has the capacity to accommodate the development of this site. Initially, access was proposed from Church Lane. Access is now proposed from Cordy Lane, although there is the potential for accessing the site from both Church Lane and Cordy Lane, with the primary access being off Cordy Lane. A mini-roundabout would also be possible, as preferred by the Parish Council.
- There was a discussion about education provision. 'Sure Start' is currently based in the school and relocating this to the village hall has been discussed with the Parish Council, in order to 'free-up' building space for an extension to the school. Enhancing the significance of 'heritage assets' has

been considered, i.e. St James the Great Church and the Brinsley Headstocks. A 'land swap' for Headstocks enhancement is being considered. Contamination is being considered as 'former mine working' is possible.

- The site is in the Selston 'education planning area' and therefore the link to Ashfield needs to be considered. Pedestrian linkages through the park to the village centre would be included within proposals for the site. There will be improved pedestrian and cycle connectivity. Pre-app enquiries have been undertaken in relation to flood risk. There would be areas of SuDS near to the Brinsley Brook corridor; all necessary land is within the client's ownership / control. There are proposals to use additional land to the south of the site for SuDS and GI purposes; the Parish Council was previously in agreement with these proposals.
- The landowner is keen to see the inclusion of accommodation for retirement purposes on the site. The proposals will include facilities for bin storage / sewerage infrastructure.
- An OPUN Design Review has been undertaken for the site.
- The Brinsley Brook Corridor, also within the ownership of the client at this point, will be enhanced as a part of the development. Connectivity with the Local Wildlife Sites, Headstocks, recreation ground and village will be provided. Bridleways will be enhanced where this can be done without encouraging motorcycling. [Tim Crawford reported that the former railway line to the east of the site is an informal bridleway, but this terminates further to the north. There was agreement that this route could be enhanced]. A full pre-application submission to the Borough Council was undertaken last year; no major issues were revealed.
- The developer is ready to submit a planning application for development at the site as soon as its release from the Green Belt is confirmed.
- Concerns were raised by NCC that any 'retirement' scheme should be genuinely for retired people; it should not accommodate those with living with children. There should be an appropriate legal 'clause' to ensure this.
- The distance of the site from the local centre was queried. The agent explained that shops within the local centre are located further to the southwest of the site, within the Conservation Area. Pedestrian linkages to the local centre will be provided.
- NCC noted that consultations with the Nottingham North & East CCG and Mansfield and Ashfield CCG team will need to be undertaken in relation to health provision. An impact upon the Nottingham West CCG area in relation to elderly care would be anticipated.
- In terms of heritage, the agent was asked whether improvements to Vine Cottage were still proposed. The developer responded that discussions had previously been underway with Brinsley Parish Council. However, since that time, the Parish Council has recently decided that it will no longer support this site, but has selected another site instead; the developer noted that the Parish Council is now refusing to communicate with him.
- The need to address issues in relation to flood risk at the Brinsley Brook was noted. The agent responded that SuDS would be incorporated within this area.

North of Cordy Lane, Brinsley Site:

- The planning agent explained that this is now the preferred site of Brinsley Parish Council. The owner had been approached by Brinsley Parish Council, and the owner has now commissioned the planning agent and developer (Richborough Estates) to act on their behalf.
- The planning agent set out progress in relation to the site:
- An indicative master plan has been produced; full support has been received from Brinsley Parish Council.
- Access would be from Cordy Lane. A roundabout will probably not be possible, and so access would be via a T-Junction, possibly using some of the client's land. Rights of way and footpaths will link the site with the village centre, school and nursery; low level lighting could be provided to light these paths. There will be SuDS and drainage ditches provided. A Phase 1 drainage study has been commissioned.

- The site is not within a Conservation Area, and no listed buildings will be affected. The site is surrounded by development on two sides. The site is an ideal location for ‘family homes’.
- They are ‘ready to go’ with a planning application; a permission with a condition requiring development within ‘two years’ would be welcomed.
- The developer noted that space is available at the primary school for expansion; the implication being that any contributions would be ‘normal’. NCC (Education) responded that the primary school is currently at capacity. By 2025/6 space is unlikely to be available. Due to ‘site levels’, and a flooding issue, no space is available for expansion of the school at the current site. They disagreed with the assessment of the landowner / agent. They noted that contributions would need to be higher (as acknowledged by the developer of the ‘East of Church Lane’ site); land acquisition and annex is proposed, and therefore costs will be higher.
- Mansfield & Ashfield CCG would need to be contacted in relation to health provision.

Land to the West of Coventry Lane, Stapleford & Land to the East of Coventry Lane, Bramcote Sites:

- The Planning & Design Group (planning agent for part of the West of Coventry Lane site) outlined recent progress in relation to bringing forward this part of the site for development:
- The owner of part of the site and also an infrastructure provider, has recently established a house building division – ‘Peter James Homes’, and so will be in a good position to develop the site. They have a good capability for delivery. A Transport Assessment has been undertaken. The current highway ‘bell mouth’ into the site off Coventry Lane is compliant with highway standards. The Transport Assessment takes account of development at Field Farm. There are no wider highway implications. This modelling considered a housing development figure of up to 450 dwellings.
- A Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken for the site including Boundary Brook and a tributary drain. Standard attenuation ponds will be provided. Houses will be constructed at the standard 150mm above ground level.
- There will be footpath / cycleway accesses to nearby facilities including the local schools and nearby amenities. There have been discussions in relation to public transport / provision of new bus routes along Coventry Lane, for example an ‘Ecolink’ service extension. Quality bus stop infrastructure is already in place along this route.
- No archaeology has been recorded on their part of the site.
- The former railway sidings have already been remediated, but as a depot, there could be hydrocarbon contamination.
- They recognise the development connections between the site, the Field Farm site and the Crematorium, especially the setting of the latter.
- The Bramcote Bereavement Services Joint Committee (BBJC), which owns the part of the land (on behalf of the Borough Council), is generally supportive of the proposals for the site. There would however need to be GI buffers / landscaping and careful master planning of the site to ensure no overlooking of the crematorium, in order to protect the interests of both the new occupiers of the houses and also the interests / operation of the crematorium.

Broxtowe Borough Council, in the absence of the landowner / agent for the ‘East of Coventry Lane, Bramcote’ site, outlined the current progress in relation to this site.

- Ownership issues relating to the school and NCC will need to be resolved. The re-development of the secondary school will be provided as a result of the proposed development providing funding for the White Hills Park Federation. [Contributions to primary education will also be required]. Basic principles need to be in place for the provision of a secondary school. Legal provision for its development at the same time as the homes will need to be ensured. The new school will utilise the existing access off Moor Lane; the new housing to the north will be accessed exclusively off Coventry Lane.
- NCC (Highways) noted that access to the sites (to the east and west of Coventry Lane) should be provided by a junction at the same point on Coventry Lane. The impact upon the wider highway

network, including Field Farm, would need to be assessed. NCC would prefer the junction to be located towards the south of the sites, away from the bridge over the railway. Both of the two sites need to be considered together in terms of highways impact.

- It was noted that the development would have an ‘urbanising’ effect upon Coventry Lane. Access to amenities and GI / open space will be important.
- Questions were raised in relation to the landfill site to the south of the (northern) school playing fields. Broxtowe Borough Council responded that this had closed and that remediation and work to transform the land into public open space were drawing to a close.
- Concerns were raised in relation to the provision of health care facilities. It was reported that many local GP surgeries and other healthcare providers are already at or close to capacity. The City area of Wollaton Vale is under pressure.

Chetwynd Barracks Site:

The planning agent for the MOD reported that:

- The MOD has confirmed that the Chetwynd Barracks site will no longer be required for defence as a part of the MOD Estate from 2021. It will therefore be available for housing from that point. 1,500 homes could be provided on the site. A new primary school will need to be provided. Hobgoblin Wood would be retained and new parks and open space created, and general ecology would be considered. Half of the gross area of the site would be retained.
- The site would feature SuDS schemes. New access (both vehicular and pedestrian) would be possible, for example opening up vehicular access to Chetwynd Road to the east of the site. The results of a technical assessment will be available within the next couple of weeks. This will contain information in relation to highways and will include suggested mitigation measures. Wider transport consideration and ‘future-proofing’ is needed as a result of the HS2 site. There will be connectivity with the HS2 and tram interchanges. No issues have been identified in relation to the provision of utilities. The site is within Flood Risk Zone 1. A concept master plan for the site has been drafted. Three buildings of heritage interest are currently being assessed, one of which could be for a continuing community use.
- It was noted that the development of the site should consider the wider strategic aims of the local area including the proposed development at Toton and HS2.
- NCC (Highways) noted that there would need to be highway improvements to Toton Lane / Stapleford Lane. These routes would need to be assessed in detail. The Swiney Way / Banks Road / Stapleford Lane links and junction are locations where highway issues exist.
- It was noted that a new primary school would need to be provided. Secondary school provision was also discussed. It was stressed that engagement with the Neighbourhood Plan process would be essential. The importance of engaging with Nottinghamshire Police in relation to the development of such a large site was stressed.

Kimberley Site (including Kimberley Depot):

- It was noted that the ‘Kimberley Caravans’ part of the site may or may not be become available for housing; the inclusion of this part of the site is not critical to the development of the remainder of the site.
- Broxtowe Borough Council noted that increasing the number of ‘shared facilities’ across local borough councils could lead to the release of the Kimberley Depot site for housing, as a result of it no longer being required for its current purpose.
- NCC made reference to the ‘Walker Street’ site in Eastwood. There is a feasibility study underway for combining community services wishing to return to the town centre, including joint GP service provision, in an Eastwood hub.

Key Infrastructure Requirements and Closing Remarks

- The largest, most complex and expensive infrastructure works which would be required across the sites were summarised as:
- Highway improvements: There is a need for engagement across developments.

- HS2: At 2033, this project will come to fruition, some 8 years outside of the plan period. Work streams are currently on-going.
- Understanding of development clusters, including Chetwynd Barracks and the Bramcote sites.
- Ensuring that there are no 'show-stoppers' in relation to the provision of education / healthcare services.
- It was noted that no major issues have been identified in relation to the provision of Green Infrastructure or open space.
- It will be important to understand the implications of creating access to the 'North of Cordy Lane, Brinsley' site.
- Broxtowe Borough Council was asked whether the Council plans to continue to use the Section 106 agreement process for developer contributions to fund infrastructure requirements, or whether it plans to move to a system of using the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

The Duty to Cooperate:

The duty to cooperate was created in the Localism Act 2011 and places a legal duty on local planning authorities (such as Broxtowe), county councils and public bodies to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with each other in order to maximise the effectiveness of Local Plans in the context of strategic cross boundary matters.

The duty to cooperate is not a duty to agree. But local planning authorities should make every effort to secure the necessary cooperation on strategic cross boundary matters before they submit their Local Plans for examination.

The duty to cooperate is a legal test and the Local Plan Inspector will recommend that the Local Plan is not adopted if the duty has not been complied with and the examination will not proceed any further.

The other public bodies, in addition to local planning authorities, which are subject to the duty to cooperate, are:

- the Environment Agency
- the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (known as Historic England)
- Natural England
- ~~the Mayor of London~~
- the Civil Aviation Authority
- the Homes and Communities Agency
- each clinical commissioning group established under section 14D of the National Health Service Act 2006
- the National Health Service Commissioning Board
- the Office of Rail Regulation
- ~~Transport for London~~
- each Integrated Transport Authority
- each highway authority within the meaning of section 1 of the Highways Act 1980 (including the Secretary of State, where the Secretary of State is the highways authority)
- ~~the Marine Management Organisation.~~

The planning practice guidance states that *“authorities should submit robust evidence of the efforts they have made to cooperate on strategic cross boundary matters. This could be in the form of a statement submitted to the examination. Evidence should include details about who the authority has cooperated with, the nature and timing of cooperation and how it has influenced the Local Plan”*.

The following document will take each of the Duty to Cooperate bodies in turn in order to show how the duty has been complied with:

This is a summary from formal consultation only, in many instances further informal discussions and joint working have taken place, the outcome of these is not documented below.

Nottingham City Council

When they were consulted	What they were consulted on	What they Said	What has happened subsequently / What we did in response
<p>November 2013</p>	<p>Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation</p>	<p>107 - Land at Woodhouse Way Nuthall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would not support the development of this site. 	
		<p>220 - Land east of Low Wood Road Nuthall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would not support the development of this site. 	
		<p>Town Centres Main town centre uses below 1,000sqm should not need to provide an impact assessment.</p>	
		<p>Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement of transport measures should be assessed on a site by site basis (i.e. no threshold) • If thresholds used then percentage margin should be included. Integrated transport hubs and linked sustainable systems are key and any safeguarded routes should be retained so long as there is sufficient capacity. 	
<p>January / February 2015</p>	<p>Meetings with Nottingham City and Ashfield District Councils to discuss and agree a joint approach to cross-boundary Green Belt between settlements.</p>		
<p>February 2015</p>	<p>Preferred Approach to site allocations: Green Belt Review Consultation</p>		
<p>February 2015</p>	<p>Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation</p>		
<p>November 2015</p>	<p>Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitted two possible masterplan's (not intended to be comprehensive – rather to stimulate debate). • Masterplan should not prejudice development around the station. • When developed this area will have a very different character to current and should be planned as a new place. Residential development should reflect the place one developed rather than as it is now. 	<p>It will be possible to include the broad amounts of economic development put forward by Nottingham City Council , although other ways are put forward of achieving this. This will also allow for the delivery of housing in such a way that this is deliverable in the short to medium term, will function as a better connected development to the existing settlement of Toton in line with the principles established by the Design Review process (include link) prior more comprehensive re-</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low density suburban development may not be appropriate. • Masterplanning should include former nursery to the west of Toton Lane and Garden Centre to the East of Toton Lane – options to acquire these sites may emerge as structures around the station are consolidated. • Options to move existing uses within the location to achieve better disposition of land should be considered – e.g. George Spencer to relocate to the East of Toton Lane. Net Park and Ride site could also be relocated outside the location for growth or part of HS2 operational land. • Local centre should be visible and accessible from Toton Lane to ensure vitality and viability. • Planned housing at 30 dwgs/ha average (reflective of current development in the area) should be increased because of nature of future development in area. Lower end of the density range should be around 40 dwgs/ha which would free up more land for economic development. • Example of good quality high density housing = Green Street Development in the Meadows area of the City – both sustainable and attractive. • Developing all or some of the housing on the East of Toton Lane would allow more economic development to the West with a better relationship with the Toton hub. • It is considered that the amount of economic development to the West of Toton Lane should be increased more in-line with the Oxalis development approach. 	<p>development of the location once HS2 is operational</p> <p>Planning with a view to the density of the residential development as it will sit in a mixed use location is considered to be good planning, and this may include higher average density when compared to Toton. The points relating to inclusion of the nursery in the location, the local centre and the principle of increasing the economic potential are also agreed in principle.</p> <p>For Bardills, although the suggestion of not excluding this area from our thinking is sensible and good planning, it is considered too early at this stage to take steps to include this within an area proposed to be removed from the Green Belt. The reason for this is that the long term Green Belt boundary is considered to be best located along the existing tram line and park and ride being a defensible long term boundary. In addition the area to the north of the strategic location including that in the vicinity of the garden centre is identified as a Green Infrastructure corridor.</p> <p>The re-location of the school is considered to be a disproportionate upheaval particularly as this is at the northern edge of the strategic location and can be successfully incorporated into planning for the wider area without compromising other ambitions. The tram park and ride may be relocated in the long term, but ambitions for the wider area can be incorporated with the Tram park and ride in its current location.</p>
<p>August 2016</p>	<p>Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation</p>	<p>Bramcote: Support Allocation - Sustainability Appraisal, Equalities Impact Assessment and Green Belt assessment not included in consultation.</p> <p>Represents significant contribution to housing requirements of Greater Nottingham as well as those in Broxtowe (set out in the Aligned Core Strategy).</p> <p>Although currently Green Belt it forms a natural sustainable extension to the existing urban area of Greater Nottingham and provides opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure and wildlife corridors throughout the site and protects Bramcote Park, Stapleford Hill and the</p>	<p>Broxtowe welcome the support from the City Council with regards to the potential Bramcote site allocation. This allocation was carried forward into the publication version of the Part 2 Local Plan.</p>

