

Broxtowe Borough Council

Part 2 Local Plan

Consultation Statement

July 2018

Updated November 2018

Contents

Introduction	5
Executive Summary.....	6
Key Messages.....	7
Appendix 1	10
Site Allocations Issues and Options (4th November 2013 – 10th January 2014)	10
Greater Nottingham and Ashfield Draft Green Belt Assessment Framework (4 th August – 19 th September 2014) ..	11
Preferred Approach to Site Allocations (Green Belt Review) (9 th February 2015 – 23 rd March 2015)	12
Development Management Policies Issues and Options (9 th February 2015 – 23 rd March 2015)	13
Strategic Location for Growth at Toton (12 th October – 23 rd November 2015)	14
Workshop for key stakeholders (6 th November 2015).....	17
Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites (22 nd August – 3 rd October 2016).....	19
Workshop 1: Natural Environment, Open Space and Climate Change (19 th July 2016)	20
Workshop 2: Green Belt and Countryside Issues (22 nd July 2016).....	22
Workshop 3: Design and Heritage (25 th July 2016).....	24
Workshop 4: Employment and Retail (27 th July 2016).....	26
Workshop 5: Housing and Community Facilities (29 th July 2016).....	28
Site Specific workshop 1: Chetwynd Barracks (17 th October 2016).....	31
Site Specific workshop 2: Land north of Moorgreen Eastwood (19 th October 2016).....	33
Site Specific workshop 3: Land east of Church Lane Brinsley (31 st October 2016).....	33
Site Specific workshop 4: Land east and west of Coventry Lane Bramcote / Stapleford (2 nd November 2016)	36
Site Specific workshop 5: Land west of Awworth (inside the bypass) (7 th November 2016).....	38
Site Specific workshop 6: Land south of Kimberley (9 th November 2016).....	40
Site Specific workshop 7: Land south of Blenheim Industrial Estate Nuthall (11 th November 2016).....	41
Brinsley Alternative Site consultation (13 th February - 24 th March 2017)	43
Topic based workshop 7: Infrastructure (17 th March 2017)	44
The Duty to Cooperate:.....	51
Neighbourhood Planning group engagement:	134
Appendix 2	140
Whole Plan:.....	140
Policy 1: Flood Risk.....	142
Policy 2: Site Allocations	143
Policy 3.1 Chetwynd Barracks	166
Policy 3.2 Toton (Strategic Location for Growth)	185
Policy 3.3 Bramcote (East of Coventry Lane)	209
Policy 3.4 Stapleford (West of Coventry Lane)	225

Policy 3.5 Severn Trent (Lilac Grove)	234
Policy 3.6 Beeston Maltings	240
Policy 3.7 Beeston Cement Depot	243
Policy 3.8 Wollaton Road Beeston	246
Policy 4.1 Land west of Awworth (inside the Bypass)	247
Policy 5.1 East of Church Lane, Brinsley.....	259
Policy 6.1 Walker Street, Eastwood	274
Policy 7.1 Land south of Kimberley including Kimberley Depot	280
Policy 7.2 South of Eastwood Road Kimberley	291
Policy 7.3 Builders Yard Kimberley.....	298
Policy 8: Development in the Green Belt.....	301
Policy 9: Retention of Good Quality Existing Employment Sites	303
Policy 10: Town Centre and District Centre Uses	304
Policy 11 The Square, Beeston.....	306
Policy 12: Edge-of-Centre A1 Retail in Eastwood	311
Policy 13: Proposals for Main town Centre Uses in Edge-of Centre and Out-of-Centre Locations.....	312
Policy 14: Centre of Neighbourhood Importance (Chilwell Road / High Road – no representations received.....	313
Policy 15: Housing Size, Mix and Choice	314
Policy 16: Gypsies and Travellers – no representations received.....	319
Policy 17: Place-making, Design and Amenity	320
Policy 18: Shopfronts, Signage and Security Measures	323
Policy 19: Pollution, Hazardous Substances and Ground Conditions	324
Policy 20: Air Quality.....	325
Policy 21: Unstable Land	327
Policy 22: Minerals	328
Policy 23: Proposals Affecting Designated and Non-designated Heritage Assets	329
Policy 24: The Health Impacts of Development.....	333
Policy 25: Culture, Tourism and Sport	335
Policy 26: Travel Plans.....	336
Policy 27: Local Green Space.....	338
Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets.....	342
Policy 29: Cemetery Extensions	347
Policy 30: Landscape	348
Policy 31: Biodiversity Assets	349
Policy 32: Developer Contributions	352
Proposed Additional Policies:	355

Other issues	357
Other officer recommended changes to the Plan	359
Requested Map Amendments:	360
Appendix Amendments:	364

Introduction

Broxtowe Borough Council has prepared a Part 2 Local Plan for Broxtowe which allocates development sites and sets out planning policies in the Borough. Once adopted, the Part 2 Local Plan will sit alongside the Broxtowe Core Strategy, which is known as Part 1 of the Local Plan. Together, these two documents comprise the Development Plan for the Borough which will guide development in the Borough up to 2028.

Preparation of the plan has been informed by consultation undertaken in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. This Statement has been prepared in accordance with the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and sets out how the council has complied with the requirements of Regulations 18, 19, 20 and 22.

At appendix 1 is a statement setting out:

- i) Which bodies and persons were invited to make representations at regulation 18, Issues and Options stage (and at various other stages as well)
- ii) How these bodies and persons were invited to make representations
- iii) A summary of the main issues raised, and
- iv) How the representations were taken into account

At appendix 2 is a statement setting out a summary of representations made at regulation 20, publication stage. There were 769 representations made by 368 individuals and groups (a summary is shown below).

