Policy 3.7 – Beeston Cement Depot:

ID	Organisation						
Duty to Co-operate / Interest Groups							
18	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England (supported by Nottinghamshire Campaign for Better Transport)						
34	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust						
55	Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign)						
222	Severn Trent						
6276	Nottingham West Clinical Commissioning Group						
Developer / Landowner							
2716	Network Rail						
4200	Taylor & Burrows Property (Represented by Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd)						
Individual / Local Resident							
6809	Sellers						
6810	Hood						

Response to Broxtowe Local Plan Part 2 Publication version (Sep 17)

Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England

3rd November 2017



Policy	Comment	Changes proposed
3.3 3.4 3.7 4.10 5.1 7.1	The key development requirements for each of these major housing allocations include provision for an enhanced bus service "adjacent to" the sites. While we welcome this, we do not think it is sufficient to maximize encouragement to use alternatives to the car. The distances to the nearest bus stop would be too large for most people to be able (or willing) to walk there. So the policy as it stands would undermine the Plan's sustainable transport objectives.	include provision for bus services <u>into</u> <u>and through the</u> <u>sites</u> in the key development requirements
	Our comments here are also supported by Nottinghamshire Campaign for Better Transport.	
8 (Green Belt)	We welcome this policy, especially the clarification in 4. of what is to be regarded as a town. Without the clarification, there would be a real risk of coalescence.	
20 (Air Quality)	We welcome this policy because it provides a clear steer to development in accordance with the Local Plan's sustainability and sustainable travel objectives.	
	This policy is also supported by Nottinghamshire Campaign for Better Transport.	
23 (Heritage)	We welcome this comprehensive policy.	
26 (Travel Plans) : "All developments of 10 or more dwellings or 1,000 square metres or more gross floorspace will be expected to submit a Travel Plan with their application."	We welcome this policy because it provides a clear steer to development in accordance with the Local Plan sustainable travel objectives. Having such a policy will also make Local Plan delivery more effective and efficient compared to the labour-intensive process of assessing each planning application case by case with regard to whether a Travel Plan is needed.	

	This policy is also supported by Nottinghamshire Campaign for Better Transport.	
28 (Green Infrastructure)	We welcome the inclusion of informal and amenity Green Infrastructure and the requirement to enhance these. However, there is a significant risk to the implementation of the policy in practice if the proposed wording is retained : "2. In all cases listed in part 1, and in the case of school playing fields, permission will not be granted for development that results in any harm to the Green Infrastructure Asset, <u>unless</u> <u>the benefits of development are clearly</u> <u>shown to outweigh the harm</u> ." (our emphasis) The lack of clarity as to what would constitute a benefit and for whom leaves so much room for interpretation as to undermine the overall policy intention. This would make this aspect of the Local Plan <u>unsound.</u>	reword the policy by deleting "unless the benefits of development are clearly shown to outweigh the harm".

Planning Policy Broxtowe Borough Council Council Offices Foster Ave Beeston Notts NG9 1AB

3rd November 2017

Dear Sir/ Madam

Comments on Publication Version Part 2 Broxtowe Local Plan

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Broxtowe Local Plan Part 2 (publication version).

Whilst recognising the need for housing provision and economic investment in Broxtowe, we have significant concerns about whether the scale of growth proposed during the plan period is necessary or sustainable.

We do not currently have resources to submit each comment on a separate form but to help with your collation of responses our comments are broadly set out by policy number, as requested on the response form (question 1). Where appropriate, we have also indicated if we query the 'soundness' of the plan, as per question 2 and 3. After putting forward our comments we have submitted suggested modifications, as per question 4 of the response form.

Our comments on individual policies are set out below:

Policy 3 Main built up area site allocations

For the reasons provided at 3.1 and 3.2 we generally support the Spatial Strategy approach. We do, however, have substantive concerns about the scale of some of the allocations. We do understand that allocation sites would not necessarily be built up in their entirety and land within the allocation boundary would potentially be set aside for Green Infrastructure (GI) provision and related requirements. However, we think that seeing sites with large red-line boundaries might be potentially confusing and of concern to many of the other consultees - certain local community groups and individuals have contacted us about their concerns about potential loss of greenfield and wildlife sites.

Policy: 3.1 Chetwynd Barracks: 500 homes (within the plan period)

If this site is to be allocated, we very much support the 'key development requirement' to "*Retain and enhance Green Infrastructure corridors around the eastern and northern areas of the site*".

Some parts of the site have developed significant habitat value. These include Hobgoblin Wood and the adjacent Chilwell Ordnance Depot Local Wildlife Site (LWS) which is located outside the redline boundary. Both areas should be protected during construction phase and be retained within GI with their management secured and paid for in perpetuity by the developer. Focusing new built development on the previously developed parts of the site whilst converting and reusing existing buildings, roads and infrastructure wherever possible would allow for a more sustainable form of development to be achieved.



Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust



Website www.nottinghamshirewildlife.org

President Sir Andrew Buchanan Bt.

Registered Charity No. 224168R A company limited by guarantee. Registered in England No. 748865.

Modification sought

Include a clear statement confirming that Hobgoblin Wood, other woodland area, mature trees and grasslands will be retained and their long-term management will be secured in perpetuity.

Policy: 3.2 Toton (Strategic Location for Growth): 500 Homes

Toton sidings is at the very centre of the Erewash Valley Living Landscape area, where many partners including Broxtowe Borough Council are investing in extending and improving habitats and GI to achieve Broxtowe Borough Council's Biodiversity and GI targets.

We therefore **object** to this site as a strategic location for growth. Not only would it lead to the loss of a substantial area of Green Belt, resulting in the merging of Chilwell and Stapleford, it would cause a well-defined wildlife corridor between the Erewash Valley and Wollaton Park (via Bramcote Village and Beeston Fields golf course) to be lost. This corridor is identified as primary corridor 1.2 and secondary corridors 2.12 and 2.23 in the Broxtowe Green Infrastructure Strategy and the land between the two secondary corridors will also, in effect, function as a single wide corridor.

We cannot see how transport issues can be addressed in a location already suffering from severe congestion and where other large-scale developments are planned for the current plan period, i.e. 500 homes in connection with the Chetwynd Barracks redevelopment.

We need to point out that part of this land, especially the northern and eastern part of the sidings, are within floodplain and are at high risk of flooding. Therefore, there should be a presumption against development of these parts of the site. Also, if substantive measures are not put in place (e.g. flood storage), development of such a large parcel of land could increase risk of both fluvial and surface water flooding in adjacent areas, especially within Toton and parts of Long Eaton.

Whilst we don't support the principle of development on Green Belt and the scale of the proposed development, we welcome inclusion of open space: "*Minimum of 16ha Open Space, to incorporate Green Infrastructure of sufficient width and quality to provide attractive and usable links between Hobgoblin Wood in the east and Toton Fields Local Wildlife Site in the west and the Erewash Canal, which will blend with a high quality built environment.*"

However, we would expect to see the quantity of 'informal' open space (wildlife habitat) specified in the policy wording. In the absence of this, we are concerned that:

a). the 16ha minimum could be taken up with 'formal' open spaces, such as sports pitches, play areas etc,

b). the open spaces would be sited in areas subject to high levels of disturbance, such as along paths, road verges etc, which will never develop high wildlife value,

c). areas of open spaces will be too narrow to usefully function as wildlife habitat (our comments on policy 27 and our recommendation for 50 metre wide buffer are relevant to this).

We are also concerned about the loss of such a large extent of brownfield land in the sidings, which has regenerated to woodland. New open space wildlife sites cannot be recreated easily and will take many years to develop a level of wildlife value equivalent to what will be lost from the sidings, if achievable at all.

Modification sought

Removal of the allocation. If Broxtowe Borough Council is minded to allocate then all LWS habitat should be removed from the allocation, as it might never be possible to recreate habitats of the same value. Clarification that the 16ha minimum will comprise a significant amount of informal open space (wildlife habitat), including a 50m wide habitat corridor.

Policy: 3.3 Bramcote (East of Coventry Lane): 300 Homes

If the entire site is to be developed, this allocation would result in the loss of a LWS – Bramcote Moor Grassland, which we would strongly **object** to.