		<p>Ridgeline.</p> <p>It also has direct access off Coventry Lane.</p>	
		<p>Chetwynd: Support Allocation - Sustainability Appraisal, Equalities Impact Assessment and Green Belt assessment not included in consultation.</p> <p>Represents significant contribution to housing requirements of Greater Nottingham as well as those in Broxtowe (set out in the Aligned Core Strategy).</p> <p>Located with the existing built up area of Greater Nottingham and is brownfield.</p> <p>Proposals further Core Strategies approach in terms of urban concentration with regeneration.</p>	<p>Broxtowe welcome the support from the City Council with regards to the potential Chetwynd site allocation. This allocation was carried forward into the publication version of the Part 2 Local Plan.</p>
		<p>Nuthall: Oppose Allocation - In the joint assessment carried out by Nottingham City and Broxtowe the site performs very well in Green Belt terms. Development would involve encroaching across the existing defensible boundary that is formed by the disused railway line and Blenheim Industrial Estate and there is no obvious new defensible boundary.</p> <p>The site lies immediately adjacent to a SSSI, Local Nature Reserve and Ancient Semi-Natural. It is ancient woodland and has a woodland ground flora that includes notable species. City Council has strong concerns about residential development within such close proximity to a site and habitat of such high value.</p> <p>Ancient woodland should always have a buffer that is retained as open space or agriculture and not developed so as not to isolate the fauna that uses the woodland and to protect the woodland from excessive human pressure. For example to protect from fly-tipping, the spread of non-native species and pressure to trim over-hanging trees etc.</p> <p>Although a buffer is proposed to Sellers Wood the need to provide more direct pedestrian and cycle links to the urban area to the east and increased human activity will have a potential negative impact, including on Colliers Wood.</p> <p>Grande 3 Agricultural Land quality – Local Planning Authorities should</p>	<p>Broxtowe note the strong objection from the City Council and as a result of the consultation response the site was not carried forward into the Part 2 Local Plan.</p>

		<p>seek to use areas of poor quality land in preference to that of high quality. No assessment has been provided to show that there is no alternative (as required by NPPF).</p> <p>Vehicular access would need to be taken through Blenheim Industrial Estate as the city would not permit direct access from Sellers Wood Drive West which it owns, in order to avoid harm to the SSSI. This would provide poor connection with the wider urban area, promoting a greater propensity for car borne journeys due to poor links to public transport or existing footpath/cycle links specifically into the urban area within the City to the east.</p> <p>The site is remote from existing facilities.</p> <p>Possible highway capacity issue with surrounding highway network as well as conflict between Heavy Goods Vehicles using the Industrial Estate. New public green space to the west of the site would not be an ideal location for the existing residential areas within the City.</p> <p>Noted that distances are 'as the crow fly's' and hides how poor the connections are to surrounding facilities.</p> <p>Site performs poorly in sustainability terms.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the strong objection, should the site be taken forward for development and S106 contributions would need to consider the impact of the development on the City (e.g. Education, transport to be paid to City Council and not County Council).</p>	
<p>February 2017</p>	<p>Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation</p>		

Erewash Borough Council Comments

When they were consulted	What they were consulted on	What they Said	What has happened subsequently / What we did in response
November 2013	Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation	<p>Transport</p> <p>Support the site allocations document but note that any development near the boundary between Erewash and Broxtowe should take into account the cumulative impact of traffic with that of other sites planned on both sides of the boundary.</p>	
January / February 2015	Meetings with Nottingham City and Ashfield District Councils to discuss and agree a joint approach to cross-boundary Green Belt between settlements.		
February 2015	Preferred Approach to site allocations: Green Belt Review Consultation	<p>Growth of Awsworth should capitalise on close proximity to Ilkeston railway station - fostering sustainable travel e.g. additional (or re-routed) local bus services, or enhancements to footpaths, roads and cycle-ways.</p> <p>EBC has produced the Ilkeston Gateway Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) - framework transport/access proposals will be considered against in order for its full economic potential to be reached.</p> <p>Importance of collaborative working - EBC wish to provide support to any future efforts to further enhance connectivity between Awsworth and Ilkeston station.</p> <p>Disused Bennerley Viaduct important as part of the accessibility network - aware of efforts to return the Viaduct to an active use and generally support any such initiatives in this regard. Its re-establishment could contribute to enhancing the local Green Infrastructure network and allow walkers and cyclists to cross and explore the Erewash Valley in an east-west direction.</p> <p>Viaduct would also contribute to the extension of the Great Northern Greenway, a recreational trail, beyond the current point of termination at Cotmanhay, crossing the Erewash Valley and finally over into Broxtowe heading in the direction of Awsworth.</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Awsworth housing allocation in the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 4.1: Land west of Awsworth (inside the bypass) which includes the following key development requirements;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Provide safe pedestrian crossing points across the bypass.</i> • <i>Enhance Green Infrastructure corridors by linking Awsworth with Ilkeston/Cotmanhay via Bennerley Viaduct.</i> • <i>Enhance walking and cycling routes to Ilkeston Railway Station.</i> • <i>Enhance bus routes adjacent to the site”</i> <p>Broxtowe has also incorporated the request with regards to Bennerley Viaduct (as part of the ‘Great Northern Path’ recreation route) into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets which states;</p> <p><i>“1. Development proposals which are likely to lead to increased use of any of the Green Infrastructure Assets listed below, as shown on the Policies Map, will be required to take reasonable opportunities to enhance the Green Infrastructure Asset(s). These Green Infrastructure Assets are:...</i></p> <p><i>e) Recreational Routes”</i></p>

		<p>Zone 7: Notes conclusions which recognise the important role to ensure continued separation of settlements.</p> <p>Development would additionally serve to substantially narrow the current gap between Eastwood and Cotmanhay</p>	<p>Broxtowe Borough Council welcomes Erewash Borough Councils support for their conclusion that development is not appropriate in this location. This area has not been carried forward as an allocation in the Part 2 Local Plan.</p>
		<p>Zone 33: Zone broadly flanks the western fringes of Stapleford.</p> <p>Close proximity between the land under review inside Broxtowe and a number of urban areas (in Erewash) situated west of the River Erewash.</p> <p>Noted that no release of Green Belt land within zone is required.</p>	<p>Broxtowe Borough Council welcomes Erewash Borough Councils support for their conclusion that development is not appropriate in this location. This area has not been carried forward as an allocation in the Part 2 Local Plan.</p>
		<p>Zone 43: Presence of River Erewash and lack of defences expose area to flooding – mitigation required if released for development</p>	<p>Broxtowe Borough Council welcomes Erewash Borough Council support for their position with regards to the lack of flood defences. This area has not been carried forward as an allocation in the Part 2 Local Plan.</p>
		<p>Zone 44: Contains Attenborough Nature Reserve, a prominent area of wetland with great ecological significance. EBC fully agree with BBC’s conclusion that any release of Green Belt for residential development would be inappropriate.</p>	<p>Broxtowe Borough Council welcomes Erewash Borough Councils support for their conclusion that development is not appropriate in this location. This area has not been carried forward as an allocation in the Part 2 Local Plan.</p>
		<p>Zone 48 & 49: Located to the south-west of the settlement of Trowell, directly abutting Erewash - assessment acknowledges number of limiting factors which raise uncertainties as to the suitability of these broad locations to deliver future housing development.</p>	<p>Broxtowe Borough Council welcomes Erewash Borough Council support for their position with regards to the constraints associated with development at Trowell. Trowell is not a ‘Key Settlement’ in the Aligned Core Strategy and no amendments to the Green Belt boundary are proposed here. This area has not been carried forward as an allocation in the Part 2 Local Plan</p>
February 2015	Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation		
November 2015	Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation	<p>Erewash are supportive of Broxtowe in meeting development requirements of the ACS.</p> <p>Support incorporation of recommendations into on-going work as set out in EBC’s Toton HS2 Station Area Plan.</p> <p>EBC strongly advocate establishment of north-south link road connecting A6005, B5010 and HS2 station.</p> <p>Future development should not prejudice the ability to construct north-south route.</p>	

		<p>EBC urge caution regarding scale of retail floor space to be promoted – suggest the use of the word ‘neighbourhood’ rather than ‘local’.</p> <p>Encouraged that Broxtowe are committed to working with Erewash to ensure that development design takes into account the Sandiacre Lock Conservation Area.</p>	
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation	<p>Chetwynd: Support Allocation –importance of constraining the scale of retail to that of a ‘small neighbourhood centre’ (as proposed) cannot be understated. The vitality and viability of existing local centres such as Stapleford and Sandiacre will rely on the supply of retail within the development being proportionate to the need of the incumbent population and sensitive to the existing hierarchy of retail centres across the wider area.</p> <p>Future proposals should utilise existing and, where necessary, accommodate new public transport options to minimise wider and longer term private car use.</p> <p>Support provision of Green Infrastructure including link to Strategic Location for Growth.</p>	<p>Broxtowe welcome the support from Erewash Borough Council with regards to the potential Chetwynd site allocation. This allocation was carried forward into the publication version of the Part 2 Local Plan.</p> <p>The emphasis on non- private car use has been incorporated into the ‘Key Development Requirements’ for the specific site allocation.</p> <p>The importance of the size of the local center was incorporated into the ‘Key Development Requirements’ for the specific site allocation and the size threshold for the ‘out-of-town’ retail provision being ‘capped’ at 500 gross square meters.</p>
February 2017	Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation		

Ashfield District Council

When they were consulted	What they were consulted on	What they Said	What has happened subsequently / What we did in response
<p>November 2013</p>	<p>Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation</p>	<p><u>Housing / General Development</u> Housing mix and density should be determined on a site by site basis supported by an up-to-date assessment of local need.</p>	
		<p><u>Brinsley Generally</u> Any development in Brinsley would impact upon the infrastructure in Underwood and possibly Jacksdale.</p>	
		<p><u>197 – North of Cordy Lane Brinsley</u> Concern about coalescence with Underwood if whole of site is developed.</p>	
		<p>513 - Land belonging to Stubbing Wood Farm Watnall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any future development contributions from this site should be made available to Ashfield DC as development would affect the services and infrastructure in Hucknall. 	
		<p>Economic Issues/Job Creation Additional employment allocations should not be made so long as there is an enabling policy to deliver business growth not in the plan.</p>	
		<p>Climate Change Specific sites for renewable energy should not be allocated because flexibility is required to adapt to the ever changing renewable industry.</p>	
		<p>Community Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certainty in private investment through planning process is needed to ensure implementation. • Should be linked to master planning for the whole area to create sustainable communities. 	
		<p>Healthy Living</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites need to be considered alongside other development • GI should be driven by local evidence base. 	
<p>Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No size threshold should be applied and should be dictated by viability. 			
<p>January / February 2015</p>	<p>Meetings with Nottingham City and Ashfield District Councils to discuss and agree a joint approach to cross-boundary Green Belt between settlements.</p>		
<p>February 2015</p>	<p>Preferred Approach to site allocations: Green Belt Review Consultation</p>		
<p>February 2015</p>	<p>Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation</p>		
<p>November</p>	<p>Strategic Location for Growth at Toton</p>		

2015	Consultation		
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation		
February 2017	Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation	<p>ADC have concerns regarding the impact of Option 2 on the Green Belt between Brinsley and Underwood.</p> <p>Policy 3 of the Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategy (ACS) indicates that the principle of the Nottingham Derby Green Belt will be retained. Section 3 of Policy 3 indicates that, in reviewing Green Belt boundaries, consideration will be given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The statutory purposes of the Green Belt , in particular the need to maintain the openness and prevent coalescence between Nottingham, Derby and other surrounding settlements; b) Establishing a permanent boundary which allows for development in line with the settlement hierarchy and/or to meet local needs; c) The appropriateness of defining safeguarded land to allow for longer term development needs; and d) Retaining or creating defensible boundaries. e) <p>ADC is of the opinion that the proposed Brinsley Option 2 consultation site would have an adverse effect on the coalescence of Brinsley and Underwood. Policy 3 of the ACS identified the prevention of coalescence as an important consideration in reviewing Green Belt boundaries. The 2015 Green Belt Review undertaken by Broxtowe indicates that the area scores very high in Green Belt terms with regard to the merging of settlements. Development would directly adjoin Ashfield’s boundary and would go beyond the built up area in Brinsley towards Underwood’s settlement boundary. ADC was proposing to allocate land at Winter Closes in Underwood in the 2013 withdrawn Ashfield Local Plan. The Council has now determined that the site is not suitable because it scores very high in relation to merging of settlements (Underwood and Brinsley) in the 2015 Ashfield Green Belt Review. It should be noted that, in the interests of good planning practice and the Duty to Cooperate, a requirement in the 2011 Localism Act, Ashfield has worked closely with Broxtowe to ensure a consistent approach to reviewing Green Belt boundaries. The site assessments undertaken should play a crucial role in determining which sites are the most appropriate in Green Belt terms. As part of their response (letter dated 14th October 2013) to the public consultation on the 2013 withdrawn Ashfield Local Plan, Brinsley Parish Council objected to the proposals to allocate Winter Closes. One of their reasons related to the effect it would have on the coalescence between Brinsley and Underwood. The Parish indicated that:</p> <p><i>“This initial development, therefore, could lead to significant further development which will give the risk of coalescence between the two villages of Underwood and Brinsley which would be completely unacceptable as we would then lose the separation between the two villages and Brinsley is one of the last true villages in Broxtowe surrounded by Green Belt on all sides”.</i></p>	

		<p>Brinsley Parish Council's response to Selston Neighbourhood Area Consultation in 2013 in relation to Winter Closes proposed allocation stated that their proposal, to remove Winter Closes, would ensure that the narrow Green Belt gap between the two villages is removed from consideration for development purposes, which is to the benefit of both communities and in line with National Planning Practice Guidance concerning the prevention of coalescence of settlements. The allocation of the Option 2 site would clearly go against Brinsley Parish Councils Commitment to protect the narrow Green Belt gap between Brinsley and Underwood.</p> <p>In conclusion, ADC has concerns that the allocation of Option 2 would significantly reduce the gap between Underwood and Brinsley. Both Ashfield's and Broxtowe's Green Belt Assessments for the area between Underwood and Brinsley have scored very high with regard to merging of settlements. The prevention of coalescence is a key priority in terms of Green Belt Policy.</p>	
--	--	---	--

Bolsover District Council:

When they were consulted	What they were consulted on	What they Said	What has happened subsequently / What we did in response
Jointly prepared by the HMA Councils	Green Belt Review Methodology	Bolsover District Council: No objections to the methodology.	

Nottinghamshire County Council

When they were consulted	What they were consulted on	What they Said	What has happened subsequently / What we did in response
November 2013	Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation	Housing / General Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stress importance of good design and layout of new development, this should include the provision of supporting waste infrastructure and integrating heat and/or power from other developments where viable. 	
		190 – North of Barlows Cottages Awsworth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant part of site covered by SINC 2/256 – species-rich neutral grassland which would need to be protected from development. 	
		192 - West of Awsworth Lane South of Newtons Lane Cossall <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area covered in rough grassland, scrub and hedgerows which may have nature conservation value and may support protected species. 	
		197 – North of Cordy Lane Brinsley <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjacent SINC 5/2328 and SINC 2/167 – mitigation for indirect impacts would be required which could include buffer zone. 	
		198 – East of Church Lane Brinsley <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjacent SINC 5/2302 – mitigation for indirect impacts would be required including significant corridor/buffer along Brinsley Brook 	
		376 - Land opposite 28 Church Lane Brinsley <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjacent SINC 5/3405 – mitigation for indirect impacts would be required which could include buffer zone. 	
		3 – Wade Printers (and adjacent land) Baker Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjacent SINC 5/273 – questions extent of SINC boundary Mitigation for indirect impacts would be required which could include buffer zone. Mitigation for direct impact may involve reduction in developable space. 	
		125 - Land at Church Street Eastwood <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remnant area of neutral grassland which may have conservation value. 	
		130 - Church Street Eastwood (Raleigh) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area of grassland and scrub which may have conservation value. 	
138 - Walker Street Eastwood <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area of grassland, scrub and post-industrial habitat which may have conservation value. 			