Part of Plan	Number of Representations on this issue
Whole Plan	12
Policy 1	7
Policy 2	39
Policy 3.1	23
Policy 3.2	34
Policy 3.3	31
Policy 3.4	25
Policy 3.5	57
Policy 3.6	9
Policy 3.7	9
Policy 3.8	2
Policy 4.1	20
Policy 5.1	164
Policy 6.1	14
Policy 7.1	67
Policy 7.2	13
Policy 7.3	11
Policy 8	10
Policy 9	3
Policy 10	7
Policy 11	9
Policy 12	1
Policy 13	4

Policy 14	0
Policy 15	12
Policy 16	0
Policy 17	11
Policy 18	3
Policy 19	4
Policy 20	8
Policy 21	1
Policy 22	4
Policy 23	11
Policy 24	7
Policy 25	4
Policy 26	7
Policy 27	24
Policy 28	44
Policy 29	4
Policy 30	5
Policy 31	7
Policy 32	11
Proposed Additional Policies	5
Other Issues	8
Requested Map Amendments	17
Appendix Amendments	1
Total Representations	769

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. The Aligned Core Strategy (part 1 of the Local Plan) was one of 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 adopted by all five Councils).

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 10 Neighbourhood Plans under production covering over 70% 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 up to the point of publication of the and how the Council has responded. This is detailed further throughout the rest of the document. At appendix 1 is the detailed summary of comments made up to publication and at appendix 2 is a summary of comments made at Publication.

Duty to Cooperate body	
Issue Raised	Broxtowe Borough Council Response
<p>Environment Agency (EA): During the 'Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation' the EA raised concern that the contaminated land policy may be removed.</p> <p>The EA also had serious concerns regarding the draft wording of the Flood Risk Policy.</p>	<p>The Council has retained a contaminated land policy.</p> <p>The Council worked in partnership with the EA following the consultation to ensure that concern the Flood Risk Policy was addressed.</p>
<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 	<p>Through the planning application process the Council have addressed the concerns regarding Kimberley Brewery.</p> <p>The Council addressed their concern by including the references as requested.</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. This has been rectified

<p>considered.</p> <p>5. SA scoping report omitted discussion on baseline data.</p>	
<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 impact on the adjacent SSSI.</p>	<p>The Council have not allocated the site for development and it will remain in the Green Belt.</p>
<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>	<p>The Council have not allocated a site to the north of Brinsley for development and it will remain in the Green Belt.</p>
<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>	<p>The Council have not allocated the site for development and it will remain in the Green Belt.</p>
<p>Nottinghamshire County Council: 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 the designation has been reviewed since the comments of the County Council and the policy amended to require details of mitigation/compensation at equivalent quality. The County Council do not object to the allocation as proposed in the submitted plan.</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): During the 2015 consultation on the 'Preferred Approach to Site Allocations (Green Belt Review)' Bramcote residents (prior to the</p>	<p>The Council moved the location of the residential allocation to the north of the site and reduced the Green Belt boundary changes.</p>

<p>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 Forum area.</p>	
<p>Brinsley Parish Council (BPC): BPC have objected to Green Belt release through the consultation process. Notwithstanding this, at the 2016 site specific workshop they indicated that land to the north (behind the recreation ground) was the 'least worst' area to develop.</p> <p>Two days 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 amended the allocation to include only the 4.2ha site behind the recreation ground. This is compared to the 28ha site that was consulted on for removal from the Green Belt.</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 in Appendix 1).</p>
<p>Stapleford Town Council (STC) STC have objected to Green Belt release west of Coventry Lane.</p>	<p>The Council have consulted widely on development on this site which is supported by evidence including Green Belt review and Sustainability Appraisal</p>

Appendix 1

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.

Consultation Maps:

The Green Belt review included recommended areas on the edge of each settlement to be released from the Green Belt. These areas are shown in the maps on the following pages.

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

A full summary of the responses to the Development Management Policies Issues and Options consultation was presented to Cabinet on 13 October 2015. Responses from the Duty to Cooperate bodies are included later in this Statement (from page 43). A brief overview of the issues can be seen below.

National bodies including Natural England, the Environment Agency, English Heritage (now Historic England) and the Coal Authority made various requests which the Council agreed to include in several policies.

Particularly helpful were the comments, and subsequent discussions, from the Environment Agency regarding policy on flood risk and from English Heritage regarding policy for various heritage issues. Nottinghamshire County Council also made helpful representations on a variety of issues, including minerals and green infrastructure.

Representations were also made by several landowners and developers on a variety of issues including retail, employment, housing, design and environmental designations.

Representations were also made by local interest groups, Greasley Parish Council and a small number of local residents.

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 2011	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.

Summary Maps:

The responses to the consultation fed into a masterplan and site outline which was then considered by Cabinet, where it was recommended to be progressed as a site allocation. These are shown in the maps on the following pages.

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.

Consultation Maps:

The Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites consultation included additional sites which had not previously been included in a site specific consultation two of which were areas under consideration to be released from the Green Belt. These areas are shown in the maps on the following pages.

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 Employment Land Forecasting Study) 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 point's 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 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

Awsworth Site:

- The agent / developer for the Awsworth 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 Awsworth 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/Awsworth 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 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 Awsworth 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 Local Enterprise Partnership
- The Local Nature partnership

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
November 2013	Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation	107 - Land at Woodhouse Way Nuthall <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would not support the development of this site. 	Site not allocated in line with their request
		220 - Land east of Low Wood Road Nuthall <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would not support the development of this site. 	Site not allocated in line with their request
		Town Centres Main town centre uses below 1,000sqm should not need to provide an impact assessment.	500 is the appropriate figure which follows evidence in the Carter Jonas retail evidence to support the Local Plan from 2015
		Transport <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. 	Agree in principle and most of these issues will be included in the development management process. Routes for transport infrastructure such as the tram extension to the HS2 station are safeguarded in policies, but there remains uncertainty as to the exact route and alignment.
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.	Agreed Joint approach	
February 2015	Preferred Approach to site allocations: Green Belt Review Consultation	NCC were a partner in this consultation	
February 2015	Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation	No representations made.	
November	Strategic Location for	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitted two possible masterplan's (not intended 	It will be possible to include the broad amounts of

2015	Growth at Toton Consultation	<p>to be comprehensive – rather to stimulate debate).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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 	<p>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-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</p>
------	------------------------------	---	---

		<p>of Toton Lane would allow more economic development to the West with a better relationship with the Toton hub.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>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>
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation	<p>Bramcote: Support Allocation and question availability of supporting evidence.</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 Ridgeline.</p> <p>It also has direct access off Coventry Lane.</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 and sufficient supporting evidence was available with the consultation, in particular the evidence from the previous Green Belt Review consultation</p>
		<p>Chetwynd: Support Allocation and question availability of supporting evidence.</p> <p>Represents significant contribution to housing</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</p>

		<p>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>	Plan with no objections from the City Council to doing so.
		<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</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>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 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.</p> <p>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>	
--	--	---	--

		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).	
February 2017	Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation	No representations made.	