LWSs are defined areas identified and selected locally for their substantive nature conservation value. Their selection takes into account the most important, distinctive and threatened species and habitats within the county. They therefore comprise many of our best remaining flower-rich meadows, ancient woodlands, ponds, swamps, fens and mires and provide a home to many of our native plant and animal species, including many rare, declining or protected species. These sites can be of SSSI quality or can be even more important than SSSIs for wildlife. We therefore consider protection of this network of sites to be of the upmost importance.

Should the LWS be lost, we would consider the policy unsound as it is not consistent with local (Policy 17 of ACS) and national policy (NPPF para 118).

Modification sought

Inclusion of a sentence stating that the LWS will not be developed or removal of LWS from the allocation boundary. If the LWS would be retained, it would also need to be adequately buffered and work would be required to make the site more robust, as it will be subject to greater footfall post any development. Future management of the LWS should also be secured.

Policy: 3.4 Stapleford (West of Coventry Lane): 240 Homes

The 'key development requirements' include "provide enhanced Green Infrastructure corridors linking urban areas of Nottingham to the east with Bramcote and Stapleford Hills, Bramcote Park, Boundary Brook, Pit Lane Wildlife Site, Nottingham Canal and Erewash Valley Trail".

Whilst we **object** to this allocation because we consider it is encroaching significantly into the surrounding countryside and that local needs have been met by the adjacent Fields Farm site, achievement of a strong corridor is very important. We also agree with the last point of the 'key development requirements', that the cemetery and Stapleford Hills should be adequately buffered, forming a strong and robust habitat corridor linking to Bramcote Moor Grassland LWS.

Modification sought

Removal of allocation. Clarification as to the extent of the corridor, so the site isn't over developed. The adjacent Field Farm Development is mentioned in the location description but we think this policy needs to offer some guidance in terms of how GI linkages will be provided between the two sites.



Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust



Website www.nottinghamshirewildlife.org

President Sir Andrew Buchanan Bt.

Registered Charity No. 224168R A company limited by guarantee. Registered in England No. 748865.

Policy: 3.5 Severn Trent (Lilac Grove): 150 Homes

The 'key development requirements' states that the 150 homes will be located towards the north of the site, which appears to be on the former Severn Trent works, and that access will only be from the north (Lilac Grove).

We are hopeful this means the land at the end of Cornwall Avenue will remain undeveloped. It also talks about 'soft landscaping' along the canal and the importance of "Green Infrastructure" corridors. The field at the end of Cornwall Avenue is an important buffer to the Beeston Canal, which itself is a Local Wildlife Site and this should form part of the "Green Infrastructure" and remain undeveloped and long-term management of GI needs to be secured.

Modification sought

Clarification of the extent of GI, confirmation that fields along the Beeston Canal will not be developed and that long-term management of GI will be secured.

Policy: 3.6 Beeston Maltings: 56 Homes

Transport corridors can provide essential wildlife habitat. For instance our sister Wildlife Trust in Yorkshire is promoting a project to maximise their value, which is supported by the Humberhead Levels Nature Improvement Area. Given the apparent lack of buffer on the south of the railway line, we would strongly recommend some form of green link be provided along the southern development boundary.

Modification sought

Provision of green infrastructure link along the railway line under the 'key development requirements'.

Policy: 3.7 Beeston Cement Depot: 21 Homes

Transport corridors can provide essential wildlife habitat. For instance our sister Wildlife Trust in Yorkshire is promoting a project to maximise their value. We would strongly recommend some form of green link be provided along the southern development boundary.

Modification sought

Provision of green infrastructure link along the railway line under the 'key development requirements'.

Policy 4 Awsworth Site Allocation

A substantial population of common toad (Local Biodiversity Action Plan Priority species and NERC Act species of principal importance in England) was known to be present in the vicinity of the allocated site. We are aware that toad tunnels, which we understand have not been maintained, were installed underneath the Awsworth Bypass, to allow toads to migrate between breeding habitat (Nottingham Canal) and fields on the opposite side of the new bypass. Potentially, the fields subject to this allocation still provide terrestrial habitat for common toad, should they still occur. We would recommend surveys for common toad and other wildlife, possible reinstatement of toad tunnels (if required). Due to it's greenfield nature and strong hedgerow network, we think the land could provide habitat for many other species.

Common Toad is considered a biodiversity asset under policy 31, as they are a species of concern in the Notts Biodiversity Action Plan.

Should this species be subject to further adverse impacts, we would consider the policy unsound as it is not consistent with local (Policy 17 of ACS) and national policy (NPPF para 118).

Modification sought

We would wish to see removal of this allocation. If the allocation is to remain, provision of substantial green infrastructure, incorporation of existing hedges and retention of some meadows (quantity defined) and protection of common toads, should they still occur.

Policy 5 Brinsley Site Allocation

We would have preferred to have seen the alternative site included (option 2) rather this one (option 1) for the reasons provided in our response to the Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation February 2017:

"Option 1 is located immediately adjacent to Brinsley Headstocks Local Nature Reserve and associated Local Wildlife Sites, Brinsley Brook Grassland LWS (5/2302) and Brinsley Headstocks LWS (5/3405), which are identified for their botanical interest. The wildlife value of Brinsley Headstocks, which has been well recorded, may be harmed by any substantial increases in recreational use, which would be inevitable if Option 1 is taken forward.

The LNR and adjacent land is considered locally by members of the Friends Group and others who carry out regular birdwatching locally, as being more valuable for birds. This is certainly likely because the LNR itself supports more structural diversity in its habitats, with areas of woodland, plantation, hedges alongside meadows and the Brinsley Brook These features are largely lacking from land within Option 2, which is predominantly arable. The LNR currently has good, strong habitat connectivity along the brook and to Saints Coppice to the north, which could be adversely affected by built development if Option 1 is taken forward.

Option 1 contains areas of permanent grassland whereas the majority of land within option 2 is mainly arable, which contains no known botanical interest is less valuable in wildlife terms, apart from hedges which we would like to see sensitively retained within any development".

Local residents have reported that the fields in the vicinity of the Brinsley allocation included in the current consultation support a number of wintering farmland bird species. We are also concerned about possible hydrological impacts on the Brinsley Brook. As this allocation is within the catchment for the watercourse there is the potential for adverse impacts on the ecology of the brook due to increased runoff rates, contamination (directly or indirectly, via any new drains) etc.

Modification sought

Replace this site allocation with 'option 2'.

Policy 6 Eastwood Site Allocation

Walker Street Eastwood is an important Green Space in the centre of Eastwood. Whilst we welcome retention of 'Canyons' as open space, we would wish to see Green Infrastructure/ habitat corridors enhanced throughout the site.

Modification sought

Include a commitment to provide GI links across the wider site.



Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust



Website www.nottinghamshirewildlife.org

President Sir Andrew Buchanan Bt.

Registered Charity No. 224168R A company limited by guarantee. Registered in England No. 748865.

Policy 7.1 Land south of Kimberley Depot

We find proposals to develop the exiting built up part of the site acceptable but are concerned about the impact on wildlife arising from loss of surrounding farmland and plantation woodland. Kimberley Disused Railway, on the southern boundary, is a LWS and important wildlife corridors, which should be adequately buffered from any development.

Modification sought

If this allocation is to remain, we would like to see a statement about extent of developable area, ideally limiting it to the existing built up part of the site. It is important that the allocation is sensitive to, and secures future positive management of the LWS.

Policy 7.2 Land south of Eastwood Road Kimberley

We consider this is an important area of remnant fields on the edge of urban area which, when considered with the adjacent woodland, is an important wildlife corridor. We would be concerned about inclusion of the site as an allocation.

Modification sought Site to be excluded.

Policy 17 Place-making, Design and Amenity

We **support** the inclusion of 1(n - p):

"n). Incorporates ecologically sensitive design, with a high standard of planting and features for biodiversity; and

o). Uses native species of trees, shrubs and wild-flower seeds in landscaping proposals; and

p). Integrates bat and/or bird boxes into the fabric of new buildings".

Modification sought

Under n) adding reference to following:

- green walls,
- brown and green roofs,
- ecologically designed / focused suds schemes,
- features to assist permeability for wildlife through the built environment (e.g. gaps under fences for hedgehogs).

Under p) adding a reference to insect houses.

The policy should raise future responsibilities and funding mechanisms for management of habitats / informal open spaces. The developer should cover the costs for management of habitats in perpetuity, so that it does not fall to Broxtowe Borough Council to pay for this.

Policy 19 Pollution, Hazardous Substances and Ground Conditions

Sub section 1b). "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)".