		143 - South of Smithurst Road Giltbrook <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area of grassland and scrub which may have conservation value. 	
		146 – Chewton Street Newthorpe <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area of grassland and hedgerows which may have conservation value. 	
		203 – Nether Green East of Mansfield Road Eastwood <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjacent SINC 2/259 – mitigation for indirect impacts would be required which could include buffer zone. Area of grassland and hedgerows which may have conservation value. 	
		204 – North of 4 Mill Road Beauvale <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area of grassland and hedgerows which may have conservation value. 	
		206 – East of Baker Road/North of Nottingham Road Giltbrook <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part of site covered by SINC 2/274 – marshy grassland which would need to be protected from development. Adjacent SINC 5/253 – mitigation for indirect impacts would be required which would include significant green corridor/buffer along the Brinsley Brook. Area of grassland and hedgerows which may have conservation value. 	
		313 - Brookhill Leys Farm Eastwood <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjacent SINC 2/245 – mitigation for indirect impacts would be required which could include buffer zone. 	
		519 - Land off Thorn Drive & West of the Pastures Newthorpe <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area of grassland and scrub which may have conservation value. 	
		103 – Land east of New Farm Lane Nuthall <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site entirely covered by SINC 5/753 – species-rich calcareous grassland which should not be developed. 	
		105 - Land west of New Farm Lane Nuthall <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area of grassland which may have conservation value. 	
		131 - Church Hill Kimberley <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site entirely covered by SINC 2/276 – species-rich neutral grassland which should not be developed. 	
		144 - South of Eastwood Road Kimberley <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area of grassland and trees which may have conservation value. 	
		145 – Land between 3 and 12 Hardy Close Kimberley <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjacent Kimberley Railway Cutting SSSI and SINC 2/71 Mitigation for indirect impacts would be required which could 	

		<p>include buffer zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of grassland which may have conservation value. 	
		<p>215 - Land adjacent to Kimberley Depot Eastwood Road Kimberley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site partly covered by SINC 2/140 – disused railway which would need to be protected from development. • Area of grassland, hedgerows and scrub which may have conservation value. 	
		<p>218 - South of Kimberley Road Nuthall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great Crested Newts believed to be in pond on site. 	
		<p>234 - Land at New Farm Nuthall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site entirely covered by SINC 5/753 – species-rich calcareous grassland which should not be developed. 	
		<p>271 - Gilt Hill Farm Kimberley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of grassland and hedgerows which may have conservation value. 	
		<p>285 - Land north of Alma Hill west of Millfield Road Kimberley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of grassland and mature hedgerows which may have conservation value. 	
		<p>411 - 2 High Street Kimberley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent SINC 2/140 mitigation for indirect impacts would be required which could include buffer zone. • Area of grassland and scrub which may have conservation value. 	
		<p>428 – Rear of Chilton Drive Watnall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent Kimberley Railway Cutting SSSI and SINC 2/71 • Mitigation for indirect impacts would be required which could include buffer zone. 	
		<p>586 – Kimberley Brewery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of woodland which may have conservation value. 	
		<p>104 – Land off Coventry Lane Bramcote</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site partly covered by SINC 2/6 – canal which would need to be protected from development. 	
		<p>107 - Land at Woodhouse Way Nuthall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site partly covered by SINC 5/755 – woodland which would need to be protected from development. 	
		<p>108 - Field Farm north of Ilkeston Road Stapleford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent SINC 5/1086 mitigation for indirect impacts would be required which could include buffer zone. • Area of grassland and scrub which may have conservation value. 	
		<p>111 – Land off Moss Drive Bramcote</p>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent SINC 5/1086 mitigation for indirect impacts would be required which could include buffer zone. • Area of grassland and scrub which may have conservation value. 	
		<p>220 - Land east of Low Wood Road Nuthall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site partly covered by SINC 2/57 – parkland, grassland, woodland and ponds which would need to be protected from development. 	
		<p>258 – Land at Lilac Grove Beeston</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of grassland and scrub which may have conservation value. 	
		<p>298 – Spring Farm Nottingham Road Trowell Moor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prominent Area for Special Protection identified under constraints heading Landscape Quality and Character which has not been defined or referenced in the documents. 	
		<p>410 - South of Baulk Lane Stapleford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of grassland and scrub which may have conservation value. 	
		<p>Toton - (133, 254, 259, 403, 132, 407 & 358)</p> <p>Site 358</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partly covered by SINC 5/2210 –mosaic of habitats on railway sidings which would need to be protected from development. <p>Site 133</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent SINC 5/2210 mitigation for indirect impacts would be required which could include buffer zone. 	
		<p>189 - Land at Smithfield Avenue Trowell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site partly covered by SINC 2/6 –canal which would need to be protected from development. • Area of grassland, hedgerows and scrub which may have conservation value. 	
		<p>513 - Land belonging to Stubbing Wood Farm Watnall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent SINC 2/319 mitigation for indirect impacts would be required which could include buffer zone. • Area of grassland and scrub which may have conservation value. 	
		<p>Economic Issues/Job Creation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local employment policies should make adequate provision for waste management and waste related development and would welcome the opportunity to discuss suitability of existing or proposed employment sites. 	
		<p>Enhancing the Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undesignated sites may have ecological value • Ecological assessments of sites should be carried out before they are allocated for development. 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites that consist wholly or partly of SINCs should not be considered further. 	
		<p>Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual development sites should be accompanied by a site specific Transport Assessment (or transport statement for smaller sites) and a cumulative impact transport assessment (where small sites are clustered together). Transport impact of the total quantum of development on non-strategic sites has already been taken into consideration (through the CS). All development will need to contribute towards a package of transport infrastructure required to support new development in the Borough (as set out in the Broxtowe Infrastructure Delivery Plan). 	
		Local plans should include policies on minerals safeguarding and consultation areas.	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request to include a policy on minerals safeguarding and consultation areas into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 22: Minerals which states that;</p> <p><i>“Development will not be permitted which would needlessly sterilise mineral resources of economic importance or pose a serious hindrance to future extraction in the vicinity”.</i></p> <p>The justification text 22.1 recognises the minerals safeguarding and consultation areas and shows them on map 40.</p>
		Omission of specific policy on developer contributions – would welcome involvement in CIL development.	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request to include a policy on developer contributions into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 32: Developer Contributions.</p> <p>Broxtowe Borough Council is yet to determine whether to develop a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). If a CIL is developed then Nottinghamshire County Council will be consulted.</p>
		Landscape Character Assessment within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Constraints/Requirement summary.	
		<p>No subheading or reference to Landscape Character in locally distinctive issues.</p> <p>Site constraints often reference ‘N/A’ for landscape quality and character.</p>	

		<p>A more informed & consistent approach to landscape quality and character required.</p>	
		<p>Employment Sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E31 – covered by SINC 2/140 & SINC 2/276 areas of disused railway and species-rich neural grassland which need to be protected from development. • E35 – adjacent SINC 2/245, mitigation would be required which may include buffer zone. • E36 – significant part of site grassland and scrub which may have nature conservation value. • E30 - significant part of site woodland which may have nature conservation value. <p>E31 – Partly covered by SINC 2/140 & SINC 2/276 site contains grassland and scrub which may have nature conservation value.</p>	
		<p>The County Council welcome the opportunity of cross boarder infrastructure working, to ensure that the facilities meet the needs of the communities. E.g. Rolls Royce (p157), Clifton, (p160) (Not an exclusive list).</p>	
		<p>Stapleford / Bramcote:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boundary too superficial when considering Green Belt Criteria • New boundary in this area should be based on a strong feature having regard to long term unforeseen development requirements and endue for long term e.g. 30 years • Boundary should follow east-west railway line providing a proper long term physical definition. • Should be considered as part of the urban area but not necessarily identified for development. <p>Urban spaces, playing fields etc. can be adequately protected by other policies – other land can be identified as safeguarded.</p>	
		<p>Possible new policy: Coal – Mineral Safeguarding Areas</p> <p>“The County Council welcomes the inclusion of a policy on minerals safeguarding. In order to maintain consistency with the emerging Minerals Local Plan, account should be taken of policy DM13 ‘Mineral safeguarding and consultation areas’ and any subsequent amendments as the Minerals Plan progresses.”</p> <p>“It is also important to note that Para 143 point 3 of the NPPF states that as well as defining Minerals Safeguarding Areas, Minerals Consultation Areas (based on the Minerals Safeguarding Areas) should be included.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is also worth noting that a sand and gravel safeguarding area 	

		exists in the south of the district which you may wish to consider.”	
Autumn 2014	Green Belt Review Framework	<p>H6: Density of housing development</p> <p>“The County Council recommends that reference to public transport accessibility appraisal mechanisms is essential for sustainable developments, and to ensure the long term viability of a development in terms of public transport provision”</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan and which can now be seen in Policy 22: Minerals.</p> <p>Care has been taken as Broxtowe is not the Minerals Planning Authority, Nottinghamshire County Council is.</p> <p>At the time of the publication of the Broxtowe Part 2 Local Plan the Nottinghamshire County Council Minerals local plan has been withdrawn from Examination. However, the County Council have advised that the Minerals safeguarding and consultation areas cover the same geographic area and this is based on the economic mineral resource as identified by the British Geological Survey, this is the data that Broxtowe have applied.</p>
February 2015	Preferred Approach to site allocations: Green Belt Review Consultation	<p>T1: Developers’ contributions to integrated transport measures</p> <p>“Any new approach should ensure that public transport provision is prioritised as part of any future policy development.”</p>	Noted. This relates to a requirement for high densities that may not be viable or appropriate in all locations.
		<p>T4: Park-and-ride facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “The Council isn’t currently considering any future Park & Ride developments in Broxtowe.” 	This may be problematic in relation to s106 ‘pooling restrictions’.
February 2015	Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation	<p>T5: South Notts Rail Network (SNRN)</p> <p>The policy is listed in a schedule of comments; however no comments on this policy are actually made.</p>	Noted and points will be considered.
		<p>T6: Nottingham Express Transit (NET)</p> <p>The policy is listed in a schedule of comments; however no comments on this policy are actually made.</p>	
		<p>T12: Facilities for people with limited mobility</p> <p>“It is important that the [County] Council can negotiate with developers for contributions to include such facilities as part of developments i.e. raised kerbs, audio and visual information. The Council requests the inclusion and retention of Policy T12.”</p>	
		<p>Possible new policy: Sustainable transport networks</p> <p>“Any single policy should include reference to the role of accessible public transport networks as part of a sustainable transport framework.”</p>	This may be problematic in relation to s106 ‘pooling restrictions’.
		<p>Possible new policy: Travel plans</p> <p>“The inclusion of a local policy setting out what is considered to be “significant” is supported.”</p>	Noted and points will be considered.

		<p>E16: Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation The policy “should certainly be retained, or incorporated into a ‘natural environment policy (see below).”</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 26: Travel Plans which states that; <i>“All developments of 10 or more dwellings or 1,000 square meters or more gross floorspace will be expected to submit a Travel Plan with their application.”</i></p>
		<p>Possible new policy: Green infrastructure “A policy relating to the natural environment (i.e. beyond just locally designated sites) [and so presumably potentially part of a new GI policy] is also required, which could incorporate policy E16, above.” In addition, the policy would need to : ensure that impacts on biodiversity are minimised; contribute to the establishment of coherent ecological networks; set criteria against which proposals affecting designated wildlife sites will be judged; plan positively for networks of biodiversity and GI; plan for biodiversity at a landscape scale across local authority boundaries; identify and map components of ecological networks; promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats; promote the recovery of populations of priority species; identify suitable monitoring indicators; prevent harm to geological conservation interests; and “make provision for an Nature Improvement Areas which may be identified in the plan area in the future”.</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan and which can now be seen in Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets and Policy 31: Biodiversity Assets which in combination seek to protect important biodiversity assets whilst creating/enhancing GI routes.</p>
		<p>H5: Affordable housing “The County Council welcome the issue of whether a consistent Borough Wide approach is appropriate, this will help when considering viability issues/priorities relating to the delivery of new housing sites.”</p>	<p>Noted and points will be considered.</p>
		<p>EM1 (?) New employment sites and/or RC2 and RC3 Community and education facilities “Paragraph 3.4.21 (p38) the County Council welcome the plans for “specific provision” for education which is also supported in Policy RC2 and RC3 (p55-56). Where ‘Reference to particular sites will need updating’ is included. The Capacity of schools sites to allow for further expansion is an issue that is changing over the duration of the plan period.”</p>	<p>Noted and points will be considered.</p>
		<p>RC5: Protection of open spaces The policy does “not provide an adequate framework, standards or criteria for an objective determination of the role and value of open spaces in new development...There needs to be a very clear relationship between the demographic projections of the local areas and the open spaces required – a PPG 17 type study which is only partly reported in the Council’s Green Spaces Strategy 2009-16.”</p>	<p>Paragraph 3.4.21 of the Aligned Core Strategy, which is referred to on page 38 of our consultation document with regard to policy EM1, is about the ‘knowledge based economy’; unclear what “specific provision” is referring to; and unclear as to the perceived relationship between employment and education policies. Further discussions will be held with Nottinghamshire County Council. Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan and which can now be seen in Policy 27: Local Green Space and Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets. Including the justification text</p>
		<p>RC6: Open space: requirements for new developments The policy does “not provide an adequate framework, standards or criteria</p>	

		<p>for an objective determination of the role and value of open spaces in new development...There needs to be a very clear relationship between the demographic projections of the local areas and the open spaces required – a PPG 17 type study which is only partly reported in the Council’s Green Spaces Strategy 2009-16.”</p>	<p>16.13 which links the distance from households to different types of Green Space and states that;</p> <p><i>“16.13 The need for the provision and maintenance of playing pitches, and associated developer contributions, will be assessed on a case-by-case basis, using evidence from the Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS, adopted in January 2017) and the Green Infrastructure Strategy (GIS, adopted in January 2015).”</i></p>
		<p>Bramcote: A coal Minerals Safeguarding Area/Minerals Consultation Area covers the entirety of the site. There it is important to avoid the needless sterilisation of economically important mineral reserves and to ensure that development would not pose a serious hindrance to future extraction. Where there is need for non-minerals development prior extraction should be sought where practicable.</p> <p>Note that site contains the Bramcote Quarry and Landfill – site restoration has been completed. County Council acknowledge the identified desire for further development and improvements to the site restoration as part of wider green infrastructure enhancements.</p> <p>Need to provide good access to health and social facilities – in Bramcote many of the health indicators are similar or no better than the England average.</p> <p>Area identified is larger than that which might be required, wider area includes several local wildlife sites and local nature reserves. Area hatched for residential development includes Bramcote Moor Grasslands Local Wildlife Site (LWS). This LWS appears to be last vestige of the Bramcote Moor (which once existed in the area) shown on historic maps. The LWS are of at least county-level importance and would need to be retained in its entirety. If this were not possible the County Council would object to the allocation of the site.</p> <p>Further information could be provided regarding the value of the LWS and how its interest would be protected (e.g. by incorporating into public open space and securing long term positive management).</p> <p>Should be designed to include good non-motorised permeability and where possible pass through public open space and green corridors with good natural surveillance.</p>	<p>Noted and points will be considered.</p>

		<p>Heritage List should make reference to site of Bramcote Hall and the design landscape that is an un-designated heritage asset.</p> <p>Further detailed transport assessments required. County Council is likely to request developer contribution to provide bus service to serve the development adequately.</p>	
		<p>Chetwynd: A coal Minerals Safeguarding Area/Minerals Consultation Area covers the southern part of the site. There it is important to avoid the needless sterilisation of economically important mineral reserves and to ensure that development would not pose a serious hindrance to future extraction. Where there is need for non-minerals development prior extraction should be sought where practicable.</p> <p>Need to provide good access to health and social facilities – for Chetwynd Barracks many of the health indicators are similar or no better than the England average.</p> <p>Existing mature vegetation on site should be retained and incorporated into the development where possible. Hobgoblin Wood and adjacent Local Wildlife Site (LWS) are to be retained which is welcomed. Opportunities for significant Green Infrastructure improvement should be pursued.</p> <p>Should be designed to include good non-motorised permeability and where possible pass through public open space and green corridors with good natural surveillance. Bridleway network in Broxtowe is segmented and north-south bridleway through site would be an excellent addition to the network.</p> <p>Further detailed transport assessments required. County Council is likely to request developer contribution to provide bus service and a bus stop to serve the development adequately including penetrating into the site to ensure that all new residents have access to quality public transport and infrastructure.</p>	
		<p>Nuthall: Oppose Allocation - Need to provide good access to health and social facilities – in Nuthall many of the health indicators are worse than the England average with all-cause death aged under 65 and 75 both being statistically worse than the England average and therefore improvements are particularly important.</p> <p>Serious concerns regarding Sellers Wood SSSI would be abutted by new</p>	