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	Transport 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.	Noted and extensive work in relation to HS2 in particular will fully take into account cross boundary issues.
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</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</i></p>

	<p>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 Awsorth.</p>	<p><i>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 than 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.</p> <p>EBC fully agree with BBC's conclusion that any release of Green Belt for residential development would be</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>

		inappropriate.	
		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.	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
February 2015	Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation	No representations made.	
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</p>	Comments have been incorporated in the submission version of the Plan

		into account the Sandiacre Lock Conservation Area.	
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	No representations made.	

Ashfield District 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	<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.	Noted
		<u>Brinsley Generally</u> Any development in Brinsley would impact upon the infrastructure in Underwood and possibly Jacksdale.	The site allocated is in line with ADCs request
		<u>197 – North of Cordy Lane Brinsley</u> Concern about coalescence with Underwood if whole of site is developed.	Site not allocated
		513 - Land belonging to Stubbing Wood Farm Watnall <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. 	Site not allocated
		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.	Employment allocations are in line with the requirement in the ACS and will not adversely impact on ADC
		Climate Change Specific sites for renewable energy should not be allocated because flexibility is required to adapt to the ever changing renewable industry.	Sites not allocated
		Community Facilities <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. 	Addressed through specific allocations
		Healthy Living <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites need to be considered alongside other development GI should be driven by local evidence base. 	Addressed through specific allocations and Green Infrastructure policy 28

		Transport <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No size threshold should be applied and should be dictated by viability. 	Addressed through application process.
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.	Agreed Joint approach	
February 2015	Preferred Approach to site allocations: Green Belt Review Consultation	ADC were a partner in this consultation.	
February 2015	Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation	No representations made.	
November 2015	Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation	No representations made.	
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation	No representations made.	
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 	These comments have been addressed in the submission version of the Plan.

		<p>d) Retaining or creating defensible boundaries.</p> <p>e)</p> <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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</i></p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p><i>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.	Noted

No representations made to any other consultations.

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. 	Policy 1 of the ACS and Policy 1 of this Local Plan give sufficient steer to these issues.
		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. 	Site not allocated for housing
		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. 	Site not allocated for housing
		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. 	Site not allocated for housing
		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 	Much smaller site allocated in part to take on board the NCC comments
		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. 	AS above
		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 	Site not allocated for housing

		<p>could include buffer zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigation for direct impact may involve reduction in developable space. 	
		<p>125 - Land at Church Street Eastwood</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remnant area of neutral grassland which may have conservation value. 	Urban site (and not allocated in this Local Plan) but points will be addressed through the development management process
		<p>130 - Church Street Eastwood (Raleigh)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of grassland and scrub which may have conservation value. 	Urban site (and not allocated in this Local Plan) but points will be addressed through the development management process
		<p>138 - Walker Street Eastwood</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of grassland, scrub and post-industrial habitat which may have conservation value. 	Site allocated in full co-operation (and agreement) from NCC who are the owners of this site.
		<p>143 - South of Smithurst Road Giltbrook</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of grassland and scrub which may have conservation value. 	Urban site (and not allocated in this Local Plan) but points have been addressed through the development management process
		<p>146 – Chewton Street Newthorpe</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of grassland and hedgerows which may have conservation value. 	Urban site (and not allocated in this Local Plan) but points will be addressed through the development management process
		<p>203 – Nether Green East of Mansfield Road Eastwood</p> <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. 	Site not allocated for housing
		<p>204 – North of 4 Mill Road Beauvale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of grassland and hedgerows which may have conservation value. 	Site not allocated for housing
		<p>206 – East of Baker Road/North of Nottingham Road Giltbrook</p> <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. 	Site not allocated for housing

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area of grassland and hedgerows which may have conservation value. 	
	<p>313 - Brookhill Leys Farm Eastwood</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjacent SINC 2/245 – mitigation for indirect impacts would be required which could include buffer zone. 	Urban site (and not allocated in this Local Plan) but points will be addressed through the development management process
	<p>519 - Land off Thorn Drive & West of the Pastures Newthorpe</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area of grassland and scrub which may have conservation value. 	Site not allocated for housing. This is protected by Policy 28 as open space and land for flood mitigation if required.
	<p>103 – Land east of New Farm Lane Nuthall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site entirely covered by SINC 5/753 – species-rich calcareous grassland which should not be developed. 	Site not allocated for housing
	<p>105 - Land west of New Farm Lane Nuthall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area of grassland which may have conservation value. 	Site not allocated for housing
	<p>131 - Church Hill Kimberley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site entirely covered by SINC 2/276 – species-rich neutral grassland which should not be developed. 	Eastern part of the earlier proposed allocation to remain in the Green Belt. The railway embankment now forms the western boundary of the site
	<p>144 - South of Eastwood Road Kimberley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area of grassland and trees which may have conservation value. 	Previously allocated site and development area reduced to preserve Green Infrastructure
	<p>145 – Land between 3 and 12 Hardy Close Kimberley</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. Area of grassland which may have conservation value. 	Urban site (and not allocated in this Local Plan) but points will be addressed through the development management process
	<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. 	Site proposed to be allocated but will not come forward until later in the plan period and comments will be fully addressed through the details of any application. No development will take place on the embankment as it will not be practical to do so.
	<p>218 - South of Kimberley Road Nuthall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Great Crested Newts believed to be in pond on site. 	Points addressed through the development management process