We **support** inclusion of point in relation to darkness and nature conservation.

Policy 27 Local Green Space

We strongly **support** this policy and welcome inclusion of the sites listed. Protection of the sites around Bramcote Hills Park and wood, Stapleford Wood and the Bramcote Schools (section 3 relating to land east and west of Coventry Lane) is welcome, as these are very important wildlife sites with historic / cultural interest.

In terms of policy wording, we are concerned about inclusion of '*exceptional circumstances*' clause, as this will undermine the policy protection.

Paragraph 28.2 states, "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. The details of these opportunities for enhancement will depend on the characteristics of the corridors concerned".

Development certainly creates opportunities for enhancing corridors but we would question whether it creates the 'greatest opportunities'. Many of the corridors are in the rural landscape, not through areas allocated for potential development and significant opportunities exist through working with existing landowners and farmers, in relation to improving existing Rights of Way or strengthening important landscape features and wildlife habitats, such as hedgerows, woodlands and field margins.

Green infrastructure corridors need to be of a reasonable, specified width to be viable; otherwise they will fail to function in ecological terms. Without specified widths there is the danger the corridors will be narrow as developers will naturally seek to maximise the size of the new built development. We have carried out some research on what is considered viable widths of green corridors. In summary:

- "Corridors should be preserved, enhanced and provided, [.....], as they permit certain species to thrive where they otherwise would not. Corridors should be as wide and continuous as possible" (Dawson, 1994).
- 50m buffers [are] recommended for developments in the Local Plans of both Wakefield & Darlington Councils to protect local wildlife sites and / or river corridors.
- A 50m width allows corridors to function as a 'multi-purpose network', as defined in NECR 180, so that it includes attributes that are valuable to people, i.e. biodiversity alongside amenity, footpaths, cycleways, sustainable drainage, microclimate improvement, heritage [etc.]
- Quadrat Scotland 2002 (Appendix 1). For connectedness, to be defined as 'high' (on scale high, medium, low), the corridor needs to be at least 50m wide for more than 50% of the corridor

References

- Dawson, D. 1994. Are Habitat Corridors Conduits for Animals and Plants in a Fragmented Landscape? A Review of the Scientific Evidence. English Nature Research Reports
- Wakefield Consultation on spatial strategy: Wakefield Council Spatial Policy Areas
- Darlington consultation on draft housing allocations: Darlington Council Housing Allocations report
- Natural England Commissioned Report NECR180 (2015). Econets, landscape & people: Integrating people's values and cultural ecosystem services.



Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust



Website www.nottinghamshirewildlife.org

President Sir Andrew Buchanan Bt.

Registered Charity No. 224168R A company limited by guarantee. Registered in England No. 748865. Quadrat Scotland (2002) The network of wildlife corridors and stepping stones of importance to the biodiversity of East Dunbartonshire. Scottish Natural Heritage Commissioned Report

Modification sought

Removal of "*except in very special circumstances*" from the final sentence of the policy wording.

State that development provides opportunities for enhancing corridors, but remove (development) 'provides *the greatest'*.

State that corridors must be at least 50 metres wide to be considered beneficial and viable for wildlife.

Policy 28 Green Infrastructure Assets

We strongly **support** this policy and welcome that "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)".

Policy 29: Cemetery extensions

We **support** this policy and welcome that the potential biodiversity value of new proposed cemeteries has been recognised in the supporting text.

Policy 31: Biodiversity Assets

In terms of defining biodiversity assets, 1b "*Priority habitats and priority species* (as identified in the Nottinghamshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan and section 4.5 of the Green Infrastructure Strategy)", whilst we welcome inclusion of the reference to Nottinghamshire LBAP, we consider that the definition of biodiversity assets is missing the following:

1. Any reference to UK priority species and habitats (formerly called UK BAP priority species and habitats). Section 41 of the Natural Environmental and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 identifies these and they may be found both within or outside designated sites. Priority species correspond to those identified under Section 41 of the NERC Act as species of principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England and have to be considered under planning policy.

2. Any reference to protected species. This is different from priority species list (although some priority species may also be protected).

Due to lack of reference to S41 species and habitat NERC Act and Biodiversity Duty, Legally protected species we consider the policy is not sound as it is not consistent with local (Policy 17 of ACS) and national policy (Biodiversity paras).

Modification sought

Inclusion of a reference to NERC Act (species and habitats of principal importance) and legally protected species.

We also consider there is a requirement for a Biodiversity SPD to help protect Broxtowe's important nature sites, habitat and species and would like to see a commitment to produce one made in the LPP2 main document. A Biodiversity SPD would also help the council to secure its aspirations set out in the Green Infrastructure Strategy and Nature Conservation Strategy.

Policy 32: Developer Contributions

We welcome that financial contributions may be sought for biodiversity for applications of 10 or more houses and therefore **support** the policy in this respect.

In terms of question 5 on the response form (participation at public inquiry), if we have resources available at the time of the hearings, we would be happy to attend public examination sessions. In any case, we are happy to be contacted by the Planning Policy Team regarding future consultations and would welcome email correspondence in connection with this and future consultations.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any further queries.

Yours sincerely

Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust



Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust



Website www.nottinghamshirewildlife.org

President Sir Andrew Buchanan Bt.

Registered Charity No. 224168R A company limited by guarantee. Registered in England No. 748865.

Broxtowe Part 2 L Plan

Agent

Please provide your	client	's nam	ne n	n/a		
Your Details						
Title	Mr	Mrs	Miss	Ms	Other:	
Name			-			
Organisation (if responding on behalf of the organisation)			On b	ehalf	f of Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign)	
Address						
Postcode						
Tel. Number		- S	à 👘			
E-mail address						

oca

towe

Comments should be received by 5.00pm on Friday 3rd November 2017

If you wish to comment on several policies, paragraphs, or sites, please use a separate form for each representation.

If you would like to be contacted by the Planning Policy Team regarding future consultations. Please
tick here
Please help us save money and the environment by providing an e-mail address that correspondence can be sent to:

For more information including an online response form please visit:

www.broxtowe.gov.uk/part2localplan

Data Protection - The comment(s) you submit on the Local Development Framework (LDF) will be used in the plan process and may be in use for the lifetime of the LDF in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. The information will be analysed and the Council will consider issues raised.

Please note that comments cannot be treated as confidential and will be made available for public inspection. All representations can be viewed at the Council Offices.

Please return completed forms to:

Planning Policy, Legal and Planning Services, Foster Avenue, Beeston, Nottingham NG9 1AB For more information: Tel: 0115 917 3452, 3448, 3468 or 3015 E-mail: <u>policy@broxtowe.gov.uk</u>

Question 1: What does your comment relate to? Please specify exactly

Document	Policy number	Page number	Policy text/ Paragraph number
Part 2 Local Plan	 Policy 1: Flood Risk Policy 2: Site Allocations Policy 3: Main Built up Area Site Allocations Policy 3: Main Built up Area Site Allocation Policy 4: Awsworth Site Allocation Policy 5: Brinsley Site Allocation Policy 6: Eastwood Site Allocations Policy 7: Kimberley Site Allocations Policy 8: Development in the Green Belt Policy 9: Retention of good quality existing employment sites Policy 10: Town Centre and District Centre Uses Policy 10: Town Centre and District Centre Uses Policy 12: Edge-of-Centre A1 Retail in Eastwood Policy 13: Proposals for main town centre uses in edge-of-centre and out-of-centre locations Policy 14: Centre of Neighbourhood Importance (Chilwell Road / High Road) Policy 15: Housing size, mix and choice Policy 16: Gypsies and Travellers Policy 17: Place-making, design and amenity Policy 18: Shopfronts, signage and security measures Policy 20: Air Quality Policy 21: Unstable land Policy 22: Minerals Policy 23: Proposals affecting designated and nondesignated heritage assets Policy 24: The health impacts of development Policy 25: Culture, Tourism and Sport Policy 26: Travel Plans Policy 27: Local Green Space Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets Policy 29: Cemetery Extensions Policy 30: Landscape Policy 31: Biodiversity Assets Policy 32: Developer Contributions 	P28-	

Policies Map	
Sustainability Appraisal	
Other (e.g. omission, evidence document etc.)	

Question 2: What is the issue with the Local Plan?