		<p>development (approx. 630m). Buffer indicated by no suggestion of how broad this would be. Development would have a serious urbanising effect on a site that is of regional importance for wildlife. Concern regarding increased public access pressure, potential for fly-tipping of garden waste, predation of wildlife by pets, general disturbance by noise and artificial lighting, potential air quality impacts etc. Development also restricts opportunities for woodland expansion/linking and may compound the effects of HS2.</p> <p>County Council would object to the allocation of this site.</p> <p>List of heritage constraints should include the site of the Grade II listed Blenheim Farm (within the city of Nottingham). Allocation would also be in an area associated with early coal mining, for which there are a number of records close by showing on the Nottinghamshire Historic Environment Record.</p> <p>Further detailed transport assessments required.</p> <p>County Council is likely to request developer contribution to provide bus service and bus stop to serve the development adequately.</p>	
<p>November 2015</p>	<p>Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation</p>	<p>As raised at previous stages of consultation, the adopted (and emerging) Minerals and Waste Local Plans form part of the development plan for the area and as such need to be considered as part of the development of the Part 2 Local Plan. The County Council will not reiterate the points already made at previous stage, instead would highlight the following points relating specifically to the Option 2 site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site lies within a Minerals Safeguarding and Consultation Area for Coal (as per Policy DM13 of the emerging Minerals Local Plan). The reference to the presence of coal under 'other' in the consultation document is welcomed. The County Council would refer to the views of The Coal Authority in terms of assessment the impact of the development against Policy DM13. - There are no existing waste facilities in the vicinity of the site which would raise an issues in terms of safeguarding in line with Policy WCS10 of the adopted Waste Core Strategy. <p><u>Nature conservation</u> - Option 2 is not covered by any nature conservation designations. However, the Winter Close Grassland, New Brinsley LWS (5/2328) abuts part of the north-western boundary of the proposed allocation and would need to be protected during development. The site appears to be dominated by improved (or possibly semi-improved) grassland, bounded by hedgerows and has some potential to support</p>	<p>Broxtowe note the strong objection from the City Council and as a result of the consultation response the site was not carried forward into the Part 2 Local Plan.</p>

		<p>protected species; as such, a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal of the site should support any planning application. The site layout should be designed to retain existing features such as trees and hedgerows.</p> <p><u>Right of Way</u> - There are no recorded public rights of way over Option 2. The County Council would take this opportunity to inform the District Council that Brinsley Footpath No 31 crosses Option 1. The route on the ground is understood to deviate from the route shown on the Definitive Map. Should this option be taken forward, this discrepancy should be noted and any future developer advised of such.</p> <p><u>Landscape and visual impact</u> (comments provided by Via East Midlands on behalf of the County Council) - As with Option 1, Option 2 lies within Policy Zone NC03 (Selston and Eastwood Urban Fringe Farmland) within the Nottinghamshire Coalfield Character Area. The overall landscape strategy is to enhance. Any development of this site should following the recommended Landscape Actions where possible. Winter Close BioSINC/LWS lies to the north of the site (neutral grassland). Ecological surveys should be carried out, including recommended mitigations measures. Visual impact on existing residents along Cordy Lane and Broad Lane should be considered. Option 2 provides a more integrated extension to the village than Option 1, which was to the east of the A608.</p> <p><u>Public Health</u> -Detailed comments on the links between planning and health were provided as part of the County Council’s response to the previous Additional Sites Consultation. Further to these general comments, in terms of the Option 2 site, the relevant local health report can be found attached. This sets out the health profile of the local area and shows that many of the indicators for the area local to the site are ‘not better than the England average’.</p> <p>As with all sites being considered for allocation, it is recommended that the relevant Local Estate Forum and Clinical Commissioning Group be consulted on the proposals in terms of the likely additional healthcare requirements that will be generated as a result of the development of the site(s). Further details on the impact of proposals at this site on public health will be provided when more details are available at the planning application stage.</p> <p><u>Strategic Highways</u> - The County Council has no comments to make on the</p>	
--	--	--	--

		alternative site in relation to strategic transport planning.	
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation		
February 2017	Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation		

Derbyshire County Council

When they were consulted	What they were consulted on	What they Said	What has happened subsequently / What we did in response
November 2013	Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation	No comments received	
Autumn 2014	Green Belt Review Framework	No comments received	
February 2015	Preferred Approach to site allocations: Green Belt Review Consultation	No comments received	
February 2015	Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation	No comments received	
November 2015	Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ACS has been through a rigorous examination process in front of a Local Plan inspector and the scale of housing and employment development has been deemed appropriate. • Broad area of housing proposed for allocation would form logical sustainable urban extension to the existing area of Toton. • If the housing allocation were increased significantly above 500 dwellings there could be potential adverse effects on future housing delivery in Erewash (particularly Long Eaton, Sandiacre and possibly Stanton Ironworks). • The level of employment land (18,000sqm) appears to be pitched at around the right level; any substantial increase could have potential consequences on the attraction of employment land to investors in Erewash (particularly Long Eaton and Stanton Ironworks). • Much of the area included in the allocation is Green Belt and it is important that any masterplanning incorporates significant areas of landscaping and open space to form separation between Toton, Stapleford, Long Eaton and Chilwell. • An increase in employment and housing development is likely to have an impact on the amount of open space and landscaping. • Connectivity proposals do not conflict with Derbyshire County 	<p>Agree with almost all of their comments. The one exception is the 18,000 square metres of employment provision which is considered can be enhanced without competing with city centres, or impeding the delivery of other sites such as Stanton. An increase in economic potential to include the DB Schenker site has significant potential to assist in the delivery of Stanton to encourage the relocation of the existing rail connected uses to Stanton. In addition any economic development at this location should be complementary and not compete with that offered at other locations including Long Eaton, Stanton and the city centres.</p>

		<p>Council plans and are broadly supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned that there should be connectivity through the site and not just to the station. • Bus operators have indicated that they would wish to serve the station as part of a through service rather than at the end of a spur. • Mention of NET extending through the site but suggest that we would want to safeguard high-standard routes through the site for buses, walking and cycling and local connections from adjacent housing and employment areas. • Much of our literature relates to S106 agreements but we might want to use the term ‘developer contributions’ to provide flexibility in the future should we wish to adopt CIL. • Support approach to allow the school to expand if required. • Concern that there could be an impact on Derbyshire schools due to proximity of the site to the boundary and would wish for assessment of impact to be undertaken, in addition to potential pupils of Derbyshire wishing to attend new primary school/ extended secondary. • Greater consideration should be given to the impact on waste management facilities. There is no mention of current provision and whether that needs to be improved. • Any development should take into account the potential impact on Erewash especially; Erewash Canal, Nutbrook Trail, local residents and the Sandiacre Lock Conservation Area. This part of Erewash is also part of the Erewash Green Belt. • Any development should take into account the effect on landscape character. • Opportunities are supported; to expand green infrastructure network around the site, to link the west with the Erewash Valley and Canal, and where development would be designed to have full regard to maintaining the landscape and character of the Riverside Meadows and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. • EBC plan showing east-west access from existing cycle routes should be extended to strategic location, links with Sandiacre and Nutbrook Trail with the consideration of east to west infrastructure connectivity. 	
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional	Chetwynd: Support Allocation – Located in very sustainable location within the urban area between Toton and Chilwell in a well-established	Broxtowe Borough Council welcomes the support from Derbyshire County Council for the allocation of Chetwynd Barracks and has carried

	Sites Consultation	<p>large surrounding residential area.</p> <p>Well located to take advantage of the recently opened NET extension and proposed HS2 station both of which area a short distance away.</p> <p>Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant implications for housing delivery in nearby Erewash Borough Council and Long Eaton particularly.</p> <p>Erewash Borough Council has no housing allocations in Long Eaton and has only one allocation in Stanton.</p> <p>Distance between Chetwynd and Stanton is unlikely to raise any significant delivery or viability concerns for Stanton.</p>	this through as a housing allocation in the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 3.1.
February 2017	Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation	No comments received	

The Environment Agency:

When they were consulted	What they were consulted on	What they Said	What has happened subsequently / What we did in response
November 2013	Site Allocations Issues and Options	35 - Land off Main Street Awwsworth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Former landfill site underlain by principal aquifer with potential for development to cause pollution. Environmental assessment required 	Site benefits from extant planning permission (implemented by access road). The site has been carried forward as a commitment in the Part 2 Local Plan and contributes towards the Aligned Core Strategy housing requirement for Awwsworth.
		36 - The Ponderosa Awwsworth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjacent to former landfill site and underlain by principal aquifer site which has potential for development to cause pollution. Environmental assessment required. 	Development of the site is complete and contributes towards the Aligned Core Strategy housing requirement for Awwsworth.
		190 – North of Barlows Cottages Awwsworth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low flood risk area Ordinary watercourse within site. Watercourse must remain open and site specific flood risk assessment and flood mitigation measures required. 	Green Belt site which was considered further through the Green Belt Review.
		192 - West of Awwsworth Lane South of Newtons Lane Cossall <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Former Common Farm landfill site underlain by principal aquifer with potential for development to cause pollution. Environmental assessment required. Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. Site specific flood risk assessment regarding infiltration of surface water need to be considered. 	Green Belt site which was considered further through the Green Belt Review.
		117 - Land at Newtons Lane Awwsworth 394 – Rear of 13-27 The Glebe Cossall 138 - Walker Street Eastwood 146 – Chewton Street Newthorpe <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No constraints. Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. 	Green Belt site which was considered further through the Green Belt Review.
		564 - Land at Gin Close Way Awwsworth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historical flooding in vicinity Surface water strategy required to reduce flooding to others. Development would have potential to pollute groundwater Environmental assessment required. 	Site benefits from extant planning permission. The site has been carried forward as a commitment in the Part 2 Local Plan and contributes towards the Aligned Core Strategy housing requirement for Awwsworth.
		197 – North of Cordy Lane Brinsley	Green Belt site which was considered further through the Green

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management and analysis of watercourse through site required. 	Belt Review.
	<p>200 - West of High Street Brinsley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific constraints Surface water flooding to north of site requires investigation 	
	<p>376 - Land opposite 28 Church Lane Brinsley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific constraints Surface water flooding through middle of site requires investigation 	Green Belt site which was considered further through the Green Belt Review.
	<p>3 – Wade Printers (and adjacent land) Baker Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. Drain adjacent to East of site that will need site specific flood risk assessment. Historic use of site potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer environmental assessment required. 	Green Belt site which was considered further through the Green Belt Review.
	<p>34 - Land off Acorn Avenue Giltbrook</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historical flooding in vicinity Surface water strategy required to reduce flooding to others. Development has potential to pollute groundwater Environmental assessment required. 	
	<p>130 - Church Street Eastwood (Raleigh)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. Historic use underlain by secondary aquifer with potential for development to cause pollution. Environmental assessment required. 	
	<p>143 - South of Smithurst Road Giltbrook</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. Flood mitigation assessment required for drain on Western boundary of site. 	
	<p>203 – Nether Green East of Mansfield Road Eastwood</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> South West and Western boundary within flood zone 3. Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. Flood risk management and biodiversity protection required for Brinsley Brook on Western part of site. 	
	<p>204 – North of 4 Mill Road Beauvale</p> <p>206 – East of Baker Road/North of Nottingham Road Giltbrook</p>	

		<p>208 – West of Moorgreen 514 – Hall Farm Cockerhouse Road Eastwood</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. 	
		<p>413 – Mansfield Road Nether Green</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ordinary watercourse to North and South of boundaries. • Southern boundary within flood zone 3 suitable easement for flood risk management and biodiversity protection should be used. • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. • Historic use as landfill site has potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer, environmental assessment required. • Site underlain by Made Ground and deterioration of water quality of adjacent brook suggests site causing pollution. 	
		<p>496 – Greasley Beauvale D H Lawrence Primary School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific constraints • Nearby watercourse (that EA have no knowledge of) requires investigation. 	
		<p>519 - Land off Thorn Drive & West of the Pastures Newthorpe 522 - Castle College Chewton Street Eastwood 105 - Land west of New Farm Lane Nuthall 113 - Land north of Alma Hill Kimberley 116 - Land north of Alma Hill Kimberley 131 - Church Hill Kimberley 234 - Land at New Farm Nuthall 271 - Gilt Hill Farm Kimberley 285 - Land north of Alma Hill west of Millfield Road Kimberley 586 – Kimberley Brewery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific constraints. • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. 	
		<p>521 - Beamlight Automotive Newmanleys Road Eastwood</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. • Historic use and adjacent landfill site potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer. • Environmental assessment required. 	
		<p>140 - Builders Yard Eastwood Road Kimberley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific constraints. 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. Impacts on former landfill adjacent to Southern boundary should be investigated. 	
	<p>144 - South of Eastwood Road Kimberley 215 - Land adjacent to Kimberley Depot Eastwood Road Kimberley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific constraints. Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. Impacts on former landfill adjacent to Southern boundary should be investigated. 		
	<p>411 - 2 High Street Kimberley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific constraints. Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. Small watercourse to South West boundary needs to be included in the flood risk assessment. 		
	<p>473 – Home Farm Nuthall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to principal aquifer Environmental assessment required. 		
	<p>136 - East of Main Street Awsworth 128 – Robin Hood Inn, 17 Hall Lane Brinsley 125 - Land at Church Street Eastwood 129 - Telford Drive Eastwood 134 – Springbank Primary School Devonshire Drive Eastwood 147 - East of Pinfold Road Newthorpe 163 - Chewton Street Eastwood 201 – Rear of the Island Eastwood 313 - Brookhill Leys Farm Eastwood 349 - 66 Dovecote Road Eastwood 508 – Hilltop House Nottingham Road Eastwood 103 – Land east of New Farm Lane Nuthall 144 - South of Eastwood Road Kimberley 210 – South-east of 32 - 40 Maws Lane Kimberley 218 - South of Kimberley Road Nuthall 219 - West of the Paddocks Nuthall 228 – North-west of Chestnut Drive Nuthall 428 – Rear of Chilton Drive Watnall 518 – Rear of 127 Kimberley Road Nuthall 1 - 92-106 Broadgate Beeston</p>		

		<p>28 - Hofton & Sons Regent Street Beeston 261 - Brethren Meeting Hall Hillside Road Beeston 265 – Beeston Police Station 419 - Wadsworth Road Stapleford 458 - Wyndham Court Field Lane Chilwell 460 - Peatfield Court Peatfield Road Stapleford 520 - Garages off Hall Drive Chilwell 543 - Inham Nook Methodist Church Pearson Avenue Chilwell 551 - Feathers Inn 5 Church Street Stapleford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific constraints. 	
		<p>6 - N K Motors 205a Bye Pass Road Chilwell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in flood zone 3 • Adjacent to unnamed watercourse. • Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. • Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer, • environmental assessment required. 	
		<p>12 - Moults Yard 68-70 Nottingham Road Stapleford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to principal aquifer • Environmental assessment required. 	
		<p>20 - Chetwynd Barracks Chetwynd Road Chilwell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. • Historic use of site potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer • Environmental assessment required. 	
		<p>51 - Pinfold Trading Estate Nottingham Road Stapleford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. • Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to principal aquifer, • Environmental assessment required. 	
		<p>95 - Allotments Hassocks Lane Beeston 107 - Land at Woodhouse Way Nuthall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments on planning application remain valid. 	
		<p>108 - Field Farm north of Ilkeston Road Stapleford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority of site within flood zone 1 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Watercourse (Boundary Brook) dissects site meaning some within flood zone 3. Sequential approach confirmed, site specific flood risk assessment required. 	
		<p>111 – Land off Moss Drive Bramcote</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management and flood risk from Boundary Brook required. 	
		<p>135 - Field Lane Chilwell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific constraints. Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. 	
		<p>150 – Beeston Maltings Dovecote Lane</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer Environmental assessment required. 	
		<p>104 – Land off Coventry Lane Bramcote 178 - Land north of Nottingham Road Trowell Moor 356 - East of Field Farm Sidings Lane Bramcote 410 - South of Baulk Lane Stapleford 412 – Chilwell Lane Bramcote (south of Common Lane) 415 - Ashlands Bilborough Road Trowell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. 	
		<p>195 - Land adjacent to 428 Queens Road West Chilwell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Located in flood zone 3. Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer Environmental assessment required. 	
		<p>220 - Land east of Low Wood Road Nuthall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority of site within flood zone 1 Watercourse dissects site meaning some within flood zone 3. Sequential approach and specific flood risk assessment required. 	
		<p>230 - Lower Regent Street Beeston 239 - Works Bailey Street Stapleford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Located in flood zone 3. Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. 	