		234 - Land at New Farm Nuthall <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site entirely covered by SINC 5/753 – species-rich calcareous grassland which should not be developed. 	Site not allocated for housing
		271 - Gilt Hill Farm Kimberley <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area of grassland and hedgerows which may have conservation value. 	Site not allocated for housing
		285 - Land north of Alma Hill west of Millfield Road Kimberley <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area of grassland and mature hedgerows which may have conservation value. 	Site not allocated for housing
		411 - 2 High Street Kimberley <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. 	Eastern part of the earlier proposed allocation to remain in the Green Belt. The railway embankment now forms the western boundary of the site
		428 – Rear of Chilton Drive Watnall <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. 	Points addressed through the development management process
		586 – Kimberley Brewery <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area of woodland which may have conservation value. 	Points addressed through the development management process
		104 – Land off Coventry Lane Bramcote <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site partly covered by SINC 2/6 –canal which would need to be protected from development. 	Site not allocated for housing
		107 - Land at Woodhouse Way Nuthall <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site partly covered by SINC 5/755 –woodland which would need to be protected from development. 	Site not allocated for housing
		108 - Field Farm north of Ilkeston Road Stapleford <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. 	Site allocated in the Core Strategy and points fully addressed through the development management process. Construction now underway on site.
		111 – Land off Moss Drive Bramcote	Site not allocated for housing

		<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. 	Site not allocated for housing
		<p>258 – Land at Lilac Grove Beeston</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of grassland and scrub which may have conservation value. 	Urban site expected to come forward in the later stages of this Local Plan. Issues will be fully addressed through the development management process.
		<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. 	Site not allocated for housing
		<p>410 - South of Baulk Lane Stapleford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area of grassland and scrub which may have conservation value. 	Site not allocated for housing
		<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. 	Toton Strategic Location for Growth allocated following full dialogue with the County Council including protections for nature conservation/ green Infrastructure.
		<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. 	Site not allocated for housing

		<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. 	Site not allocated for housing
		<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. 	Sites available and full dialogue with NCC ongoing regarding their role as the waste planning authority.
		<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. • Sites that consist wholly or partly of SINCs should not be considered further. 	Noted and Policy 31 of the Local Plan has been amended to better protect ecological value
		<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). 	Comments addressed through allocation work and there is sufficient policy seer to enable these matters to be adequately addressed through the development management process
		Local plans should include policies on minerals safeguarding and consultation areas.	Broxtowe has incorporated the request to include a policy on minerals safeguarding and consultation areas

			<p>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>Up to date landscape character work was undertaken to support this local plan. This has informed policies and allocations.</p>
		<p>Employment Sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> E31 – covered by SINC 2/140 & SINC 2/276 areas of 	<p>Issues will be addressed through the development management process</p>

		<p>disused railway and species-rich neural grassland which need to be protected from development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 endure 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>The Green Belt boundary does follow the railway line and there are no outstanding issues for this allocation with the County Council.</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</p>	<p>Ongoing dialogue with the County Council regarding their role as minerals planning authority and no further policy amendments are needed for this Local Plan. Coal safeguarding areas are shown on the policies map.</p>

		<p>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> <p>T4: Park-and-ride facilities</p>	<p>Noted. This relates to a requirement for high densities that may not be viable or appropriate in all locations.</p> <p>This may be problematic in relation to s106 ‘pooling</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “The Council isn’t currently considering any future Park & Ride developments in Broxtowe.” 	restrictions’.
February 2015	Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation	<p>T5: South Notts Rail Network (SNRN) 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) 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 “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>	Policy not needed as this issue will be addressed through good inclusive design in Policy 17
		<p>Possible new policy: Sustainable transport networks “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 “The inclusion of a local policy setting out what is considered to be “significant” is supported.”</p>	Noted
		<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;</p> <p><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</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.

		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”.	
		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.”	Noted
		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.”	Noted
		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	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 have been held with Nottinghamshire County Council.

		<p>Green Spaces Strategy 2009-16.”</p> <p>RC6: Open space: requirements for new developments 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>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 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>
November 2015	Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation	No representations made.	
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation	<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</p>	<p>Ongoing dialogue with the County Council regarding their role as minerals planning authority and no further policy amendments are needed for this Local Plan. Coal safeguarding areas are shown on the policies map. The allocation at Bramcote has been reached in full dialogue with NCC. See previous comments regarding review and mitigation for the LWS.</p>

		<p>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>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Site has been allocated in full dialogue with NCC who are supportive of the allocation</p>

		<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Site not allocated for housing</p>
--	--	---	---------------------------------------

		<p>particularly important.</p> <p>Serious concerns regarding Sellers Wood SSSI would be abutted by new 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. Further detailed transport assessments required. County Council is likely to request developer contribution to provide bus service and bus stop to serve the development adequately.</p>	
February 2017	Brinsley additional site consultation	<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 	<p>Broxtowe note the strong objection from the County Council and as a result of the consultation response the site was not carried forward into the Part 2 Local Plan.</p>

		<p>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.</p> <p>- 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> <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 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.</p> <p>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</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	
--	--	---	--

		make on the alternative site in relation to strategic transport planning.	
--	--	---	--

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 representations made.	
Autumn 2014	Green Belt Review Framework	No representations made.	
February 2015	Preferred Approach to site allocations: Green Belt Review Consultation	No representations made.	
February 2015	Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation	No representations made.	
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 	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>increase could have potential consequences on the attraction of employment land to investors in Erewash (particularly Long Eaton and Stanton Ironworks).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Council plans and are broadly supported. • 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 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>undertaken, in addition to potential pupils of Derbyshire wishing to attend new primary school/ extended secondary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Sites Consultation	<p>Chetwynd: Support Allocation – Located in very sustainable location within the urban area between Toton and Chilwell in a well-established 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</p>	<p>Broxtowe Borough Council welcomes the support from Derbyshire County Council for the allocation of Chetwynd Barracks and has carried this through as a housing allocation in the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 3.1.</p>

		<p>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>	
February 2017	Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation	No representations made.	