Do you consider this paragraph or policy of the Local Plan to be: (please refer to the guidance note at for an explanation of these terms)					
2.1	Legally compliant	у			
2.2	Compliant with the duty to co-operate	у			
2.3	Sound		n		

Question 3: Why is the Local Plan unsound? Please <u>only</u> answer this question if you answered 'No' to 2.3 above

If you think this paragraph or policy of the Plan is not sound, is this because:				
It is not justified	n			
It is not effective				
It is not positively prepared	n			
It is not consistent with national policy	n			

Your comments

Please give details of why you consider this part of the Local Plan is not legally compliant, is unsound or does not comply with the duty to co-operate. Alternatively, if you wish to support any of these aspects please provide details. Please be as precise as possible. Continue on an extra sheet if necessary. Not all sections in this make clear the need for good cycle as well as pedestrian links, although some are very supportive, such as Policy: 3.1 Chetwynd Barracks and Policy: 3.2 Land in the vicinity of the HS2 Station at Toton, which we very much welcome and support, especially the many aspirations for Policy 3.2 including good routes to and from Stapleford and Long Eaton, and the Erewash Trail, as well as the existing main urban areas in Beeston and Chilwell etc. with their substantial existing cycle network.

We also welcome the inclusive of cycle access as a key development requirement for Policy: 3.7 Cement Depot Beeston, in view of the fact that this is of direct relevance to improving a substandard stretch of Sustrans National Cycle Network Route 6, as well as being of particular importance to improving cycle access to and from Beeston Station.

National policy is to support cycling as well as walking and this is very much indicated in the new DfT system of Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans, and its technical guidance, launched in 2017.

The ones where a specific need for good cycle as well as pedestrian access should be mentioned specifically include:-

Policy: 3.3 Bramcote (East of Coventry Lane)

Policy: 3.5 Severn Trent, Beeston, which includes a proposal for a new pedestrian bridge over the canal

Question 4: Modifications sought

Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. Continue on an extra sheet if necessary.

National policy is to support cycling as well as walking and this is very much indicated in the new DfT system of Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans, and its technical guidance, launched in 2017.

We therefore think that there is a need for good cycle as well as pedestrian access to be mentioned specifically include:-

Policy: 3.3 Bramcote (East of Coventry Lane)

Policy: 3.5 Severn Trent, Beeston, which includes a proposal for a new pedestrian bridge over the canal

This would also help to connect to existing cycle routes and generally to increase the extent of the Greater Nottingham Cycle Network, for both leisure and utility (commuting etc) purposes.

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested modification, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

Question 5: Public Examination Attendance

If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the public examination? Yes, I wish to participate at the public examination No, I do not wish to participate at the public examination If you wish to participate at the public examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the public examination.

Guidance Note:

Please complete a separate form for each representation you wish to make.

'Legally Compliant':

If your response relates to <u>the way in which the plan has been prepared</u>, then this is likely to relate to whether it or not it is '**Legally Compliant**'. To be 'Legally Compliant', the Local Plan has to be prepared in accordance within the 'Duty to Cooperate' and legal and procedural requirements. These are set out by legislation in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended). If you think that we have not met the legal requirement in the preparation of the Local Plan, please use the response form to tell us what we have not done or what we have done incorrectly.

'Compliant with the Duty to Co-operate':

If your response relates to **the way in which we have worked with other authorities** then this is likely to relate to the '**Duty to Co-operate'.**

The 'Duty to Co-operate' places a legal duty on Local Planning Authorities, County Councils and certain public bodies to engage constructively, actively, and on an on-going basis, to maximise the effectiveness of Local Plan preparation in the context of strategic cross-boundary matters. The 'Duty to Co-operate' is not a duty to agree. However, Local Planning Authorities should make every effort to secure the necessary co-operation on strategic cross-boundary matters before they submit their Local Plan for examination.

'Sound'

If your response is about the <u>content</u> of the Local Plan and the strategy it adopts, then it is likely to relate to whether or not the Local Plan is '**Sound**'.

To meet the 'Test of Soundness', the independent Planning Inspector is required to consider whether or not our Local Plan is '**justified**', '**effective**', has been '**positively prepared**', and is '**consistent with national policy**'. You may wish to consider the following before making a representation on the 'Soundness' of our Local Plan:

- **'Justified':** This means that the Local Plan is based upon a robust and credible evidence base. If you think that the evidence doesn't support the choice made in our Local Plan, or there are realistic alternatives, then your comments may relate to whether or not it is 'justified'.
- **'Effective':** This means that the Local Plan will deliver what it sets out to. If you think that what we are proposing in the Local Plan is not deliverable, then your comments may relate to whether or not our Local Plan is 'effective'.
- 'Positively Prepared': This means the Local Plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development.
- 'Consistent with National Policy': Do you consider that our Local Plan accords with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and other policies, or includes clear and convincing reasons for doing something different?

For further guidance or assistance, please contact the **Planning Policy Team** on **0115 917 3452** or by emailing <u>policy@broxtowe.gov.uk</u>.

Broxtowe Borough Council

Potential impact of proposed developments on sewerage infrastructure assets Date:

17/10/2017

NOTE: The purpose of these desktop based assessments are to indicate where proposed development MAY have a detrimental impact on the performance of the existing public sewerage network taking into account the size of the development proposals.

For most new development provided the surface water in managed sustainably through use of a SuDS the additional foul only flows will have a negligible impact on existing sewer performance but where there are pre-existing capacity constraints additional capacity improvements may be required.

Where subsequent detailed modelling indicates capacity improvements are required such work will be phased to align with development occupancy with capacity improvement works will be funded by Severn Trent Water. However, whilst Severn Trent have a duty to provide additional capacity to accommodate planned development, we also have a requirement to manage our assets efficiently to minimise our customers' bills. Consequently to avoid potential inefficient investment we generally do not provided additional capacity until there is certainty that the development is due to commence. Where development proposals are likely to require additional capacity upgrades to accommodate new development flows it is highly recommended that potential developers contact Severn Trent as early as possible to confirm flow rates and intended connection points. This will ensure provision of additional capacity can be planned into our investment programme to ensure development is not delayed.

Note: These are desktop assessments using readily available information and have not been subjected to detailed hydraulic modellin

Site Ref	Site Name	Size	Units	Sewage Treatment Works Catchment	Sewerage Comment	Potential impact on sewerage infrastructure
----------	-----------	------	-------	---	------------------	---

Toton, Stapleford and Bramcote

3.1 Chetv	twynd Barracks	91.5 ha	500		Sewer records do not exist for Chetwynd Barracks. Therefore the current drainage at the site is unknown. It is assumed the majority of flows will join the 300 dia combined sewer on Chetwynd Road. RPA predicts flooding in a 30 year storm. D/S of Chetwynd Road there is a large flooding cluster on Crofton Road. An FA scheme has been delivered which protects properties internally up to 40 year storm and externally up to a 20 year storm. There are no pollution incidents recorded D/S at the Attenborough Lane PS. Surface Water flows can be drained to local brook running through Chetwynd barracks.	Low
Totor	on	UNK	500		It is likely that a capital scheme would be required for a new gravity sewer to take foul flow from the development to Stapleford STW in the North West. There are numerous hydraulic flood incidents on incoming pipes to the STW. If foul flows were to discharged to the south the topography suggests a pumping station would be required. Pipes on Stapleford Lane where it would be expected to discharge to are predicted to flood in low RPs. There are foul flooding incidents recorded to the south off Stappleford Lane. Surface water will be able to drain to pre-existing surface water systems in the vicinity of the development.	High
Bram	ncote	UNK		Stoke Bardolph STW	It is expected that foul flows will be connected to 225mm dia pipe on Latimer Drive. RPA does not predict flooding in storm events up to 40 yrs. Flows from the east of the site may have to be pumped due to the topography of the site.	Low
Stapl	pleford	UNK	240		It is likely that a capital scheme would be required for a new gravity sewer to take foul flow from the development to Stapleford STW in the North West. There are numerous hydraulic flood incidents on incoming pipes to the STW. If foul flows were to discharged to the south the topography suggests a pumping station would be required. Pipes on Stapleford Lane where it would be expected to discharge to are predicted to flood in low RPs. There are foul flooding incidents recorded to the south off Stappleford Lane. Surface water will be able to drain to pre-existing surface water systems in the vicinity of the development.	Med