		<p>231 - Wollaton Road Beeston</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to principal aquifer • Environmental assessment required. 	
		<p>232 - Sandiacre Road Stapleford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in flood zone 3. • Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. • Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to principal aquifer • Environmental assessment required. 	
		<p>237 – The Boots Company Beeston Site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in flood zone 3. • Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. • Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer • Environmental assessment required. 	
		<p>258 – Land at Lilac Grove Beeston</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in flood zone 3. • Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. • Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer • Environmental assessment required. 	
		<p>298 – Spring Farm Nottingham Road Trowell Moor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within flood zone 1 • Site dissected by watercourse. • Site specific flood risk assessment and potentially mitigation proposals required. 	
		<p>301 - 7a Middleton Crescent Beeston</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in flood zone 3 and includes Tottle Brook. • Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. • Water Resource Act 1991 & Midlands Land Drainage Byelaws mean prior written consent from EA required which is not guaranteed. 	
		<p>310 - Neville Sadler Court Beeston 389 - Neville Sadler Court Beeston</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in flood zone 3. 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. 	
		<p>343 – St Johns College Peache Way Bramcote</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific constraints. Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. 	
		<p>360 - Chetwynd Barracks Chetwynd Road Chilwell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. Historic use of site potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer environmental assessment required. 	
		<p>398 - Manor Garage 365 Nottingham Road Toton</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjacent to River Erewash part of site is close to or is functional floodplain (flood zone 3b) and should not be developed. Prior written consent from EA required which is not guaranteed. 	Following this response the site was moved out of the land supply and was deemed to be 'not deliverable or developable' in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
		<p>407 – Land between A52 Stapleford and Chilwell Lane Bramcote</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management including analysis of ordinary watercourse required. 	
		<p>408 - Myford Machine Tools Wilmot Lane Beeston</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments on planning application remain valid. 	
		<p>420 - Land north of Stapleford Road Trowell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. Historic use of site potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer environmental assessment required. 	
		<p>449 – Beeston Cement Depot Station Road Beeston</p> <p>499 - Beeston Business Park Technology Drive Beeston</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Located in flood zone 3. Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer, Environmental assessment required. 	
		<p>509 - Trowell Freight Depot Stapleford Road Trowell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental assessment required. 	
	<p>548 - Beeston Van Hire 2 Barton Way Chilwell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in flood zone 2. • Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. 	
	<p>588 – Land to west of Bilborough Road Strelley 189 - Land at Smithfield Avenue Trowell 513 - Land belonging to Stubbing Wood Farm Watnall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. 	
	<p>Toton - (133, 254, 259, 403, 132, 407 & 358)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. <p>Site 358 - (Toton Sidings)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located within flood zones 1, 2 & 3. • Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. • Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to principal aquifer. • Environmental assessment required. <p>Site 133</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within flood zone 1 • Unmapped ordinary watercourse boarders site. • Planning proposals acceptable subject to flood mitigation proposals. 	
	<p>Climate Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus is almost entirely on renewable technology and not enough consideration given to reducing flood risk. • Sequential and exception tests not included in the DPD docs despite the CS saying this would be done. 	
	<p>Enhancing the Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration of good quality green space is encouraged • GI is encouraged • Recreation opportunities should be managed to avoid areas of high biodiversity. 	
	<p>SA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 3 Qu. 1-3 should promote opportunities for Green Infrastructure • Consider the better management of water resources and waste. Recommend indicators for: increasing biodiversity levels “Will it 	

		<p>provide a net biodiversity gain?"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend indicators for: managing flood risk "Will it avoid flood risk?" • Recommend indicators for: minimising water usage "Will it minimise water usage?" • Recommend indicators for: waste "will it reduce the number of fly-tipping incidents?" 	
Autumn 2014	Green Belt Review Framework		
February 2015	Preferred Approach to site allocations: Green Belt Review Consultation		
February 2015	Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation	<p>E27: Protection of groundwater The EA "would wish for it to be retained rather than merged into other policies. This approach is important for Broxtowe as the district is situated on principal and secondary aquifers".</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request to retain the 2004 LP policy E27 however; it has been incorporated into a merged policy in the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 19: Pollution, Hazardous Substances and Ground Conditions.</p> <p><i>"1. Permission will not be granted for development which would result in:...</i></p> <p><i>c) Development which would be liable to result in the infiltration of contaminants into groundwater resources, having regard to any cumulative effects of other developments and the degree of vulnerability of the resource, unless measures would be carried out as part of the development to prevent such contamination taking place".</i></p>
		<p>E29: Contaminated land The EA "do not agree that there is no need for this policy. Former contaminative uses for example petrol stations or cemeteries pose a risk to groundwater and drinking water supply, but are not covered by environmental permitting regulations". They "point out that issues around contaminated land is an environmental consideration and is not exclusive to human health matters".</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request to retain the 2004 LP policy E29 and has incorporated it into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 19: Pollution, Hazardous Substances and Ground Conditions which states that;</p> <p><i>"2. Development of land potentially affected by contamination will not be permitted unless and until:</i></p> <p><i>a) A site investigation has been carried out to assess the nature and degree of contamination, using a method of investigation agreed in writing with the Council; and</i></p> <p><i>b) Details of effective and sustainable remedial measures required to deal with any contamination have been agreed in writing with the Council, taking into account actual or intended uses; and</i></p>

			<p><i>c) There will be no significant risk to the health and safety of the occupants of the development; and</i> <i>d) There will be no contamination of any surface water, water body, groundwater or adjacent land”.</i></p>
		<p>Possible new policy: Flood risk – sequential and exception tests The EA “have some serious concerns about the wording of the current draft and would not be able to support the draft policy in its current form”.</p> <p>“There is a need for clarification within the policy wording on which types of development would be subject to the principles of the Sequential and Exception Test elements of the policy.”</p> <p>Clarity should be added on the Exception test “to state that only the first part of the requirement for ‘wider sustainability benefits’ will be waived and the need to undertake a Flood Risk Assessment that demonstrates development will be safe and does not increase flood risk elsewhere, will continue to be complied with”.</p> <p>The EA “challenge the proposal to consider the term ‘minor development’ as less than 10 dwellings within the defended area”, as this is contrary to the PPG, and “small scale” [in the explanatory paragraph] needs to be defined.</p> <p>The EA notes that “the tenor of the explanatory paragraph text is not replicated in the proposed policy wording”.</p> <p>The policy has “a number of phrases which are poorly defined and would be hard to understand and apply by all parties in the planning process”, including ‘where a risk of flooding or problems of surface water disposal exist’, ‘existing developed’, ‘adequately protected’, ‘suitable’ and ‘no adverse effects on the management of flood risk’.</p> <p>It is “important” that the “message is clear in the final policy wording” that the policy “relates only to a particular area that is defended to an appropriate standard”.</p> <p>Bullet A) “is simply application of the NPPF without any references to your justification of the variations proposed in the explanatory paragraph text and makes the flood risk policy aspirations unclear”.</p> <p>In bullet B), “further clarification is needed in regard to the term</p>	<p>Following this response Broxtowe Borough Council consulted with the Environment Agency to address the concerns that they had.</p>

		<p>‘compensation’ in the draft policy or whether the council’s intended requirement is for mitigation measures”. “Where an area benefits from an appropriate standard of flood protection (such as the river Trent defences) the Environment Agency does not normally seek flood compensation.”</p> <p>The “requirement for flood mitigation is and must be applicable to all sites (defended or not) and the requirement for flood ‘compensation’ is and must be for all sites that are not defended or have a sub standard level of flood defence”.</p> <p>If the draft policy “is intended to suggest that no mitigation...works are necessary for developments of less than 10 dwellings, it will be strongly opposed by the EA”; and “any policy where flood compensation is not an absolute requirement in non defended or sub standard defended areas is not acceptable to the EA and will be resisted”.</p> <p>In bullet C), the reference to ‘adverse effects’ “will need to be clearly defined”.</p> <p>In bullet D), the EA “would suggest that additional wording is included for ‘flood risk management assets’ to ensure that access is maintained at all times”.</p> <p>In bullet E), the EA “recommend that the policy needs to be more proactive in that it leads to an actual reduction in surface water run-off, rather than a simple no worsening principal”. The EA also “question how the policy will be made to apply to ‘off site measures””.</p> <p>The EA “request that this draft policy is revised, and we would be happy to have further discussion around the detail of the proposed changes.”</p>	
		<p>Possible new policy: Flood risk – Sustainable Drainage Systems The EA “support the inclusion of the principle of the policy with details to follow once the necessary system is known and approved”.</p> <p>Possible new policy: Green Infrastructure The policy should make specific reference to “blue infrastructure i.e. watercourse networks (including rivers, streams, canals, ditches and drains)” throughout the borough.</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets. Whilst ‘blue infrastructure’ isn’t specifically referenced using those terms the Justification text 28.1 for this policy says that;</p> <p><i>Green Infrastructure is defined for the purposes of the Green Infrastructure Strategy (GIS) and the Part 2 Local Plan as “a network of living multi-functional natural features, green spaces, rivers, canals and lakes that link and connect villages, towns and</i></p>

			<i>cities</i>
		<p>SA scoping report Three specified documents are recommended to be added to the schedule of relevant plans, policies and programmes.</p> <p>The SFRA “could be considered to be out of date” and the EA “recommend that the document is reviewed and updated”.</p>	
November 2015	Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation		
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation		
February 2017	Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation	<p>No preference on which site is developed – no difference in terms of environmental constraints.</p> <p>As set out in the SA secondary aquifer is present below the entire settlement and mitigation measures may be required. Environment Agency comfortable that any potential issues can be addressed by way of future discussions.</p>	

Historic England (formerly English Heritage)

When they were consulted	What they were consulted on	What they Said	What has happened subsequently / What we did in response
November 2013	Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation	128 – Robin Hood Inn, 17 Hall Lane Brinsley <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site adjacent to conservation area – character and significance of this need to be considered. 	
		198 – East of Church Lane Brinsley <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact of development on setting of Grade II Listed church needs to be considered – not referenced in site assessments 	
		3 – Wade Printers (and adjacent land) Baker Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on wider setting of Greasley Castle Scheduled Monument needs to be considered. 	
		134 – Springbank Primary School Devonshire Drive Eastwood <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on the conservation area and adjacent Grade II Listed Building need to be considered. Note conversion of existing school building. 	
		204 – North of 4 Mill Road Beauvale Impact on setting of Grade II Listed D H Lawrence primary school (site 496) needs to be considered.	
		206 – East of Baker Road/North of Nottingham Road Giltbrook <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on wider setting of Greasley Castle Scheduled Monument needs to be considered. 	
		413 – Mansfield Road Nether Green <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Setting of Grade II Listed Eastwood Hall will need to be considered. 	
		496 – Greasley Beauvale D H Lawrence Primary School <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to ensure that residential use is most suitable and viable use for this Grade II Listed Building and is sympathetic to designation reasons Have we explored alternatives including employment use? Lower residential density might be more appropriate given significance of asset. 	
		508 – Hilltop House Nottingham Road Eastwood <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider impact of development on adjacent Grade II Listed memorial. 	
514 – Hall Farm Cockerhouse Road Eastwood <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site includes Grade II Listed Hall Farm buildings 			

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 98 dwellings is likely to impact upon the setting of these buildings • Further consideration of these issues is required. 	
		<p>144 - South of Eastwood Road Kimberley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of site falls within a Conservation Area and therefore impact upon this will need to be considered. 	
		<p>473 – Home Farm Nuthall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is within Conservation Area • Includes 3 Grade II Listed Buildings (plus curtilage buildings), impact on these need to be considered. 	
		<p>586 – Kimberley Brewery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade II Listed Buildings (LB) on site. • Buildings form substantial and distinctive part of Kimberley Conservation Area (CA) (considered to be ‘at risk’ on the 2013 register). • Concern over the number of dwellings proposed and impact upon the significance of heritage assets and the woodland within the site which contributes to the character of the CA. • TPO, SSSI & SINC have not been picked up in site constraints. • Number for allocation more than for hybrid scheme EH were consulted on and they felt that even the lower figure would constitute substantial harm to the LB’s and CA. • Recognise need for development to regenerate buildings. • Have alternate uses for buildings been explored (i.e. employment uses)? • Concern over the level of development and the potential loss of important features of the existing buildings and CA. 	
		<p>104 – Land off Coventry Lane Bramcote</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on setting of Grade II Listed Trowell Hall and bridges along Nottingham Canal needs to be considered. • Large scale development may have wider impacts on heritage assets (e.g. at Strelley and Wollaton). 	
		<p>150 – Beeston Maltings Dovecote Lane</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buildings on site include non-designated heritage assets and therefore consideration should be given to retain and convert them. 	
		<p>237 – The Boots Company Beeston Site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setting of Grade I Listed Buildings needs to be considered. 	<p>An outline planning application (14/00515/OUT) has been received and is currently pending. Historic England have been consulted throughout and support the principle of the redevelopment of the site.</p>

		258 – Land at Lilac Grove Beeston	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Setting of Grade I Listed Buildings needs to be considered. 	
		265 – Beeston Police Station	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site includes Grade II Listed Buildings and is within the Conservation Area, impact on these needs to be considered. 	
		298 – Spring Farm Nottingham Road Trowell Moor	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on setting heritage assets in Strelley needs to be considered. 	
		343 – St Johns College Peache Way Bramcote	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site is within Conservation Area and includes 3 Grade II Listed Buildings, impact on setting and significance needs to be considered. 	
		407 – Land between A52 Stapleford and Chilwell Lane Bramcote	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Setting and significance of Bramcote Conservation Area needs to be considered. Not recognised in constraints. 	
		412 – Chilwell Lane Bramcote (south of Common Lane)	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Setting of adjacent Conservation Area needs to be considered. 	
		449 – Beeston Cement Depot Station Road Beeston	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on setting of Listed railway buildings needs be considered. 	
		588 – Land to west of Bilborough Road Strelley	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on setting of Broad Oak Farm scheduled monument and Conservation Area needs to be considered. Not recognised in constraints. 	
		Green Belt	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comment on Green Belt issues other than those for specific sites. 	
		Economic Issues/Job Creation	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comment other than those for specific sites. 	
		Climate Change	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check EH’s policy through various guidance documents. There is a need to differentiate between technical potential and deployable potential. 	
		Town Centres	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See EH’s guidance on retailing in settlements 	
		Community Facilities	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No detailed comment to make at this time 	
		Enhancing the Environment	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus is mainly on natural environment. • Positive strategy for conservation and enhancement needs to be set out including heritage at risk. • Landscape and historical landscape character assessments need to be carried out for large-scale expansion options. • Recognition of non-designated heritage assets is important through the development of a local list. • Up-to-date evidence base should be used. Inc. annual update of heritage counts survey. • Concerns regarding documents relating to historic environment considerations are not referenced. • No historic environment objectives have been identified. • Implications of development on the historic environment has not been analysed and assessed. • Historic environment should have its own dedicated heading. • Nottinghamshire Historic Environments Record (HER) should be used to gain info. Regarding underground historic environment assets. 	
		<p>Healthy Living</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition that the protection of cultural facilities may also benefit heritage assets including wildlife corridors etc. 	
		<p>Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No detailed comments at this time. 	
		<p>SA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reference to historic environment considerations therefore no objectives identified. • No analysis or assessment of historic environment policies or programs. • ‘Landscapes’ have not been properly considered. • No further information or discussion of historic environment attributes. • Appears unfinished, unclear of indicator measurements. • Info regarding non-designated heritage assets not included. Further baseline data required inc. Grade II LB’s on the ‘at risk’ register. • No detailed comments regarding historic environment attributes. This needs to inc. character of the area and setting, for both designated and non-designated heritage assets. • County, national and regional scale comparison information not 	