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 Awsworth <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 Awsworth.
		36 - The Ponderosa Awsworth <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 Awsworth.
		190 – North of Barlows Cottages Awsworth <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 Awsworth 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. 	Site no allocated for housing.
		117 - Land at Newtons Lane Awsworth 394 – Rear of 13-27 The Glebe Cossall 138 - Walker Street Eastwood	As comments for Nottinghamshire County Council staring on page 58 of this statement.

		<p>146 – Chewton Street Newthorpe</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No constraints. • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. 	
		<p>564 - Land at Gin Close Way Awsworth</p> <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. 	<p>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 Awsworth.</p>
		<p>197 – North of Cordy Lane Brinsley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management and analysis of watercourse through site required. 	<p>Green Belt site which was considered further through the Green Belt Review.</p>
		<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 	<p>Green Belt site which was considered further through the Green Belt Review.</p>
		<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. 	<p>Site not allocated for housing.</p>
		<p>34 - Land off Acorn Avenue Giltbrook</p>	<p>Part commitment and part to be protected for open</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. 	space and flood mitigation on land to rear of Thorn Drive.
		<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. 	Same general response as in relation to comments in response to NCC for all remaining sites. Comments to be addressed through the development management process.
		<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. 	Planning Permission granted and issues fully addresses.
		<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. 	Site not allocated for housing
		<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</p> <p>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. 	Sites not allocated for housing
		<p>413 – Mansfield Road Nether Green</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ordinary watercourse to North and South of boundaries. 	Site not allocated for housing

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Noted
		<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. 	Noted
		<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 	Issues addressed through the development management process.

		<p>development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental assessment required. 	
		<p>140 - Builders Yard 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. <p>Impacts on former landfill adjacent to Southern boundary should be investigated.</p>	Noted
		<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. 	Noted
		<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. 	Noted
		<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. 	Noted
		<p>136 - East of Main Street Awwsworth 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</p>	Noted

		<p>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 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>Development management issues to be addressed in line with Policy 1 of this Local Plan as site not allocated in this Local Plan.</p>

		<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. 	As above
		<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. 	Matters addressed through the site allocation.
		<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. 	Development management issues. Aldi have planning permission to build a new foodstore.
		<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. 	Noted
		<p>108 - Field Farm north of Ilkeston Road Stapleford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority of site within flood zone 1 • Watercourse (Boundary Brook) dissects site meaning some within flood zone 3. • Sequential approach confirmed, site specific flood risk assessment required. 	Core Strategy allocation
		<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. 	Site not allocated for housing
		<p>135 - Field Lane Chilwell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific constraints. • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on 	Noted

		sustainable surface water management required.	
		150 – Beeston Maltings Dovecote Lane <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer • Environmental assessment required. 	Noted and development management issues to be assessed in line with Policy 1 of this Local Plan.
		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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. 	Noted
		195 - Land adjacent to 428 Queens Road West Chilwell <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. 	Issues addressed through a planning application.
		220 - Land east of Low Wood Road Nuthall <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. 	Site not to be allocated for housing.
		230 - Lower Regent Street Beeston 239 - Works Bailey Street Stapleford <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in flood zone 3. • Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. 	Sites not allocated in this Local Plan. Urban sites and Development management issues to be assessed in line with Policy 1 of this Local Plan
		231 - Wollaton Road Beeston	Noted

		<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. 	Site not to be allocated for housing.
		<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. 	Matters fully addressed through Core Strategy and the planning application on this site.
		<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. 	Matters fully addressed through the Core Strategy re Sequential Test and other matters to be addressed as part of the development management process to be assessed in line with Policy 1 of this Local Plan.
		<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. 	Site not to be allocated for housing.
		<p>301 - 7a Middleton Crescent Beeston</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in flood zone 3 and includes Tottle Brook. 	Urban site and development management issues process to be assessed in line with Policy 1 of this Local Plan.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	
	310 - Neville Sadler Court Beeston 389 - Neville Sadler Court Beeston <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Located in flood zone 3. Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. 		Urban sites and development management issues to be assessed in line with Policy 1 of this Local Plan.
	343 – St Johns College Peache Way Bramcote <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific constraints. Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. 		Planning Permission granted and development underway.
	360 - Chetwynd Barracks Chetwynd Road Chilwell <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. 		Comments have been fully taken on board with the site allocation.
	398 - Manor Garage 365 Nottingham Road Toton <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.
	407 – Land between A52 Stapleford and Chilwell Lane Bramcote <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management including analysis of ordinary watercourse required. 		Site not proposed to be allocated for housing.
	408 - Myford Machine Tools Wilmot Lane Beeston		Noted

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments on planning application remain valid. 	
		420 - Land north of Stapleford Road Trowell <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. 	Noted and development management issues
		449 – Beeston Cement Depot Station Road Beeston 499 - Beeston Business Park Technology Drive Beeston <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. 	No sequentially preferable sites for either and no objections to the published version of the Local Plan. Beeston Business Park has planning permission.
		509 - Trowell Freight Depot Stapleford Road Trowell <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 Environmental assessment required. 	Noted
		548 - Beeston Van Hire 2 Barton Way Chilwell <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Located in flood zone 2. Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. 	Noted
		588 – Land to west of Bilborough Road Strelley 189 - Land at Smithfield Avenue Trowell 513 - Land belonging to Stubbing Wood Farm Watnall <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. 	Sites not allocated
		Toton - (133, 254, 259, 403, 132, 407 & 358) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on 	Toton Strategic Location for growth, allocated for development with the full support of the EA. The site