3.6	Beeston Maltings	1.3 ha	56	Based on topographic levels it is likely the development will connect to the sewage system on Cartwright Way to a 150 mm dia pipe. Surface water would also drain to the existing system on this road. The model does predict flooding on low RPs D/S on Ireland Avenue. However there are no incidents of flooding reported.	Low
	Beeston Cement Depot	UNK	21	Sewage from the development is likely to join the network on Station Road into a 375 mm dia combined sewer. Surface Water will be able to be connected to local surface water network. There are no reports of flooding in the area and flooding is not predicted in low return periods.	Low
	Wollaton Road Beeston	UNK	12	The building adjacent to the proposed development site has experienced repeat floodings recently. Return period analysis predicts flooding in a storm with a two year return period. The development is unlikely to have a noticeable impact to Severn Trent's sewage infrastructure, however, the development is likely to flood.	Low

	Awsworth	UNK	350	Surface Water from the development will be able to drain to a local watercourse. Foul water from the development	Med
				will join a 225mm dia combined sewer running across the development site. Flooding in a low return period is predicted downstream and there are pollutions recorded at Awsworth - A610 TPS. There are also a large number of flooding incidents upstream of the development in the south of Awesworth.	
4.1	Awsworth	UNK	250	Surface Water from the development will be able to drain to a local watercourse. Foul water from the development will join a 225mm dia combined sewer running across the development site. Flooding in a low return period is	Med
				predicted downstream and there are pollutions recorded at Awsworth - A610 TPS. There are also a large number of flooding incidents upstream of the development in the south of Awsworth.	

Brinsley	UNK	150 Ne	ewthorpe STW	Foul flows from the development will join a 225 mm dia combined sewer running adjacent to the development site.	Low
				Surface water from the development will be able to drain to Brinsley Brook. Flooding is not predicted in low return	
				periods locally and there are no reported flooding incidents near the development	
		110 Ne	ewthorpe STW	Foul flows from the development will join a 225 mm dia combined sewer running adjacent to the development site.	Low
				Surface water from the development will be able to drain to Brinsley Brook. Flooding is not predicted in low return	
				periods locally and there are no reported flooding incidents near the development	

6.1	Walker Street	9	230	Newthorpe STW	Foul and surface water flows will join pipes on Greenhills Avenue. Flooding is not predicted in low periods	Low
					downstream of the development. However there are a number of recorded flooding incidents that additional flow	
					could exacerbate.	
	Kimberley	UNK	600	Newthorpe STW	Foul flows from the development will join the 750 mm dia existing combined sewer which runs through the site.	Med
					Surface Water from the development can join the existing surface water network which runs through the proposed	
					development site. Flooding is predicted in a low return period storm on the combined system close to the	
					development site. There is a repeat internal flooding caused by the combined sewer. The development is likely to	
					exacerbate the flooding at this property.	

Nottingham West Clinical Commissioning Group



Steffan Saunders Head of Neighbourhoods and Prosperity Directorate of Legal and Planning Services Council Offices Foster Avenue Beeston Nottingham NG9 1AB

30 October 2017

Dear Steffan

Broxtowe Local Plan Part 2 Consultation

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to respond to your consultation document. New treatments and an aging population mean that pressures on services are greater than they have ever been, as people are living longer, often with very complex conditions. An increase in local population as a result of new housing developments compounds that pressure particularly on primary care - family doctor services. Having the right infrastructure in place in primary and community settings is crucial for the successful delivery of the Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP) ambitions and the GP Forward View (GPFV). The ability to transform care and keep services sustainable will only be possible if efficient, fit-for-purpose, high quality facilities underpin the delivery of services.

Workforce recruitment for GPs in particular is paramount for sustaining quality general practice provision. Good quality fit for purpose primary care facilities are a key part of attracting the necessary workforce to support the existing and new population as a result of these housing developments.

In recent years there have been a number of developments approved which have had a major impact on our ability to provide primary care services. As a consequence we would like to work with the Borough Council to explore a better way of planning for care homes and retirement living facilities. We are often the last public sector organisation to find out that a care home is opening; a building has a change of use or that retirement facilities are being developed. 65% of the NHS budget is spent on the over 65s and understandably the elderly are the predominant users of health and social care services so the impact of such changes on the health and social care system are huge for a relatively small part of the population.

In terms of this consultation document, we have taken each of your options in turn and outlined our current position with regards to primary care facilities, indicating where we have areas of risk.



NHS Nottingham West Clinical Commissioning Group

Potential Site Allocations Sites Adjacent to the Main Urban Area

Delieur 2.1 Chetur and Demoster	The notential for 900 - duallings (with a maximum of
Policy: 3.1 Chetwynd Barracks 500 homes with potential for 800+ overall Land for Medical Centre required in order to make plan effective and therefore sound	The potential for 800+ dwellings (with a maximum of 1,500) presents significant concern with respect to local health service provision. The nearest facilities for this development, and where patients are likely to register, is Chilwell Valley & Meadows Surgeries which comprise a main surgery (Valley) which has no development potential; and a branch surgery (Meadows) which has some expansion potential.
	Based on 2.3 residents per dwelling we would anticipate an increased patient population of up to 3,500 patients if the total of 1,500 dwellings was achieved, which would require 2 full-time General Practitioners, over and above the current service provision.
	Given the size of this development and the potential for further development at Toton, together with the limited / non-existent expansion potential of the current facilities, we are to consider the option of a new Primary Care Centre for the Chilwell / Toton area subject to funding being made available. Therefore, in order for the plan for Chetwynd Barracks to be effective and sound, we request a reserved site within this development to provide primary care services to the residents of this area.
	We are not in a position to confirm the size of site required at this stage; however based on similar size developments it would be no more than 1 acre to serve a potential population of around 18,000 patients. Funding contributions should be sought through Section 106.
Policy: 3.2 Toton – 500+ homes	We understand that we have missed the opportunity to comment on this proposal as it stands currently at 500 homes. However, we consider that there may be further development in this area and would like to offer the following comments:
	The nearest facilities for this development is Chilwell Valley & Meadows Surgeries which comprise a main surgery (Valley) which has no development potential; and a branch surgery (Meadows) which has some expansion potential.
	We would like to consider any expansion to the Toton development over and above the original 500 houses alongside the Chetwynd Barracks development which



Nottingham West Clinical Commissioning Group

	affects the same GP practice.
Policy: 3.3 & 3.4 Bramcote, East of Coventry Lane 300 homes Stapleford, West of Coventry Lane 240 homes	 The nearest facilities to these developments are Bramcote Surgery and Hickings Lane Medical Centre. Hickings Lane Medical Centre has recently extended the surgery to take account of the new resident population generated by 450 dwellings (a potential of 1,035 residents based on 2.3 residents per dwelling) at Field Farm. There is potential to further expand this facility. Bramcote Surgery is a purpose built facility with some potential for small scale development which could assist with the expansion of patient population from these two developments. We are also aware of discussions regarding the development of the old Bramcote Hills Golf Course for retirement / continuing care privately owned units. This will, if it goes ahead, compound capacity issues within the existing practices. We ask the Borough Council to request on our behalf a Section 106 contribution to support the expansion to the physical capacity of these existing facilities in order to provide health services to the additional 1,242 residents these developments will attract.
Beeston (339 homes / 780 residents)	There are four GP practices providing healthcare to
Policy: 3.5	the residents of Beeston; Abbey Medical Centre, The Manor Surgery, The Oaks Medical Centre and West

Seven Trent (Lilac Grove), Beeston End Surgery. 150 homes The Oaks Medical Centre is currently undergoing an Policy: 3.6 extension to their purpose built facility in response to Beeson Maltings, 56 homes the planned housing developments underway in Beeston. However, the future developments as Policy: 3.7 Cement Depot Beeston, 21 outlined in the Local Plan Part 2 whilst not significant homes when considered alone, need to be considered in its entirety together with what is underway and will have Policy: 3.8 Wollaton Road, Beeston, 12 significant impact upon the physical capacity of practices to provide health services. There is some homes potential for small scale developments to assist with Policy: 11 this further expansion of the patient population in Beeston Square, 100 homes (minimum) particular from the Seven Trent and Beeston Square developments. We would ask for a Section 106 contribution to be

Nottingham West Clinical Commissioning Group: 12 GP practices working together with local people as Nottingham West to develop and deliver new services to improve health and wellbeing



	available to this locality to increase the physical clinical space required to meet the needs of this increase in population over and above that already underway as part of The Oaks Medical Centre expansion.
--	---