		<p>filled in.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scoping report appears unfinished. Unclear what measurements are. • SA objective 3 & 7 need to relate to 'social' theme 	
Autumn 2014	Green Belt Review Framework	<p>Assessment criteria in figure 1 should be amended to include "both designated and non-designated heritage assets" and to also include "Scheduled Monuments" in the list that follows.</p> <p>The significance of assets should also be considered as more than just a measure of distance from an asset and should relate to broad considerations and not simply visual impacts. Local conservation and archaeological expertise should be sought when undertaking assessments.</p>	<p>Broxtowe (and the other Councils) incorporated the request into the text of the framework and this methodology was then used when carrying out the Green Belt Review.</p>
February 2015	Preferred Approach to site allocations: Green Belt Review Consultation	<p>Concerned at scale and location of proposed removal of the Green Belt at Brinsley.</p> <p>Green Belt protects setting of heritage assets including the Conservation Area, Grade II listed Church (which currently enjoys an open landscape setting to the west and east) and non-designated heritage assets relating to the colliery site (including links to D.H.Lawrence) and the footpath which forms the former railway line.</p> <p>Historically development has occurred to the west of the Church Lane - development to the East may be unsustainable.</p> <p>As the development need for the settlement is comparatively small – why have the particular boundaries been chosen?</p> <p>2003 Local Plan Inspector recognised value of the agricultural land and importance area fulfils in the Green Belt. Inspector considered more sustainable locations that could meet housing requirements.</p>	<p>Following these comments Broxtowe commissioned an independent expert in Historic Environment to assess the impact of development on the designated and non-designated heritage assets through an Open Design Review. The in-house Conservation Officer also assessed the proposals against their significance.</p>
		<p>Agree with the results of the assessment for zone 6</p> <p>Bramcote/Stapleford:</p> <p>Assessment fails to take into consideration impacts upon designated heritage assets such as Bramcote Conservation Area.</p> <p>Topography of area with the two hills – Stapleford Hill and Bramcote Hill,</p>	

		<p>are significant landscape features.</p> <p>Sites have some historic landscape interest with woodland planting.</p> <p>Consider wider impacts relating to views from Wollaton Hall.</p> <p>Scoring is incorrect for historic settlements and countryside encroachment (particularly from up the hills which has remained unaffected by development).</p>	
February 2015	Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation	<p><u>E24: Trees, hedgerows and Tree Preservation Orders</u></p> <p>EH “consider that it would be helpful and NPPF compliant to retain a policy with regard to trees and hedgerows where they are important – for example where they play a positive contribution to the local character”. There is “scope for updating” to accord with the NPPF.</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 31: Biodiversity Assets which states that;</p> <p><i>“Development proposals which are likely to lead to the increased use of any of the Biodiversity Assets listed below, as shown on the Policies Map, will be required to take reasonable opportunities to enhance the Asset(s). These Biodiversity Asset(s) are;...</i></p> <p><i>c) Trees which are the subject of Tree Preservation Orders; or</i></p> <p><i>d) Aged or veteran trees; or</i></p> <p><i>e) Ancient Woodland; or</i></p> <p><i>f) Hedgerows which are important according to the criteria of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997; or</i></p> <p><i>g) Other trees and hedgerows which are important to the local environment”.</i></p>
		<p><u>S8: Shopfront design</u></p> <p>EH consider that “continuing policy reference to shopfront design, security and signage is important for the new Local Plan, as it will form part of your positive strategy for the historic environment”; “these three policies could easily be amalgamated”.</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 18: shopfronts, signage and security measures which states that;</p> <p><i>“1. Proposals for shopfronts, signage and security measures will be granted permission/consent provided:</i></p> <p><i>a) That they relate well to the design of the building concerned;</i></p> <p><i>b) Are in keeping with the frontage as a whole; and</i></p> <p><i>c) Respect the character of the area.</i></p> <p><i>2. Security shutters should ensure that at least two thirds of their area comprises an open grille or large slots, in order to give a reasonable degree of visibility. Shutter boxes should be located discreetly within the frontage.”</i></p>
		<p><u>S9: Security measures</u></p> <p>EH consider that “continuing policy reference to shopfront design, security and signage is important for the new Local Plan, as it will form part of your positive strategy for the historic environment”; “these three policies could easily be amalgamated”.</p>	
		<p><u>S10: Shopfront signage</u></p> <p>EH consider that “continuing policy reference to shopfront design, security and signage is important for the new Local Plan, as it will form part of your positive strategy for the historic environment”; “these three policies could easily be amalgamated”.</p> <p>With regard to signage, “amenity is a very important consideration,</p>	

		<p>particular[ly] in those historic areas (such as conservation areas) and as such a policy reference is needed, and should not simply be deferred to the NPPF". The PPG "states that in relation to amenity, this includes the local characteristics of the neighbourhood, citing that if the locality where the advertisement is to be displayed has important scenic, historic, architectural or cultural features consideration of whether it is in keeping with these features is required. A local plan policy on this would make this explicit for Broxtowe".</p>	
		<p><u>RC5: Protection of open spaces</u> "Open spaces can often form part of heritage assets – for example, non-designated historic parkland, cemeteries, important open spaces within Conservation Areas etc. Policy recognition should therefore include these matters and support the enhancement of such assets where relevant."</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 23: Proposals affecting designated and non-designated heritage assets which recognises setting as an important factor when considering development proposals including non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p><i>"1. Proposals will be supported where heritage assets and their settings are conserved or enhanced in line with their significance.</i></p> <p><i>2. Proposals that affect heritage assets will be required to demonstrate an understanding of the significance of the assets and their settings, identify the impact of the development upon them and provide a clear justification for the development in order that a decision can be made as to whether the merits of the proposals for the site bring public benefits which decisively outweigh the harm arising from the proposals.</i></p> <p><i>3. Proposals affecting a heritage asset and/or its setting will be considered against the following criteria, where relevant:</i></p> <p><i>a) The significance of the asset...</i></p> <p><i>d) Whether the proposals would respect the asset's relationship with the historic street pattern, topography, urban spaces, landscape, views and landmarks".</i></p>
		<p><u>Possible new policy: Design</u> EH "consider that there is a need for a locally distinctive design policy". "This could set out design criteria in more detail and should make reference to local character and distinctiveness." There should also be reference to "local materials".</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 17: Design and Enhancing Local Identity which states that;</p> <p><i>"1. For all new development, permission will be granted for development which, where relevant:...</i></p> <p><i>d) Creates a place with a locally-inspired or otherwise distinctive character; "</i></p> <p>Policy 23: Proposals affecting designated and non-designated heritage assets also states;</p>

			<p><i>“3. Proposals affecting a heritage asset and/or its setting will be considered against the following criteria, where relevant;... c) Whether the proposals would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the heritage asset by virtue of siting, scale, building form, massing, height, materials and quality of detail”.</i></p>
		<p><u>Possible new policy: Heritage assets / conservation</u> EH “consider that further detailed development management policies are essential”. “We consider that a lack of detailed development management policies relating to heritage would render the plan unsound.” They cite the ACS and NPPF in support of this view.</p> <p>The PPS guide [to which we referred in the consultation document] “is to be replaced”, however the forthcoming new documents “are not a replacement for detailed Local Plan Policies and should not be used as such”.</p> <p>Broxtowe “may wish to set out further and more detailed local information requirements for applications involving heritage assets”.</p> <p>A “local list, or a methodology relating to the identification of non-designated heritage assets could be developed”. A link to EH guidance on local listing is provided.</p> <p>Some fairly general comments are made about possible topics and format for policies.</p> <p>Historic environment considerations “should not be limited to a stand-alone chapter”.</p> <p>EH “are happy to comment on draft policies as they develop and provide further advice on any of the above”.</p>	
		<p><u>Possible new policy: Archaeology</u> EH “consider that reference is required within the Local Plan to this – this could be combined with a heritage asset policy, as above, or separated”.</p> <p>They “consider that there should be alignment with the City Council’s approach to archaeology”.</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 23: Proposals affecting designated and non-designated heritage assets states that;</p> <p><i>“3. Proposals affecting a heritage asset and/or its setting will be considered against the following criteria, where relevant;... g) Whether the proposals would appropriately provide for ‘in-situ’ preservation, or investigation and recording, of archaeology”.</i></p>

		<p>This is in line with Nottingham City Council approach (Policy He1:3g).</p>	
		<p><u>Possible new policy: Boots / Severn Trent</u> EH “consider that it is essential a policy to guide development for the strategic employment site at Boots is included within the Plan. A joint approach between your Authority and the City Council should also be pursued. As part of this, it is critical that reference is made within this to the protection of designated and non-designated assets to ensure the policy is sound”.</p>	<p>This may not be necessary as planning permission is ready to be granted subject to s106 issues with no objection from Historic England.</p>
		<p><u>Possible new policy: Culture, tourism and sport</u> It is “important” to have a policy on this issue, as “part of your positive strategy for the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment...further detail should relate to literary heritage etc.”</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 25: Culture, Tourism and Sport which states that;</p> <p><i>“Development proposals will be encouraged that;</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Make specific provision for sports pitches that are suitable for a wide age range of users, in particular children’s sport.</i> <i>2. Enhance the tourism offer in association with DH Lawrence or the industrial/pharmaceutical heritage of the Borough”.</i>
		<p><u>Possible new policy: Cromford Canal</u> EH “would support the inclusion of such a policy”.</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan justification text 28.4 and 28.5 for Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets.</p> <p><i>“A potential continuation of the Nottingham Canal towpath north of Eastwood approximately follows the line of the former Cromford Canal. The Council will work with partners to look for ways to achieve this route. Protection of this route would help to retain a possible route for the restoration of the Cromford Canal, should proposals for this emerge in the future”.</i></p>
		<p><u>SA scoping report:</u> With regard to the inclusion of relevant plans, policies and programmes, “it does now cover the main documents”. The objectives of these documents, and their implications for the plan, “have been adequately identified”. The identification of key sustainability issues is now “adequate”, as are the SA objectives.</p> <p>Overall: “Although some further amendment is still required, we consider if this is made, the document does fulfil the legislative requirements”.</p> <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The baseline data still requires data inputting in relation to statistics for heritage assets within England.” • “We are still very concerned that there is no discussion of the baseline data in chapter 4...there is no further discussion of the 	

		<p>attributes for the area.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “We are still unclear as to what the proposed indicators are actually measuring as they just list types of heritage asset.” <p>“There is no formal framework for assessment of site allocations...further detail is needed to ensure a robust process...for example, for site allocations, a more detailed framework is needed to understand how these will be assessed and how these will be ranked (colour coding? +/-?). For heritage assets, this will need an assessment of the significance of the heritage assets. Distance should not be used as a proxy to harm”.</p>	
November 2015	Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation		
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation	Bramcote, Chetwynd and Nuthall: Not clear how heritage assets and their setting have been considered as part of the assessment of the sites and recommend that a site selection methodology in relation to historic assets is used to make the process sound.	
February 2017	Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation	No comments received.	

Natural England

When they were consulted	What they were consulted on	What they Said	What has happened subsequently / What we did in response
November 2013	Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation	Housing / General Development Welcomes reference to Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment, the 6Cs Growth Point Green Infrastructure Study and the Green Spaces Strategy 2009-2019. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest referencing emerging Broxtowe Green Infrastructure Study. • Soils and agricultural land should also be referenced. 	
		237 – The Boots Company Beeston 258 – Land at Lilac Grove Beeston <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protected species identified on site - appropriate surveys required. • Close proximity of number of wildlife sites including SSSI at Attenborough would need to be protected from adverse development impacts. • Proposed green infrastructure should protect and enhance these sites. 	Aecom undertook an extended Phase I Habitat Survey which is summarised in the Ecology chapter (13) of the Environmental Report that was submitted to the Council with their planning application 14/00515/OUT for the Boots site (237). Aecom summarised that the implementation of the mitigation measures would avoid or minimise the potential effects to the majority of the ecological receptors, therefore the overall residual effect assessment is assessed as slight adverse. However they do recognise that cumulative effects of development with the adjacent Severn Trent land are likely and that further assessment of impact would be required once details of the development are known.
		Toton - (133, 254, 259, 403, 132, 407 & 358) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two local wildlife sites immediately adjacent to the railway line and two to the North West of the proposed site which should be protected and enhanced and linked by green infrastructure. • Development should not impact on SSSIs at Attenborough and Holme Pit to the South of the site. 	Substantial Green Infrastructure is expected to be delivered on the Strategic Location for Growth at Toton linking to existing surrounding Green Infrastructure. Part of the site west of Toton/Stapleford Lane benefits from extant planning permission (12/00585/OUT) on which Natural England were consulted and raised no objection.
		Green Belt <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities should be taken to link Green Belt into green infrastructure and ecological networks. 	
		Economic Issues/Job Creation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference emerging Broxtowe Green Infrastructure Strategy to relay importance of Green Infrastructure in economic terms to the Borough. 	
		Climate Change <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated landscapes and nature conservation area sites should be fully protected. • Reference emerging Broxtowe Green Infrastructure Strategy to 	

		<p>relay value of GI to help mitigate climate change.</p> <p>Community Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision should be made of accessible semi-natural green space in and around urban area. • Recommend the use of Natural England’s Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards. • Reference emerging Broxtowe Green Infrastructure Strategy as this includes protection and enhancement of open space, Public Rights of Way and access issues. <p>Enhancing the Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference emerging Broxtowe Green Infrastructure Strategy to emphasise its provision of fundamental evidence to the plan. • Specific sites should be protected and enhanced: SSSIs (Attenborough Gravel Pits, Sellers Wood Meadows Nuthall, Kimberley Railway Cutting, Sledder Wood Meadows Greasley, Robinettes Cossall). • Local Nature Reserves and Local Wildlife Sites need to be protected. • Greenwood Community Forest should be included. 	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets which states that;</p> <p><i>“Development proposals which are likely to lead to increased use of any of the Green Infrastructure Assets listed below, as shown on the Policies Map, will be required to take reasonable opportunities to enhance the Green Infrastructure Asset(s). These Green Infrastructure Assets are:...</i></p> <p><i>c) Informal Open Spaces i.e. ‘natural and semi-natural green space’ and ‘amenity green space’....[and]</i></p> <p><i>e) Recreational Routes”.</i></p> <p>Natural England’s Accessible Natural Green Space Standard has been used to develop a local standard (Broxtowe Green Space Standard) which itself has been incorporated into the justification text 28.6 states that :</p> <p><i>“The need for contributions for other types of green space will be assessed in accordance with the Broxtowe Green Space Standard ... which was developed taking account of Natural England’s Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards”.</i></p> <p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request to reference the Green Infrastructure Strategy into the Part 2 Local Plan justification text 28.2 states that;</p> <p>All Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and Local Wildlife Sites are protected with an ambition to enhance them in the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 31: Biodiversity Assets which states that;</p> <p><i>“Development proposals which are likely to lead to the increased use of any of the Biodiversity Assets listed below, as shown on the Policies Map, will be required to take reasonable opportunities to enhance the Asset(s). These Biodiversity Asset(s) are;...</i></p> <p><i>a) Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Local Wildlife Sites or Local Geological Sites”</i></p> <p>All Nature Reserves (irrespective of management/designation) are protected in the Part 2 Local Plan through Policy 28: Green</p>
--	--	---	---