		<p>sustainable surface water management required.</p> <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 borders site. • Planning proposals acceptable subject to flood mitigation proposals. 	<p>was originally confirmed as a Strategic Location for Growth through the Core Strategy process with all flood risk and other issues addressed in principle at that time.</p>
		<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>Policy 1 of the Local Plan addresses these points.</p>
		<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>Noted</p>
		<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 provide a net biodiversity gain?” • Recommend indicators for: managing flood risk “Will it avoid flood risk?” 	<p>Noted</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	No representations made.	
February 2015	Preferred Approach to site allocations: Green Belt Review Consultation	No representations made.	
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> <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</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>not exclusive to human health matters”.</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> <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> <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</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Following this response Broxtowe Borough Council consulted with the Environment Agency to address the concerns that they had.</p>

		<p>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 ‘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</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>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>	Policy 1 addresses this point.
		<p>Possible new policy: Green Infrastructure The policy should make specific reference to “blue infrastructure i.e.</p>	Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets.

		watercourse networks (including rivers, streams, canals, ditches and drains)” throughout the borough.	Whilst ‘blue infrastructure’ isn’t specifically referenced using those terms the Justification text 28.1 for this policy says that; <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 cities”</i>
		SA scoping report Three specified documents are recommended to be added to the schedule of relevant plans, policies and programmes. The SFRA “could be considered to be out of date” and the EA “recommend that the document is reviewed and updated”.	
November 2015	Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation	No representations made.	
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation	No representations made.	
February 2017	Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation	No preference on which site is developed – no difference in terms of environmental constraints. 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.	Noted

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. 	Site not to be allocated
		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 	Addressed in allocation with no objection for Historic England
		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. 	Site not to be allocated
		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. 	Matters considered through the development management process.
		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.	Site not to be allocated
		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. 	Site not to be allocated
		413 – Mansfield Road Nether Green <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Setting of Grade II Listed Eastwood Hall will need to be considered. 	Site not to be allocated
		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 	Matters considered through the development management process

		<p>is sympathetic to designation reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have we explored alternatives including employment use? • Lower residential density might be more appropriate given significance of asset. 	
		<p>508 – Hilltop House Nottingham Road Eastwood</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider impact of development on adjacent Grade II Listed memorial. 	Development management issues
		<p>514 – Hall Farm Cockerhouse Road Eastwood</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site includes Grade II Listed Hall Farm buildings • 98 dwellings is likely to impact upon the setting of these buildings • Further consideration of these issues is required. 	Site not to be allocated
		<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. 	Matters to be addressed through the development management process
		<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. 	Site not allocated and matters will be addressed through the development management process.
		<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 & SINCE have not been picked up in site constraints. 	Issues addressed through the development management process.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	
	104 – Land off Coventry Lane Bramcote	<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). 	Site not allocated
	150 – Beeston Maltings Dovecote Lane	<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. 	The Maltings buildings were demolished several years ago. Conservation issues will be addressed through the development management process and there is no objection from HE to the allocation in the Local Plan for 56 homes.
	237 – The Boots Company Beeston Site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Setting of Grade I Listed Buildings needs to be considered. 	An outline planning application (14/00515/OUT) has been received and is currently pending albeit this is only in relation to S106 issues which are expected to be resolved by 31 August 2018. Historic England have been consulted throughout and support the principle of the redevelopment of the site.
	258 – Land at Lilac Grove Beeston	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Setting of Grade I Listed Buildings needs to be considered. 	Noted.
	265 – Beeston Police Station		It has been through the development management process

		<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. 	and development is nearing completion.
		298 – Spring Farm Nottingham Road Trowell Moor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on setting heritage assets in Strelley needs to be considered. 	Site not to be allocated
		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. 	Development nearing completion on site and issues were fully considered through the development management process.
		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. 	Site not to be allocated
		412 – Chilwell Lane Bramcote (south of Common Lane) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Setting of adjacent Conservation Area needs to be considered. 	Site not to be allocated
		449 – Beeston Cement Depot Station Road Beeston <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on setting of Listed railway buildings needs be considered. 	Noted
		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. 	Site not to be allocated
		Green Belt <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comment on Green Belt issues other than those for specific sites. 	Noted
		Economic Issues/Job Creation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comment other than those for specific sites. 	Noted
		Climate Change	Noted

		<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. 	
		<p>Town Centres</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See EH's guidance on retailing in settlements 	Policy has no objection from Historic England and various policies in the plan secure the appropriate protection and enhancement of the historic environment.
		<p>Community Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No detailed comment to make at this time 	Noted
		<p>Enhancing the Environment</p> <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. 	Comments have been incorporated in the submission version of the Local Plan.

		<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. 	Noted
		<p>Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No detailed comments at this time. 	Noted
		<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 filled in. • Scoping report appears unfinished. Unclear what measurements are. • SA objective 3 & 7 need to relate to 'social' theme 	All comments have been fully taken on board and rectified.
Autumn 2014	Green Belt Review Framework	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.	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>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>	
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 Opun Design Review. The in-house Conservation Officer also assessed the proposals against their significance.</p>
		Agree with the results of the assessment for zone 6	
		Bramcote/Stapleford:	<p>Following these comments Broxtowe commissioned an independent expert in Historic Environment to assess the</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, 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>	<p>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>
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>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2</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>S9: Security measures</u> 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> 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, 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,</p>	<p>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>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</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>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>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></p> <p>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;...</i></p> <p><i>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></p> <p>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>Policy 23 addresses these points.</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:...</i> <i>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>

			<p><i>1. Make specific provision for sports pitches that are suitable for a wide age range of users, in particular children's sport.</i></p> <p><i>2. Enhance the tourism offer in association with DH Lawrence or the industrial/pharmaceutical heritage of the Borough".</i></p>
		<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 	<p>Matters have been addressed.</p>

		<p>England.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “We are still very concerned that there is no discussion of the baseline data in chapter 4...there is no further discussion of the attributes for the area.” • “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	No representations made.	
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.	The two sites to be allocated have followed full dialogue with historic England with no outstanding objections to their allocation.
February 2017	Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation	It is recommended that the Historic Environment Record be consulted to inform your consideration of the site. Advice from your Conservation Officer and Archeological experts should be sought in respect of the site, and the findings of the Historic Landscape Character Assessment be taken into account.	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.