Policy: 4.1 Awsworth West of Awsworth (inside the bypass) 250 homes Policy: 5.1 Brinsley East of Church Lane 110 homes	The nearest facilities to this development and where patients are likely to register are Church St Medical Centre and Church Walk Surgery in Eastwood. See below for details of the Eastwood joint public services proposed development to meet the needs of this increase in population.
Policy: 6.1 Eastwood 200 homes + 30 Extra Care Units Walker Street, Eastwood (Map 24) Land for Medical Centre required in order to make plan effective and therefore sound	A new health centre for Eastwood is the CCG's top priority within its Strategic Estates Plan. The old Eastwood Health Centre was considered no longer fit for purpose and has been recently disposed of resulting in there being no local facilities for extended, community based health services in Eastwood. Both GP practices in Eastwood are in separate facilities which can no longer be extended. They are intending to merge into one practice as of April 2018 to provide GP services to 20,000 local residents. We have been working with Nottinghamshire County Council, the land owners, on the preferred solution which would be a One Public Estate public services hub incorporating a new health facility on the Walker Street site (Map 24). Alongside library services and third sector organisations this new facility would also house the two merged GP practices (Church Street Medical Centre and Church Walk Surgery in Eastwood) plus supporting community health service provision. In order that the plan for Eastwood is effective and therefore sound, part of the Walker Street site must be allocated for a new, purpose built health facility to sit behind the existing library with direct access to the main road with its public transport links ensuring it is easily accessible to the community. A one acre site is required (GIA 2000m2 of two or three storeys dependent upon meeting planning requirements). Direct vehicular access would be required to Walker Street if the site is also identified as the preferred site for a co-



Nottingham West Clinical Commissioning Group

	located blue light service base. Funding contributions should be sought for this development through Section 106.
Kimberley (167 homes / 385 residents)	The nearest facility to these developments is Hama
Paliau: 7.1 Kimbarlau Dapat	Medical Centre, Kimberley. This is a purpose built facility with potential to expand through internal re-
Policy: 7.1 Kimberley Depot 105 homes	organisation of rooms changing their use from clinical
105 Homes	to non-clinical physical space.
Policy: 7.2 South of Eastwood Road	
40 homes	We would ask for a Section 106 contribution to be requested in order to increase the physical
Policy: 7.3 Eastwood Road Builders Yard	clinical space required to meet the demands of
22 homes	the increase in population brought about by the housing developments.

In summary, we have considered the impact on our existing facilities for each of the potential developments detailed in the Local Plan Part 2. Our main challenges are:

- Policy: 6.1 Eastwood where we have had extended discussions with Nottinghamshire County Council regarding a public sector hub and require a site of 1 acre to be reserved on the Walker Street site for this;
- Policy: 3.1 Chetwynd Barracks / Policy: 3.2 Toton where we will do more work on a
 potential hub servicing this area but would ask for a reserved site on the Barracks site to be
 identified for a potential health facility;
- The impacts of other developments in the plan are of a smaller scale and could be resolved by relatively modest extensions and/or internal re-design. For these we ask for Section 106 contributions to fund the necessary works to meet the health needs of the increase in population.

I hope you find this of use in your considerations. Please let me know if you need any further information.

NHS Nottingham West CCG

Yours sincerely

Nottingham West Clinical Commissioning Group: 12 GP practices working together with local people as Nottingham West to develop and deliver new services to improve health and wellbeing



Details

Agent	A	
Please provide your client's name	Network Rail (Infrastructure) Ltd.	
Your Details		
Title		
Name		
Organisation (If responding on behalf of an organisation)	Network Rail (property)	
Address		
Telephone Number		
Email Address		
Would you like to be contacted regarding future planning policy consultations?	Yes	

Policy relates to

Please specify what y	our comment relate	es to			
Policy number	Page number	Policy text/ Paragraph number	Policies Map	Sustainability Appraisal	Other (e.g. omission, evidence document etc.)
3: Main Built up Area Site Allocations	43	3.19-20	14	3.21	

Question 1: What does your comment relate to? Please specify exactly

Question 2

Question 2: What is the issue with the Local Plan	1?	
Do you consider this paragraph or policy of the Loca	I Plan to be:	
2.1 Legally compliant	Yes	
2.2 Compliant with the duty to co-operate	Yes	
2.3 Sound	No	

Question 3

If you think this paragraph or policy of the I	lan is not sound, is this because:	
It is not justified	Yes	
It is not effective	Yes	
It is not positively prepared	No	

Yes

Additional details

Please give details of why you consider this part of	We consider that, although the allocation for residential development of Beeston
the Local Plan is not legally compliant, is unsound or	Cement Works is supported in principle, the level of development proposed (21 units)
does not comply with the duty to co-operate.	represents a significant under-use of a scarce brownfield resource. We would present
Alternatively, if you wish to support any of these	evidence to suggest that the site is capable of supporting a higher density of dwellings,
aspects please provide details.	with a minimum of 40 and a maximum of perhaps up to 100 dwellings possible.

Question 4

Question 4: Modifications sought		
Please set out what modification(s) you consider	Removal of the suggested 21 dwelling limit from the allocation and providing a	
necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant	minimum number of at least 40 dwellings, with a caveat that this may be a higher figure	
or sound. You will need to say why this modification	subject to suitable design parameters.	
will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound.		

Question 5

Question 5: Public Examination Attendance	
If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the public examination?	Yes
If you wish to participate at the public examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary	Were the Council to insist on the low level of density suggested by their figure of 21 dwellings we would wish to explore their reasoning through the hearing forum as it would need to address issues of principle concerning maximising brownfield development.

Broxtowe Part 2 Local Plan



Agent

Please provide you	r client's name	TAYLOR & BURROWS PROPERTY
our Details		
Title		
Name		
Organisation (if responding on behalf of the organisation)	Phoenix Planning	g (UK) Limited
Address		
Postcode		
Tel. Number		
E-mail address		

Comments should be received by 5.00pm on Friday 3rd November 2017

If you wish to comment on several policies, paragraphs, or sites, please use a separate form for each representation.

If you would like to be contacted by the Planning Policy Team regarding future consultations.

Please tick here $\sqrt{}$

Please help us save money and the environment by providing an e-mail address that correspondence can be sent to: As above

For more information including an online response form please visit:

www.broxtowe.gov.uk/part2localplan

Data Protection - The comment(s) you submit on the Local Development Framework (LDF) will be used in the plan process and may be in use for the lifetime of the LDF in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. The information will be analysed and the Council will consider issues raised. Please note that comments cannot be treated as confidential and will be made available for public inspection. All representations can be viewed at the Council Offices.

Please return completed forms to:

Planning Policy, Legal and Planning Services, Foster Avenue, Beeston, Nottingham NG9 1AB **For more information:** Tel: 0115 917 3452, 3448, 3468 or 3015 E-mail: <u>policy@broxtowe.gov.uk</u>

Question 1: What does your comment relate to? Please specify exactly

Document	Policy number	Page number	Policy text/ Paragraph number
	Policy 1: Flood Risk		
	Policy 2: Site Allocations		
	Policy 3: Main Built up Area Site Allocations	Page 24 - 46	Policy 3 as a whole
	Policy 4: Awsworth Site Allocation		
	Policy 5: Brinsley Site Allocation	(C = = 1)	
	Policy 6: Eastwood Site Allocation		£
	Policy 7: Kimberley Site Allocations		
	Policy 8: Development in the Green Belt Policy 9: Retention of good quality existing	<u> </u>	-
	employment sites		
	Policy 10: Town Centre and District Centre Uses	č. – – –	
	Policy 11: The Square, Beeston		
E.	Policy 12: Edge-of-Centre A1 Retail in Eastwood		
al	Policy 13: Proposals for main town centre uses in		
E	edge-of-centre and out-of-centre locations		
Part 2 Local	Policy 14: Centre of Neighbourhood Importance (Chilwell Road / High Road)		
	Policy 15: Housing size, mix and choice		
	Policy 16: Gypsies and Travellers	(7
	Policy 17: Place-making, design and amenity		
	Policy 18: Shopfronts, signage and security measures		e
	Policy 19: Pollution, Hazardous Substances and	1	
	Ground Conditions		
	Policy 20: Air Quality Policy 21: Unstable land		
	Policy 22: Minerals		
	Policy 23: Proposals affecting designated and non-		
	designated heritage assets		
	Policy 24: The health impacts of development		
	Policy 25: Culture, Tourism and Sport	-	
	Policy 26: Travel Plans	·	
	Policy 27: Local Green Space		
	Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets Policy 29: Cemetery Extensions		
	Policy 30: Landscape		
	Policy 31: Biodiversity Assets		
	Policy 32: Developer Contributions	1	
Policies Map			
Sustainability Appraisal			
Other (e.g.			
omission, evidence			
document			
etc.)			