			<p>Infrastructure Assets which states that;</p> <p><i>“Development proposals which are likely to lead to increased use of any of the Green Infrastructure Assets listed below, as shown on the Policies Map, will be required to take reasonable opportunities to enhance the Green Infrastructure Asset(s). These Green Infrastructure Assets are... f) Nature Reserves”.</i></p> <p>The Greenwood Community Forest has not been carried forward as a specific policy into the Part 2 Local Plan. However, the partnership undertook a study the ‘Greenwood Community Forest Green Infrastructure and Public Benefit Mapping’ which formed part of the evidence base for the Broxtowe Green Infrastructure Study which in turn is a fundamental part of evidence for delivering Green Infrastructure benefits throughout the Part 2 Local Plan.</p>
		<p>Healthy Living</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference emerging Broxtowe Green Infrastructure Strategy to emphasise value of GI to promote healthy living and improve well-being. • GI needs to be considered at the outset to ensure it’s fully integrated with existing green spaces. 	
		<p>HRA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfied that Site Allocations will have no significant effect on European Site (alone or in combination) • No further assessment required at this stage. 	Noted.
		<p>SA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SA scoping carried out comprehensively and follows acceptable methodologies. • National Character Areas should be included i.e. Sherwood, Southern Magnesian Limestone and Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire & Yorkshire Coalfield. • Reference should be made to 6Cs Infrastructure Study. • Reference Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment, soils and agricultural land. • Accessibility to open spaces to health and well-being inc. social and community issues. 	
Autumn 2014	Green Belt Review Framework	<p>Approach taken is appropriate to the aims and follows a logical methodology.</p> <p>Assessment should consider opportunities to link into GI & ecological</p>	<p>The issues relating to GI, ecology and landscape are not Green Belt matters and therefore did not form part of the Green Belt Review however they were all taken into account in the Broxtowe’s Part 2 Local</p>

		networks. Landscape character could be considered when assessing value of the GB and reference should be made to the NCAs.	Plan as part of the SA/ Green Infrastructure Strategy / Landscape and Visual Analysis Assessment.
February 2015	Preferred Approach to site allocations: Green Belt Review Consultation	Zone 44: Contains two Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) – Bulwell Wood SSSI and Sellers Wood SSSI. Development should avoid any activity that would damage or destroy the interest features of these SSSIs, including trampling or erosion damage as a result of increased visitor pressure.	Zone 44: Attenborough Wetlands SSSI whilst assessed through the Green Belt Review this site was not under consideration for development and has not been carried forwards in the Part 2 Local Plan.
February 2015	Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation	E16: Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation NE “generally agree with the analysis for this policy”, “particularly support the idea of including advice regarding the natural environment at the landscape scale, biodiversity networks and species protection” and “agree that it is important to link this policy with policy on green infrastructure”.	
		E24 Trees, hedgerows and Tree Preservation Orders NE “would wish to see a policy to protect ancient woodland and aged or veteran trees to comply with paragraph 118 of the NPPF”.	Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 31: Biodiversity Assets which states that; <i>“Development proposals which are likely to lead to the increased use of any of the Biodiversity Assets listed below, as shown on the Policies Map, will be required to take reasonable opportunities to enhance the Asset(s). These Biodiversity Asset(s) are;... d) Aged or veteran trees; or e) Ancient Woodland;”.</i>
		E33: Light pollution NE “support” a policy on light pollution. Reference should be made to “negative impact on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation (especially bats and invertebrates)” and to the use of “appropriate design” to address such impacts.	Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 19: Pollution, Hazardous Substances and Ground Conditions which states that; <i>“1. Permission will not be granted for development which would result in:... b) Lighting schemes unless they are designed to use the minimum amount of lighting necessary to achieve their purposes and to minimise any adverse effects beyond the site, including effects on the amenity of local residents, the darkness of the local area and nature conservation (especially bats and invertebrates)”.</i>
		Possible new policy: Reducing CO2 emissions NE “suggest that a policy regarding renewable energy schemes should particularly include the avoidance of potential impacts on nature conservation and local landscapes” and “suggest that an assessment of landscape sensitivity is carried out before locations of schemes are agreed”.	Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 30: Landscape which states that; <i>“All developments within, or affecting the setting of, the local landscape character areas listed below should make a positive contribution to the quality and local distinctiveness of the landscape. They should therefore</i>

			<i>be consistent with the 'landscape actions' for the area concerned, as set out in the Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment and in Appendix 7 of this Plan".</i>
		Possible new policy: Design Policy should "include provision to encourage "Biodiversity by Design"" (a link to a relevant part of the TCPA's website is provided). This should encourage "incorporating ecologically sensitive design and feature early on within a development scheme"; measures "can include green roofs, planting and landscaping using native species, setting up bird and bat boxes and sustainable urban drainage systems".	Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 17: Place-making, design and amenity which states that; <i>"1. For all new development, permission will be granted for development which, where relevant:...</i> <i>n) Incorporates ecologically sensitive design, with a high standard of planting and features for biodiversity; and</i> <i>o) Uses native species of trees, shrubs and wild-flower seeds in landscaping proposals; and</i> <i>p) Integrates bat and/or bird boxes into the fabric of new buildings".</i>
		Possible new policy: Landscape NE "supports the idea of a policy on landscape which uses information set out in the [Greater] Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment". It also suggests that "reference should be made to the National Character Areas", which are "a good decision making framework for the natural environment".	Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 30: Landscape which states that; <i>"All developments within, or affecting the setting of, the local landscape character areas listed below should make a positive contribution to the quality and local distinctiveness of the landscape. They should therefore be consistent with the 'landscape actions' for the area concerned, as set out in the Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment".</i>
		Possible new policy: Green Infrastructure NE "agrees that any new policy will need to complement the Council's emerging Green Infrastructure Strategy. It should integrate with other policies such as biodiversity, green space, flood risk and climate change adaptation".	Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan justification text 28.2 states that; <i>"There is a need for these [Green Infrastructure] corridors to be enhanced in terms of quality, size, multi-functionality and connectivity, in order to maximise benefits and address needs identified in the GIS. The greatest opportunities for enhancing the corridors will come through development, and the Council intends to work with developers to create and maintain new spaces and to improve connectivity".</i>
		RC8: New informal open space NE "recommend the use of the Natural England's Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards (ANGSt)", which "provides a powerful tool in assessing current levels of accessible natural greenspace and planning for better provision".	Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets which states that; <i>"Development proposals which are likely to lead to increased use of any of the Green Infrastructure Assets listed below, as shown on the Policies Map, will be required to take reasonable opportunities to enhance the Green Infrastructure Asset(s). These Green Infrastructure Assets are:...</i> <i>c) Informal Open Spaces i.e. 'natural and semi-natural green space' and 'amenity green space'".</i>

			<p>Natural England’s Accessible Natural Green Space Standard has been used to develop a local standard (Broxtowe Green Space Standard) which itself has been incorporated into the justification text 28.6 states that :</p> <p><i>“The need for contributions for other types of green space will be assessed in accordance with the Broxtowe Green Space Standard ... which was developed taking account of Natural England’s Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards”.</i></p>
		<p>RC15: Long distance trails NE “agrees... that reference to the Council’s emerging Green Infrastructure Strategy should be made”.</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets which states that;</p> <p><i>“Development proposals which are likely to lead to increased use of any of the Green Infrastructure Assets listed below, as shown on the Policies Map, will be required to take reasonable opportunities to enhance the Green Infrastructure Asset(s). These Green Infrastructure Assets are;... e) Recreational Routes “</i></p> <p>The justification text 28.1 states that Green Infrastructure assets are defined and identified in the Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p>
		<p>SA Scoping Report NE “generally supports the scoping report but would like to have seen reference to the National Character Areas”.</p>	<p>The National Character Areas have been referenced in the Sustainability Appraisal ‘plans and programs’ sections.</p> <p>The National Character Areas were used as background evidence for a Broxtowe specific Landscape and Visual Analysis Assessment which was undertaken by Aecom. The results of the assessment then fed back into the Sustainability Appraisal individual site allocation assessments.</p>
November 2015	Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation	No comments received	
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation	<p>Bramcote: Allocation unlikely to affect the notified features of any SSSI sites nearby. Welcome the opportunities identified for Green Infrastructure and wildlife corridors throughout the site.</p>	Noted.
		<p>Chetwynd Barracks: Sites lies within the Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) buffer for Attenborough Gravel Pits (SSSI) and would trigger consultation with Natural England in respect of any residential proposals in excess of 100 dwellings because of potential impact</p>	

		<p>on the SSSI. Welcome significant opportunities for Green Infrastructure (GI) that the site offers and the ability to provide good links through the area up to the existing GI and local wildlife sites and provide local alternatives to Attenborough which is a honeypot site. Attenborough is notified for birds which are affected by water quality and water levels, any potential increase in visitor numbers would need to be given consideration.</p>	
		<p>Nuthall: Adjacent to Sellers Wood SSSI and within its Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) buffer. Site also lies within the IRZ buffer for Bulwell Wood. Both sites are notified for their woodland habitat. This sites allocation would directly affect Sellers Wood which is already used by the public and dog-walkers. The site is narrow and further dwellings adjacent to it would be a concern. The development site has capacity for development and Green Infrastructure (GI) and we would welcome moving the GI so that it is closest to the SSSI and positioning dwellings furthest away. We would welcome opportunities for more woodland as part of the green space opportunities to link between Sellers Wood and Bulwell Wood which would reduce woodland fragmentation and provide links between existing woodland habitats.</p>	<p>Broxtowe noted the concern regarding development adjacent to the woodland and incorporated a 'buffer' into the discussion points for the site specific workshop which was held on the 11th November 2016 (Natural England were invited but were unable to attend) .</p> <p>As a result it was considered that there were significant difficulties to deliver an acceptable, viable residential allocation which would be sensitive to the SSSI whilst achieving an acceptable access and the aspirations of the local community. It was therefore not carried forward as an allocation in the Part 2 Local Plan.</p>
<p>February 2017</p>	<p>Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation</p>	<p>Since Natural England duties relate to the protection and enhancement of the natural environment, Natural England's concerns relate primarily to safeguarding protected sites, species and landscapes and ensuring adequate green infrastructure provision. It follows that we have no particular comment to make except to advise that development sites should be located so as to avoid any adverse impacts on nationally and internationally designated nature conservation sites.</p> <p>Natural England considers that there are a number of environmental designations and issues which may affect the size, scale, form and delivery of development sites and should be taken into account.</p> <p>Although the list below is not exhaustive, key environmental considerations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International and national nature conservation sites, 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Broxtowe have considered all of the listed environmental designations (and more) through the Sustainability Appraisal which has fed into the site selection process.</p>

		<p>including Special Protection Areas (SPA), Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Ramsar sites, SSSIs, National Nature Reserves;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Locally and regionally designated sites for geodiversity and biodiversity;• UK BAP habitats and significant proportions of BAP or protected species;• Ancient woodland;• Landscape character.	
--	--	---	--

Highways England (formerly Highways Agency)

When they were consulted	What they were consulted on	What they Said	What has happened subsequently / What we did in response
November 2013	Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation		
Autumn 2014	Green Belt Review Framework	Welcomes overall approach which will ensure a robust assessment of GB. Agency welcomes that the assessment will seek to check unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas which aligns with the Agency's preference for development to be concentrated in existing built-up areas with good access to public transport.	
February 2015	Preferred Approach to site allocations: Green Belt Review Consultation		
February 2015	Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation		
November 2015	Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation		
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation		
February 2017	Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation	Given the relatively small scale of development being proposed, and the distance of the site from M1 junctions in the area, that there will be no significant impacts on the operations of the Strategic Road Network.	

Homes and Community Agency

When they were consulted	What they were consulted on	What they Said	What has happened subsequently / What we did in response
November 2013	Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation		
Autumn 2014	Green Belt Review Framework	Welcomes joint approach as ensures consistency & have no specific comments to make.	
February 2015	Preferred Approach to site allocations: Green Belt Review Consultation		
February 2015	Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation		
November 2015	Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation		
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation		
February 2017	Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation		

Neighbourhood Planning group engagement:

Broxtowe Borough Council is committed to Neighbourhood Planning and has

The Council have organised 3 training days for anyone interested in producing a Neighbourhood Plan. The initial training day in December 2014 included presentations from David Chetwynd (the author of the Neighbourhood Planning Road Map) and a Neighbourhood Planning consultant. The initial training was well received and a 'refresher session' was requested (and provided) which included presentations from a Neighbourhood Planning consultant and a local Neighbourhood Planning Forum (from outside the borough) to give first hand advice on their experience and lessons learnt. The Council also collaborated with the Princes Trust to provide a practical workshop assessing land availability, understanding sustainability issues and applying design principles.

In addition to this every group preparing a Neighbourhood Plan has had access to a Planning Officer support and advice. Planning Officers have attended every requested meeting (including at weekends and Bank Holidays).

Broxtowe Borough Council Part 2 Local Plan Consultation	Broxtowe Borough Council Organised Training Events	Neighbourhood Plan Progress	Attendance by or Responses Received from Individuals/groups involved in Neighbourhood Plan Production
4 th November 2013 Part 2 Local Plan: Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation			
4 th August 2014 - Greater Nottingham and Ashfield Draft Green Belt Assessment Framework			
			<p>17th September 2014 - Eastwood Neighbourhood Area Designation</p> <p>17th September 2014 - Greasley Neighbourhood Area Designation</p> <p>17th September 2014 - Nuthall Neighbourhood Area Designation</p>
	11 th December 2014 – Neighbourhood Planning Training Workshop		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 Members from Brinsley Parish Council • 1 Members from Eastwood Town Council • 3 Members from Greasley Parish Council • 4 Members of Kimberley Town Council • 1 Member from Nuthall Parish Council • 6 Members of Stapleford Town Council
9 th February 2015 – Part 2 Local Plan: Preferred Approach to site allocations: Green Belt Review Consultation			<p><u>Stapleford Town Council:</u> General points - Essential that established bridleways, pathways, footpaths etc. should be protected and maintained. Prior to re-designation of green belt it should be ensured land is suitable for development - land flood risk areas should not be deemed suitable for houses. Green Belt should not be sacrificed for affordable housing and extra-care housing provision – location and infrastructure requirements should be key considerations for this type of development. Easily accessible policies should be established with regard to the green belt and new build provision in land allocated for both housing and commercial development. Trusted that housing development would be carried out on land already identified for such purposes and not on the Green Belt. Concerns relating to green belt adjacent to Nottingham City – do not want further coalescence with Nottingham - green belt break needed. Development on brown field sites should take place prior to green belt land being destroyed by unnecessary development. Main Built up Area - Concern re: area adjacent to Sisley Avenue/Baulk Lane/Coventry Lane - should be retained in the green belt.</p> <p>Concern that remaining green belt between Stapleford and Bramcote is being eroded - do not want further coalescence. Important to maintain green belt between the separate settlements of Stapleford, Trowell, Bramcote and Toton, to maintain their separate identities. Concern that Bramcote Hills Park had been included in the documentation - do not want any designated park areas in the Town and its vicinity developed for housing/commercial/industrial purposes. The areas East of Field Farm/West of Field Farm, behind Bramcote Crematorium and proposals to develop land currently occupied by Bramcote School would need to be carefully managed to minimize the impact of any such development on the green belt area between Stapleford and Bramcote to ensure minimal loss of amenity.</p> <p><u>Awsworth Parish Council:</u> Awsworth Site - Council has strong opposition to the removal of this land to the Green Belt. Proposal represents further intrusion into the countryside. Erewash Valley is important area of environmental significance which includes River Erewash, Erewash Canal, countryside footpaths and wash of habitats for variety of wildlife. Area shaded on the map includes Shiloh Recreation Ground which is owned by the Parish Council and could not be released for anything other than community recreation. By removing the site from the Green Belt the way is open for various types of development including residential, trade and industrial. Apart from impact on local wildlife it will increase traffic where there is an inadequate infrastructure provision. Access directly from Shiloh way would be difficult and undesirable.</p> <p><u>Brinsley Parish Council:</u> Brinsley site - Disagree that the site is suitable for removal from the Green Belt. Conclusion based on flawed points system which undervalues the importance of Church Lane remaining in the Green Belt. Misrepresents certain characteristics of the site and neglects to describe important features which need continued Green Belt protection. The 'old-spoil tip' is now a grassy slope with paths through mature woodland which is an attractive feature of the Headstocks Heritage Site. The 'care home' is not present on site – it is situated over the road in the existing residential area. The 'resource centre' referenced is assumed to be the Parish Hall which is situated on the playing field area, away from the proposed development land. The 'several telegraph poles' stand on the roadside and do not encroach upon the site. Adequate recognition is not given to the Headstocks status as an important feature of the D H Lawrence Heritage Site which attracts tourism. Assessment doesn't mention nature reserve within the site or the wildlife corridor which runs the length of the site. Disputes the claim that there is a need to redraw the Green Belt boundaries around Brinsley. Removal of any land in the village will be detrimental to its open aspect and character and would not comply with the NPPF. A brownfield site with the potential for up to 40 dwellings has been ignored - Priority should be given to developing brownfield land where development is needed. Area is highly valued by local residents and visitors and is prominent visually in the village. Once the site is removed from the Green Belt then it would all be vulnerable to development. Broxtowe should be conserving and enhancing the heritage and natural environment.</p> <p><u>Greasley Parish Council:</u> Eastwood site - Assessment ignores effect of development on the wider landscape. Over emphasis on disused railway line as defensible boundary– it does not have heritage protection and is a linear area of land bounded by hedges - no barrier to development could be incorporated into wider development proposals. Amount of 'open space' visible when travelling along Mansfield Road would be reduced - perception of reduced gap. Would destroy valuable views of Eastwood Hall Park and of high ground to the West. Important to setting of Eastwood Hall and parkland curtilage. Also close to the DH Lawrence Heritage Centre. Eastern part of site has long history of flooding; water builds up in the nearby stream and is added to by over-land flows from the upland area to the north. Advisory Groups for Eastwood and Kimberley are not representative of the Parish Council. Greasley wish to formulate own neighbourhood plan – Green Belt release in premature and hasty. Greasley didn't have a consultation event in their parish.</p>
9 th February 2015 – Part 2 Local Plan: Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation			<p><u>Greasley Parish Council:</u> E14 Mature Landscape Areas - There is a need to consider the formal designation of additional areas of Mature Landscape and review any areas already designated.</p> <p>H5 Affordable Housing - There is a need for new policies that take account of need and supply across the borough. Meeting Local housing need in small settlements such as Moorgreen are an important aspect of affordable housing...Greasley Parish Council is well placed to identify such local needs in the context of a Neighbourhood Plan...There is</p>