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	<p>Housing / General Development</p> <p>Welcomes reference to Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment, the 6Cs Growth Point Green Infrastructure Study and the Green Spaces Strategy 2009-2019.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest referencing emerging Broxtowe Green Infrastructure Study. • Soils and agricultural land should also be referenced. 	Noted
		<p>237 – The Boots Company Beeston</p> <p>258 – Land at Lilac Grove Beeston</p> <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. 	<p>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.</p>
		<p>Toton - (133, 254, 259, 403, 132, 407 & 358)</p> <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 	<p>Substantial Green Infrastructure is expected to be delivered on the Strategic Location for Growth at Toton linking to existing surrounding Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>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.</p>

		site.	
		Green Belt <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunities should be taken to link Green Belt into green infrastructure and ecological networks. 	Policy 28 does this.
		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. 	Noted
		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 relay value of GI to help mitigate climate change. 	Noted
		Community Facilities <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>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</p>

			<p>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>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 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 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</i></p>

			<p><i>Infrastructure Asset(s). These Green Infrastructure Assets are:...</i></p> <p><i>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. 	Noted
		<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. However in line with the recent legal judgment further work on this issue is being undertaken and will be complete by September 2018.
		<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. 	Noted

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 networks. Landscape character could be considered when assessing value of the GB and reference should be made to the NCAs.</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 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	<p>Zone 44: Contains two Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) – Bulwell Wood SSSI and Sellers Wood SSSI.</p> <p>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.</p>	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”.	Noted
		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”.	<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>d) Aged or veteran trees; or e) Ancient Woodland;”.</p>
		<p>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.</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 19: Pollution, Hazardous Substances and Ground Conditions which states that;</p> <p><i>“1. Permission will not be granted for development which would result in:...</i> <i>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></p>
		<p>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”.</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 30: Landscape which states that;</p> <p><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 and in Appendix 7 of this Plan”.</i></p>
		<p>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</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 17: Place-making, design and amenity which states that;</p> <p><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></p>

		urban drainage systems”.	<p><i>o) Uses native species of trees, shrubs and wild-flower seeds in landscaping proposals; and</i></p> <p><i>p) Integrates bat and/or bird boxes into the fabric of new buildings”.</i></p>
		<p>Possible new policy: Landscape</p> <p>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”.</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 30: Landscape which states that;</p> <p><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></p>
		<p>Possible new policy: Green Infrastructure</p> <p>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”.</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan justification text 28.2 states that;</p> <p><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></p>
		<p>RC8: New informal open space</p> <p>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”.</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</i></p>

			<p><i>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’.</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>RC15: Long distance trails</p> <p>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;...</i></p> <p><i>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</p> <p>NE “generally supports the scoping report but would like</p>	<p>The National Character Areas have been referenced in the Sustainability Appraisal ‘plans and programs’ sections.</p>

		to have seen reference to the National Character Areas”.	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.
November 2015	Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation	No representations made.	
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation	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.	Noted.
		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 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.	Noted
		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	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>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>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>
February 2017	Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation	<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, including Special Protection Areas (SPA), Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Ramsar sites, SSSIs, National Nature Reserves; • Locally and regionally designated sites for 	<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>geodiversity and biodiversity;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	No representations made.	
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.	Noted
February 2015	Preferred Approach to site allocations: Green Belt Review Consultation	No representations made.	
February 2015	Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation	No representations made.	
November 2015	Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation	No representations made.	
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation	No representations made.	
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.	Noted

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	No representations made.	
Autumn 2014	Green Belt Review Framework	Welcomes joint approach as ensures consistency & have no specific comments to make.	Noted
February 2015	Preferred Approach to site allocations: Green Belt Review Consultation	No representations made.	
February 2015	Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation	No representations made.	
November 2015	Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation	No representations made.	
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation	No representations made.	
February 2017	Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation	No representations made.	

Local Enterprise Partnership

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 representations made.	
Autumn 2014	Green Belt Review Framework	No representations made.	
February 2015	Preferred Approach to site allocations: Green Belt Review Consultation	No representations made.	
February 2015	Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation	No representations made.	
November 2015	Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation	No representations made.	
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation	No representations made.	
February 2017	Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation	No representations made.	

Local Nature Partnership

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 representations made.	
Autumn 2014	Green Belt Review Framework	No representations made.	
February 2015	Preferred Approach to site allocations: Green Belt Review Consultation	No representations made.	
February 2015	Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation	No representations made.	
November 2015	Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation	No representations made.	
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation	No representations made.	
February 2017	Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation	No representations made.	

Neighbourhood Planning group engagement:

Broxtowe Borough Council is committed to Neighbourhood Planning and there are 10 neighbourhood plans under preparation in the Borough.