Question 2: What is the issue with the Local Plan?

Do you consider this paragraph or policy of the Local Plan to be: (please refer to the guidance note at for an explanation of these terms)		Yes	No
2.1	Legally compliant		
2.2	Compliant with the duty to co-operate		
2.3	Sound		x

Question 3: Why is the Local Plan unsound? Please only answer this question if you answered 'No' to 2.3 above

If you think this paragraph or policy of the Plan is not sound	l, is this because:
It is not justified	x
It is not effective	x
It is not positively prepared	x
It is not consistent with national policy	x

Your comments

Please give details of why you consider this part of the Local Plan is not legally compliant, is unsound or does not comply with the duty to co-operate. Alternatively, if you wish to support any of these aspects please provide details. Please be as precise as possible. Continue on an extra sheet if necessary.

The Plan seeks to reduce the housing requirement as set out within the Adopted Core Strategy for Eastwood and allocate more housing within the main urban area. Objection is raised towards this approach. It is considered essential that Eastwood maintains a continual supply of housing and ensure that viable sites are released that can provide appropriate market and affordable housing to meet the needs of the area. Eastwood is a highly sustainable location which requires growth in order to sustain and improve local facilities including a deteriorating town centre badly in need of the investment new residential areas around the town can bring. The release of appropriate green field sites to meet the needs identified within the Adopted Core Strategy will bring forward much needed housing for Eastwood and enable the provision of contributions towards local infrastructure.

It is noted that Eastwood is classified as a low market area which reduces viability and the opportunities for securing appropriate S106 contributions. However, sites such as the Wades Printers site, are located within a higher market area than the remainder of Eastwood and as will be demonstrated within our submission regarding policy 6, our site can bring forward substantial local community benefits including the provision of a significant area of public open space.

Policy 3 identifies 8 sites proposed to be allocated for housing purposes within the main urban area. Concerns are raised with regards to the deliverability of a number of these sites within the plan period. The table below identifies my clients concerns and key constraints on each of the sites which may affect deliverability.

SITE	NUMBER OF DWELLINGS	ISSUES
Chetwynd Barracks	500	 A Listed building and memorial garden is present on site which may impact upon land availability. The site holds historical importance with regards to the military. This issue needs further consideration prior to redeveloping the site. Previous industrial uses present and therefore potential for contamination within the site. Significant level changes across the site which may impact upon density. Detailed masterplan required to show that the constraints have been taken into consideration and that this site can accommodate 500 dwellings. It is noted that the SHLAA identifies the delivery of 500 dwellings within the 11-15year period. It is considered ambitious to expect 500 dwellings to be completed within a 5-year period. With the constraints identified and the military processes that would have to be undertaken before the land could be released to a developer, it is considered that this allocation will be delivered over a longer period than the current plan period.
Toton (Strategic Location for Growth)	500 dwellings	This site consists of a Strategic Location for Growth. The allocation proposes a mixed-use development which will expand beyond the plan period. The wider allocation includes the provision of 500 dwellings plus retail, business use, open space, transport improvements and community facilities. Concern is raised regarding the deliverability of the housing proposed within the plan period. Within the SHLAA 300 dwelling are projected to be delivered between 2018-2023. This is considered to be extremely doubtful given the uncertainties that still surround this major infrastructure project. Question is raised as to the deliverability within these time frames with lead in times for infrastructure etc.
Bramcote (East of Coventry Lane)	300	 This is a green belt site and the proposal will have a significant landscape impact. It is considered that there are less sensitive sites available in Eastwood which would enable a distribution more in line with the with Adopted Core Strategy. Significant local objection to the release of this green belt site including the Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum. The site lies adjacent to a landfill site. Potential for contamination issue that does not appear to have been fully evaluated. SA identifies land ownership issues as a constraint. Question is raised with regards to deliverability within the plan period. The requirement for no dwellings to be occupied before the replacement school is completed, creates a difficult scenario for builders who need to see cash flowing in as well as out . This is likely to impact upon deliverability within the plan period.
Stapleford (West of Coventry Lane)	240	 This is a green belt site and its release in conjunction with Fields Farm and the Bramcote (East of Coventry Lane) will cumulatively have a significant detrimental impact upon the purposes of the green belt and should not be supported. There are less sensitive

		 green belt sites available within Eastwood that would align with the Core Strategy and should be released before this site. Question is raised with regards to the sites sustainability with residents having to rely heavily upon the car to access the key services and facilities.
Severn Trent (Lilac Grove)	150	 Ecological impacts of development upon Beeston Canal Wildlife Site. Potential contamination issues from the land fill site. This issue does not seem to have been fully considered
Beeston Maltings	56	 The site formed part of a housing allocation within the 2004 Adopted Local Plan and site has been cleared and demolished since 2012. Question is raised with regards to the deliverability of this site within the plan period as this site has not come forward to date. Development could result in potential harm to an area including non-designated heritage assets in Dovecote Lane area. The SHLAA identifies that there are on-going discussions with Network Rail about bringing this site forward and that there are some legal issues over this site. It is understood that some freight operators have objected to the proposal and Network Rail are working to resolve this. It is considered that there is uncertainty about the delivery of this site and should not be included within the land supply for the plan period.
Beeston Cement Depot	21	 Potential contamination issues which may impact upon deliverability

It is clear that whilst that Local Plan seeks to provide more housing within the main urban area than identified within the Core Strategy, there are constraints to a number of the sites allocated which could preclude the sites from coming forward and delivering the full housing needs for the Borough. It is another example of the Council relying on old ideas and not fully engaging in the adoption of a new positive approach to identifying housing land.

The Council's approach seems to be to turn its back more on the needs of Eastwood even though that may mean releasing more sensitive green belt sites in Bramcote

It is clear from viewing the Local Plan Publications Version and the accompanying Site Selection Document that the justification for release more housing within the main urban area than within Eastwood is that the areas such as Toton, Bramcote and parts of Stapleford are higher marketing areas and accordingly will enable the LPA to secure more S106 benefits. Objection is raised to this approach as the S106 provisions secured will benefit the already affluent and well provided for areas of Bramcote and Toton. By failing to release more land within Eastwood, leads to a reduction in the ability to secure funding for the more deprived settlement of Eastwood and build capacity for this area.

There are also a number of sites included within the housing land supply calculation as identified by the SHLAA. Our comments on these are as follows:

SITE	NUMBER OF DWELLING	ISSUES
Works, Bailey Street, Stapleford	15 dwellings	 Outline consent approved in 2012 which has now lapsed and has not been renewed. No certainty that this site will come forward for development. Contamination issues and adjacent existing uses may impact upon the marketability of this site and therefore question is raised with regards to its deliverability. Site should be removed from housing supply
Wadsworth Road, Stapleford	11 dwellings	 School site is now occupied by the Haven Group and unlikely to come forward for housing for several years, if at all. This site should be removed from the SHLAA as the site is not deliverable.

It is clear that there are significant issues with a number of the sites both within the allocations and within the SHLAA that may affect deliverability within the plan period. In this regards, it is considered necessary to release additional land within the Borough in order to ensure that the housing requirement is met in full.

As this and other objections will show, there is considerable concern that the policies reflect the situation as the Council would like to see it viewed in terms of site delivery, rather than as it will be. Therefore, the Plan fails the tests of soundness as:

1. Positively Prepared: To meet the test the plan must be able to show it is based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, in a manner consistent with achieving sustainable development. The sites selected, and the many previously permitted, do not show a positive approach to achieve the delivery claimed within the next 5 years let alone the immense step change that the Trajectory in Table 4 is suggesting will occur. The Council appear to be relying on sites that have failed in the past which indicates that the Plan is not positively prepared.

2. Justified: The sites highlighted above are not fully evaluated and the belief that they will deliver in the manner suggested is not justified.

3. Effective: The fact that the issues raised above, that sites will not deliver as forecast, means that the Plan will fail to be effective and deliver the growth required.