	<p>a need to consider how an appropriate balance can be struck between meeting affordable housing needs and satisfying other planning objectives such as open space provision, good design and road safety.</p> <p>Possible new policy Design -There should be a “local dimension” and “imaginative implementation” of policies. There should be a requirement for “thorough consultation both by developers with members of the public at the pre-application stage and with the Parish Council as statutory consultees</p> <p>Possible new policy Landscape - Consideration should be given to “whether the high quality of the landscape in the wider area around Kimberley and Eastwood, which has important historical associations as well as landscape value, should be given some form of designation...the value of landscapes to the local community is important”.</p> <p>Suggested additional policy Change of use from employment to residential - There should be a policy on change of use from employment to residential. No details are given. (However it is noted: “it does seem that the number of jobs provided in industrial land and buildings is falling whilst other locations such as recreational and retail centres and working from home are increasing in importance”.</p> <p>General and other points - There is an “urgent”, “priority” need to review policies relating to employment land, design, housing, recreation and traffic/transport. “This should be done in full consultation with Greasley Parish Council and should be preceded by an “effectiveness review” of existing policies, in full consultation with key “users” such as the parish council and local schools.”</p> <p>The “effectiveness review” should involve analysis of “the reasons why a policy has not been the subject of an appeal” and “a statement of the main successes and failures attributable to each policy”.</p> <p>The consultation document was “a very difficult document to respond to”, partly because it didn’t reproduce the wording of the policies concerned or summarise the relevant ACS policies. The document is “obscure, lacks real depth and is not sufficiently transparent” to encourage public participation.</p> <p>Supplementary Planning Guidance did not get sufficient attention in the consultation and should be looked at again; they “can have an important role in development control”.</p> <p>Greasley “welcome the references in the consultation document on Local Greenspace but there should be more emphasis on the role of the local community where appropriate through a Neighbourhood Plan.”</p> <p>Reference is made to previous comments in the 2013/14 consultation on traffic and transport issues, which are still considered to be relevant. Issues include Nuthall Island, Junction 26, Giltbrook and the A610 Eastwood to Nottingham corridor.</p> <p>Reference is also made to previous comments on flood risk issues regarding sites north of Eastwood and west of Kimberley, and to more recent issues at Thorn Drive, Newthorpe and Mansfield Road, Eastwood. The Council considers that “it would be unforgiveable to allow similar situations [to Thorn Drive] to be created elsewhere”.</p> <p>“As a matter of principle there should be a clear dividing line between planning policy and other strategic documents and members of the public should have a role in the production of these other strategies at least equal to their rights within the planning system...and the Council’s Capital Programme is a key vehicle which should be subject to full public participation.”</p> <p>“There is also a need for some strategy as to how to spend the additional resources in the form of the new homes bonus. Government policy is that part of these receipts are ring fenced to the locality in which they arise and the local community have a key role in deciding how the additional resources are spent.”</p>	
	<p>4th March 2015 - Brinsley Neighbourhood Area Designation</p> <p>4th March 2015 – Stapleford Neighbourhood Area Designation</p>	
	<p>11th February 2016 – Neighbourhood Planning Training Workshop</p> <p>Workshop included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to consult • When • Finances • Basic Conditions Role of Broxtowe Borough Council • Content: scope • Vision and Objectives • Case Study from Selston JUSt Neighbourhood Planning group • Activity Sessions • Questions and Answers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 Awsworth Parish Council (including one who was also representing Cossall Parish Council) • 4 Members of the Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum (not designated at the time) • 1 Bramcote Ward Councillor • 6 Members of Brinsley Parish Council • 2 Members from Eastwood Town Council • 5 Members from Greasley Parish Council • 4 Members from Kimberley Town Council • 5 Members of Stapleford Town Council
<p>12th October 2015 – Part 2 Local Plan: Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation</p>	<p><u>Stapleford Town Council:</u></p> <p>The Town Council would like to support the - Broxtowe Borough Council Option 1. The school should actually be sited within the area identified for residential development. However, it was agreed that the provision of a primary school was necessary and that it was probably better to support Broxtowe Borough Council Option 1 with regard to this proposal. The proposed access/egress to the site from Bessell Lane needs a lot of further investigation. The access onto Derby Road, with the junction directly onto the railway bridge at the border with Sandiacre was already a severe bottle neck and a previous proposal for development on the other side of Derby Road directly opposite the opening</p>	

		<p>onto Bessell lane had been refused due to highways issues at this junction. Further sometime ago an application was made to process road stone at the Toton Sidings site and this was refused by Broxtowe Borough Council on the grounds that the type of lorries that would be accessing and egressing onto Bessell Lane would make this junction even more dangerous than it already is. There were considered to be issues with the railway bridge that forms part of Derby Road and passes into Sandiacre at this junction. There were a number of traffic/parking issues relating to Bessell Lane with regard to the small industrial/commercial businesses sited on and around this area. This business activity, together with residents parking and other parking related issues on this stretch of road already cause congestion. Concern was expressed regarding the proposed roundabout on the A52 with regards to safety. There is a need for a public transport between the site and Stapleford Town centre to enable residents of the new development to access the facilities within Stapleford and for Stapleford residents to access the Tram and school pupils within the George Spencer Catchment area to access the school and that this would perhaps ease the pressure on parking spaces during the school run. Support a designated North/South and an East/West Wildlife Corridor. Welcome proposals that would benefit the local economy and enhance Stapleford Town Centre. Members considered Option two to be the more attractive option for housing. Town Council wished to see as little loss to the Green Belt as possible. This meeting did not wish to see development behind Westerlands up to Great Hoggett Drive or the area between Stapleford, Toton, and Chilwell filled in by housing development. It further it did not wish to see the back fields bordering Baulk Lane developed. Ideally the Town Council would wish to see the remaining greenbelt retained. However, being realistic, at this stage in the consultation process it would support Option 1as proposed by Broxtowe Borough Council.</p>
		<p>19th November 2015 - Kimberley Neighbourhood Area Designation</p> <p>1st December 2015 - Awsworth Neighbourhood Area Designation</p>
	<p>17th May 2016 - Neighbourhood Planning Training Workshop – focus on Neighbourhood Forums</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is Neighbourhood Planning? • Basic Conditions • What is the legal process? • What do the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations say? (What must you do and what can't you do) • Using consultants • Why do you want to do a Neighbourhood Plan, what are you trying to achieve? • Setting up a Forum; designating the area and the forum • How much will it cost? • Funding opportunities • How to successfully bid • Practicalities of making a Neighbourhood Plan • What are Neighbourhood Planning policies for? • How and when must you consult? • What evidence do you need to support your Neighbourhood Plan policies? • Drafting policies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 Members of the Chetwynd: Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum (not designated at the time) • 1 Toton and Chilwell Ward Councillor • 1 Chilwell West Ward Councillor • 3 Members of Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum (not designated at the time) • 1 Bramcote Ward Councillor • 2 Members of Friends of Toton Fields Local Interest group • 4 Members of Toton Environment Protection Society
	<p>30th June & 1st July 2016 – Princes Trust Beauty in my Backyard Networking event / Workshop</p>	
		<p>3rd August 2016 - Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum and Area Designation</p>
	<p>19th July 2016 - Natural Environment, Open Space and Climate Change Workshop</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 Members of Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum • 2 Members of Awsworth Parish Council • 2 Members of the Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum (not designated at the time)
	<p>22nd July 2016 - Green Belt and Countryside Issues Workshop</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 Members of Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum • 1 Member of Awsworth Parish Council • 1 Member of Greasley Parish Council • 1 Member of Kimberley Town Council
	<p>25th July 2016 - Design and Heritage Workshop</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 Members of Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum • 2 Members of the Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum (not designated at the time)
	<p>27th July 2016 - Employment and Retail Workshop</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 Members of Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum
	<p>29th July 2016 - Housing and Community Facilities Workshop</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 Members of Brinsley Parish Council / Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group • 2 Members of Awsworth Parish Council / Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group • 2 Members of Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum • 1 Member of Stapleford Town Council
	<p>22nd August 2016 - Part 2 Local Plan: Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation</p>	<p>Bramcote: <u>Awsworth Parish Council:</u> Support Allocation – assuming site is available with no overriding planning objections site has good potential to contributing to Boroughs housing need. Concern about housing development at Awsworth. If allocated then the proposed allocation at Awsworth should be re-examined and reduced if necessary.</p> <p><u>Brinsley Parish Council:</u> Support Allocation – Parish Council opposed to all development on Green Belt in Brinsley and protection of heritage and character of village is essential.</p>

	<p><u>Stapleford Town Council</u>: Loss of Green Belt and joining of settlements would result in loss of buffer between Nottingham City and surrounding settlements. Concern about possible increased traffic that would need to utilise Coventry Lane/ Ilkeston Road and loss of green space. Concern about the inclusion of Bramcote Park in the consultation – would make it vulnerable in the future if taken out of the Green Belt. Areas of farm/grazing land within Green Belt should be retained – particularly land off Coventry Lane and Moor Farm. Impact on roads adjacent to Stapleford would cause severe problems to residents of Stapleford in terms of access and egress from main gateways. Concern about Stapleford, Bramcote and Wollaton merging if Green Belt and the Golf Course were to be built on.</p> <p><u>Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum</u>: Oppose Allocation – Green Belt land which includes undeveloped land with protected status including the park. Reasons for considering site unclear, nothing has changed since Green Belt Review. Map associated with the consultation is flawed and misleading.</p> <p>Chetwynd: <u>Awsorth Parish Council</u>: Support Allocation – assuming site is available with no overriding planning objections site has good potential to contributing to Boroughs housing need. Concern about housing development at Awsorth. If allocated then the proposed allocation at Awsorth should be re-examined and reduced if necessary.</p> <p><u>Brinsley Parish Council</u>: Support Allocation - large brownfield site, close proximity to the city and strategic location for growth. Should lift the treat of development from greenbelt sites in rural locations such as Brinsley. The ‘up to’ figure for Brinsley can no longer be justified. Parish Council opposed to all development on Green Belt in Brinsley and protection of heritage and character of village is essential.</p> <p><u>Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum (not designated at the time)</u>: Support Allocation – no more than 800 houses should be provided. Vision for the area as a garden village. Green space within the site is vital Urban woodland should be considered – possible extension to Hobgoblin Wood. Green Corridor should be established to link Chetwynd Road recreation ground , memorial/formal gardens, Hobgoblin Wood and through to the green corridor south of the tramline at Toton Lane. Commercial development should be kept to a minimum (ideally avoided) given the amount in the Strategic Location for Growth. Neighbourhood Centre (opposite Tesco on Swiney Way) should provide a ‘heart’/sense of place for local community.</p> <p>Nuthall: <u>Awsorth Parish Council</u>: Support Allocation – assuming site is available with no overriding planning objections site has good potential to contributing to Boroughs housing need. Concern about housing development at Awsorth. If allocated then the proposed allocation at Awsorth should be re-examined and reduced if necessary.</p> <p><u>Brinsley Parish Council</u>: Support Allocation – Parish Council opposed to all development on Green Belt in Brinsley and protection of heritage and character of village is essential.</p> <p><u>Greasley Parish Council</u>: Support Allocation - sites being consulted upon should help in reducing pressure on other, more sensitive, sites elsewhere in the borough. If this site comes to fruition will all of the housing numbers be counted towards the ‘Main Built up Area’ (as it is to the east of the motorway) or could some of the numbers be attributed to part of ‘greater Kimberley’?</p> <p><u>Nuthall Parish Council</u>: Support Allocation – Bus routes service the site. Additional facilities that service the site (outside of the Broxtowe Boundary) include; Ken Martin Leisure Centre, Bulwell Hall Park and golf course and The Lime Kiln Public House.</p>
17 th October 2016 – Chetwynd Barracks Site Specific Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 Ward Councillors for Toton and Chilwell Meadows • 1 Ward Councillor from Attenborough and Chilwell East • 7 Members of the Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum (not designated at the time) • 2 Members of Beeston District Civic Society
19 th October 2016 – Land north of Moorgreen Eastwood Site Specific Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Ward Councillor for Eastwood Hilltop • 1 Ward Councillor for Eastwood Hall • 3 Members of Greasley Parish Council • 1 Member of Eastwood Town Council
31 st October 2016 – Land East of Church Lane Brinsley Site Specific Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 Members of Brinsley Parish Council
2 nd November 2016 – Land east and west of Coventry Lane Bramcote / Stapleford Site Specific Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 Representatives from Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum • 3 Representatives from Bramcote Conservation Society (also Forum Members) • 3 Representatives from Bramcote Hills Community Association (also Forum Members) • 1 Ward Councillor for Bramcote (also Forum Member) • 4 Stapleford Town Councillors (including 2 Ward Councillors)
7 th November 2016 - Land west of Awsorth (inside the bypass) Site Specific Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 Ward Councillors for Awsorth, Cossall and Trowell • 2 Awsorth Parish Councillors • 2 Awsorth Members of Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
9 th November 2016 – Land south of Kimberley Site Specific Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 Kimberley Town Councillors (including 3 Ward Councillors for Kimberley) • 2 Greasley Parish Councillors • 1 Neighbourhood Plan Consultant (Ken Maffham Associates)
11 th November 2016 – Land south of Blenheim Industrial Estate Nuthall Site Specific Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 Nuthall Parish Councillors (including 2 Ward Councillors for Nuthall East and Strelley and 1 Ward Councillor for Watnall and Nuthall West)

13th February 2017 – Part 2 Local Plan: Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation

Brinsley Parish Council: Option 2 is the preferred site for the Parish Council; it can easily accommodate 110 dwellings. The developer has stated their intention to proceed immediately once approval is gained from Broxtowe BC. Site has access onto Cordy Lane with robust traffic calming currently under review by developer. Walking and cycling routes would integrate the site into the community. Natural play area to blend with adjacent countryside is also proposed. Site is unaffected by any significant environmental or wildlife issues and no flooding issues present. Small area of site used as a sewer pit was removed from use and would present no contamination risk although it would be subject to testing.

Option 1 would narrow the gap between two settlements and would ignore the purpose of the greenbelt by allowing encroachment into the countryside. This was opposed by Historic England in the Green Belt Review. Proximity to the headstocks heritage site which relies on open aspect within the protected landscape of the village. Borders a heritage nature reserve and wildlife corridor and development would cause catastrophic disturbance to this location with no suitable re-location site for wildlife. Access requirements to the site needs clarification.

Greasley Parish Council: Option 1 constitutes an incursion into shared Green Belt area between the two Parishes and eastern boundary of site immediately abuts common boundary. If Option 1 is carried forward then the eastern edge should be established as a defensible boundary to prevent detrimental impact on adjacent Green Belt land. The design of the resulting development should also preclude future access being achievable across the common boundary. Option 2 is preferred by Brinsley Parish and Greasley offer their support. Other matters arising are for the determination of Brinsley on behalf of their community.

JUS-t (Jacksdale, Underwood, Selston tomorrow) Neighbourhood Planning Group (not preparing plan in Broxtowe)

9th March 2017 - Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum and Area Designation