4. Consistent with national policy: The NPPF (Para 14) requires local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area. It goes on to seek to "boost significantly the supply of housing" (para 47). However, as this and other objections will show, that is not the approach the council is talking, relying instead on sites where deliverability is questionable.

Question 4: Modifications sought

Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. Continue on an extra sheet if necessary.

The council should take a fresh look at potential new sites where deliverability has not already failed and consider sites that do not have the deliverability and viability issues that some of the current sites face.

It is considered that additional housing should be released within Eastwood in order to provide a plan that is more in compliance with the Adopted Core Strategy and to ensure that sufficient developable and deliverable sites are allocated to meet the full housing needs for the plan period. It should focus on the more marketable areas of Eastwood and support this areas growth and regeneration in a more positive fashion.

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested modification, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

Question 5: Public Examination Attendance

Yes, I wish to participate at the public examination	\checkmark
No, I do not wish to participate at the public examination	

There are issues of how far the Plan still aligns with the Core strategy that it claims to rely on, although it's approach appears at odds with that document.

The growth and regeneration of Eastwood is a matter which would benefit from a roundtable debate on the merits of various sites and alternatives.

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the public examination.

From: Sent: To: Subject: Daniel Sellers 30 October 2017 16:39 Policy Dan Sellers 2017-10-30

Dear relevant department,

Local Plan feedback

I fully support the **New Local Plan** consultation document.

I feel it is important that Brownfield sites are redeveloped (such as the barracks in the Chilwell / Attenborough area, the former Boots factory & cement works in Beeston) and also that Listed Buildings are used & maintained to stop them becoming derelict.

It is also important that the proposed development to the east of Toton railway yard maintains the green gap between the railway line and Toton village.

With regard to the Bennerley opencast site, as this is in the Green Belt I feel it should be remediated and retained to green land with restoration of the disused railway viaduct.

I would support residential conversion of the disused farm buildings opposite Trowell Church, between the A6007 and the railway line.

Finally, good to see that work on the residential conversion / development at Kimberley Brewery has now started.

Regards,

Dan.

Broxtowe Part 2 Local Plan

Agent

Please provide your	client's name	
Your Details		
Title	Mr Mrs Miss Ms Other:	
Name	SAMANTHA HOOD	
Organisation (If responding on behalf of the organisation)		-
Address	Broxtowe Borough Council Planning & Community Development 11 CCT 2017	t
Postcode		
Tel. Number		1
E-mail address		

Brox

Comments should be received by 5.00pm on Friday 3rd November 2017

If you wish to comment on several policies, paragraphs, or sites, please use a separate form for each representation.

If you would like to be contacted by the Planning Policy Team regarding future consultations. Please tick here	
Please tick nere Please tick nere Please help us save money and the environment by providing an e-mail address that correspondence can be sent to:	

For more information including an online response form please visit: www.broxtowe.gov.uk/part2localplan

Data Protection - The comment(s) you submit on the Local Development Framework (LDF) will be used in the plan process and may be in use for the lifetime of the LDF in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. The information will be analysed and the Council will consider issues raised. Please note that comments cannot be treated as confidential and will be made available for public inspection. All representations can be viewed at the Council Offices.

Please return completed forms to:

Planning Policy, Legal and Planning Services, Foster Avenue, Beeston, Nottingham NG9 1AB For more information: Tel: 0115 917 3452, 3448, 3468 or 3015 E-mail: policy@broxtowe.gov.uk

Question 1: What does your comment relate to? Please specify exactly

Document	Policy number	Page number	Policy text/ Paragraph number
Document	Policy 1: Flood Risk Policy 2: Site Allocations Policy 3: Main Built up Area Site Allocations Policy 4: Awsworth Site Allocation Policy 5: Brinsley Site Allocation Policy 6: Eastwood Site Allocations Policy 7: Kimberley Site Allocations Policy 8: Development in the Green Belt Policy 9: Retention of good quality existing employment sites Policy 10: Town Centre and District Centre Uses Policy 11: The Square, Beeston Policy 12: Edge-of-Centre A1 Retail in Eastwood Policy 13: Proposals for main town centre uses in edge-of-centre and out-of-centre locations Policy 14: Centre of Neighbourhood Importance (Chilwell Road / High Road) Policy 15: Housing size, mix and choice Policy 16: Gypsies and Travellers Policy 17: Place-making, design and amenity Policy 18: Shopfronts, signage and security measures Policy 19: Pollution, Hazardous Substances and Ground Conditions Policy 20: Air Quality Policy 21: Unstable land Policy 22: Minerals Policy 23: Proposals affecting designated and non- designated heritage assets Policy 24: The health impacts of development Policy 25: Culture, Tourism and Sport Policy 26: Travel Plans Policy 27: Local Green Space Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets Policy 29: Cemetery Extensions Policy 29: Cemetery Extensions Policy 29: Landscape Policy 31: Biodiversity Assets Policy 32: Developer Contributions		Paragraph
Sustainability Appraisal			
Other (e.g. omission, evidence document etc.)			

Question 2: What is the issue with the Local Plan?

	u consider this paragraph or policy of the Local Plan to be: (please refer to the new note at for an explanation of these terms)	Yes	No
2.1	Legally compliant		
2.2	Compliant with the duty to co-operate		
2.3	Sound	XAAKI	\checkmark

Question 3: Why is the Local Plan unsound? Please only answer this question if you answered 'No' to 2.3 above

If you think this paragraph or policy of the Plan is not sound, is this because:			
It is not justified			
It is not effective			
It is not positively prepared			
It is not consistent with national policy			

Your comments

Please give details of why you consider this part of the Local Plan is not legally compliant, is unsound or does not comply with the duty to co-operate. Alternatively, if you wish to support any of these aspects please provide details. Please be as precise as possible. Continue on an extra sheet if necessary.

1 Don't think there is enough room for housing on that land.

Question 4: Modifications sought

Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. Continue on an extra sheet if necessary.

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested modification, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

Question 5: Public Examination Attendance

If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the public examination?				
Yes, I wish to participate at the public examination				
No, I do not wish to participate at the public examination				
If you wish to participate at the public examination, please outline why you consider this necessary	to be			

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the public examination.

Guidance Note:

Please complete a separate form for each representation you wish to make.

'Legally Compliant':

If your response relates to <u>the way in which the plan has been prepared</u>, then this is likely to relate to whether it or not it is 'Legally Compliant'. To be 'Legally Compliant', the Local Plan has to be prepared in accordance within the 'Duty to Cooperate' and legal and procedural requirements. These are set out by legislation in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended). If you think that we have not met the legal requirement in the preparation of the Local Plan, please use the response form to tell us what we have not done or what we have done incorrectly.

'Compliant with the Duty to Co-operate':

If your response relates to the way in which we have worked with other authorities then this is likely to relate to the 'Duty to Co-operate'.

The 'Duty to Co-operate' places a legal duty on Local Planning Authorities, County Councils and certain public bodies to engage constructively, actively, and on an on-going basis, to maximise the effectiveness of Local Plan preparation in the context of strategic cross-boundary matters. The 'Duty to Co-operate' is not a duty to agree. However, Local Planning Authorities should make every effort to secure the necessary co-operation on strategic cross-boundary matters before they submit their Local Plan for examination.

'Sound'

If your response is about the <u>content</u> of the Local Plan and the strategy it adopts, then it is likely to relate to whether or not the Local Plan is '**Sound**'.

To meet the 'Test of Soundness', the independent Planning Inspector is required to consider whether or not our Local Plan is 'justified', 'effective', has been 'positively prepared', and is 'consistent with national policy'. You may wish to consider the following before making a representation on the 'Soundness' of our Local Plan:

- 'Justified': This means that the Local Plan is based upon a robust and credible evidence base. If
 you think that the evidence doesn't support the choice made in our Local Plan, or there are realistic
 alternatives, then your comments may relate to whether or not it is 'justified'.
- 'Effective': This means that the Local Plan will deliver what it sets out to. If you think that what we
 are proposing in the Local Plan is not deliverable, then your comments may relate to whether or not
 our Local Plan is 'effective'.
- 'Positively Prepared': This means the Local Plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development.
- 'Consistent with National Policy': Do you consider that our Local Plan accords with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and other policies, or includes clear and convincing reasons for doing something different?

For further guidance or assistance, please contact the **Planning Policy Team** on **0115 917 3452** or by emailing **policy@broxtowe.gov.uk**.