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			
		17 th September 2014 - Eastwood Neighbourhood Area Designation	
		17 th September 2014 - Greasley Neighbourhood Area Designation	
		17 th September 2014 - Nuthall Neighbourhood Area Designation	
	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></p> <p>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 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></p> <p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>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</p>

		<p>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 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>
		4 th March 2015 - Brinsley Neighbourhood Area Designation
		4 th March 2015 – Stapleford Neighbourhood Area Designation
	<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
12 th October 2015 – Part 2 Local Plan: Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation		<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</p>

		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 onto Bessell lane had been refused due to highways issues at this junction. Further sometime a go 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.
		19 th November 2015 - Kimberley Neighbourhood Area Designation
		1 st December 2015 - Awsworth Neighbourhood Area Designation
	<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
	30 th June & 1 st July 2016 – Princes Trust Beauty in my Backyard Networking event / Workshop	
		3 rd August 2016 - Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum and Area Designation
19 th July 2016 - Natural Environment, Open Space and Climate Change Workshop		<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)
22 nd July 2016 - Green Belt and Countryside Issues Workshop		<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
25 th July 2016 - Design and Heritage Workshop		<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)
27 th July 2016 - Employment and Retail Workshop		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 Members of Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum
29 th July 2016 - Housing and Community Facilities Workshop		<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
22 nd August 2016 - Part 2 Local Plan: Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation		<p>Bramcote:</p> <p>Awsworth Parish Council: 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><u>Chetwynd:</u> <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><u>Nuthall:</u> <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)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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)
13 th February 2017 – Part 2 Local Plan: Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation	<p><u>Brinsley Parish Council:</u> 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>Greasley Parish Council:</u> 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.</p> <p>JUS-t (Jacksdale, Underwood, Selston tomorrow) Neighbourhood Planning Group (not preparing plan in Broxtowe)</p>
	9 th March 2017 - Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum and Area Designation

Appendix 2

Whole Plan:

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
9 - The Canal & River Trust	They “do not have any comments to make on the Plan”.	None suggested.	Noted.	
59 – Ashfield District Council	Ashfield District Council have worked with Broxtowe Borough Council to ensure that strategic priorities for the wider area are reflected in the council’s respective Local Plans. No issues have been identified in the Part 2 Local Plan in relation to Ashfield.	None suggested.	Noted.	
62 - Gedling Borough Council	<p>Gedling consider that Broxtowe has fulfilled its obligations under the Duty to Co-operate. The evidence shows the allocations are more than sufficient to meet the ACS housing requirement.</p> <p>Gedling are not raising any strategic planning concerns, however once the site selection document is available they would appreciate the opportunity to consider and if necessary make further comments at submission stage.</p>	None suggested.	Noted.	
63 - Nottingham City Council	Has no objections to the Plan’s site allocations or development management policies.	None suggested.	Noted.	
187 - The Forestry Commission	Provides background information and advises that it “is not in a position to input in detail into the consultation process for Local Plans”.	None suggested.	Noted.	
253 - National Grid	It “has no comments”.	None suggested.	Noted.	
4200 - Taylor & Burrows	The Councils LDS suggests that the plan will be adopted in Autumn 2018; therefore the first full year of	The Plan should be withdrawn and	Disagree. This is Part 2 of a 2	

Property (Represented by Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd)	the plan will be 2019/20 and will be in effect until 2028. Therefore, even assuming there is no slippage in timescales the Plan will only have a lifetime for 9 years (and not the minimum of 10 required). The short life of the Plan does not provide a positive strategy for the future and avoids challenging decisions regarding Green Belt release.	reconsidered to provide a minimum of 10 years and preferably a clear 15-year vision post adoption. The Plan should have an end date of 2033/35.	Part Plan with the Aligned Core Strategy (ACS) already setting an end date of 2028. The ACS review will extend the plan period to at least 15 years.
6809	Fully support the Local Plan.	None suggested.	Noted.
3858	Plan Legally compliant and sound	None suggested.	Noted.
4193 - (represented by Planning and Design Group)	Plan overall is sound as it supports provision of new homes through allocation and provides market confidence which boosts the supply of new homes delivered.		Noted.
3305 - Bartons Plc	Content with the Part 2 Local Plan and consider that the policies do not artificially constrain delivery of housing sites. Confident that their housing commitment can be brought forward very soon.	None suggested.	Noted.
6859 - Ministry of Defence, Defence Infrastructure Organisation	Has no objection to proposals for future development within the Borough of Broxtowe.	None suggested.	Noted.

Policy 1: Flood Risk

ID	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
4	Environment Agency	“Welcomes and supports” the policy. However suggests alternative/additional wording for part of the policy and the associated justification text, regarding “equivalent quality” flood defences and finished floor levels.	See previous column.	Agreed. The alternative/additional wording is proposed to be incorporated.	No significant implications.
6279	Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum	Supports the policy.	None.	Noted.	
6577	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum	Proposes additions to the justification text to refer specifically to the Erewash Valley at Toton Sidings and to encourage solar panels and rain water harvesting systems.	See previous column.	Disagree. It would not be appropriate to highlight particular locations, as the policy relates to the whole borough; and the proposed additions would be too detailed.	
222	Severn Trent	Has provided some “general guidelines” which relate indirectly to the policy.	None.	Noted.	
6053	British Land Company (represented by WYG)	Should be amended to make clear that ‘minor development’ is excluded from the sequential or exception tests.	See previous column.	Disagree. The policy is as agreed with the Environment Agency (subject to the point above); and sufficient guidance on the issue is in the NPPF and PPG.	

Policy 2: Site Allocations

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
Housing Delivery, Trajectory and Land Supply (including 5 year land supply)				
119 - Home Builders Federation	<p>The housing trajectory shows a housing land supply of 6747 dwellings against a requirement of 6,150. Since the adopted requirement is a minimum figure it should not be treated as a maximum to restrict housing sites and prevent sustainable development from coming forward.</p> <p>It is noted that the Council has applied an 8% non-implementation allowance with the 5 years supply but it is unclear whether this has been applied to the overall housing land supply. Broxtowe needs to provide a level of flexibility within the housing land supply for non-implementation / lapse rates. The House Builders Federation do not consider that 597 (9.7%) will provide sufficient flexibility and is below the recommendations of DCLG.</p>		<p>Agree in principle.</p> <p>The Council recognise that the Aligned Core Strategy Requirement is not a maximum figure and have not restricted sustainable housing development in order to only meet this figure. This is demonstrated by the number of dwellings that are committed and allocated above the adopted requirement.</p> <p>The 20% buffer as required by the paragraph 47 of the NPPF relates solely to the 5 year land supply where the sites are 'moved forwards from later in the plan period'. This does not relate to the supply as a whole.</p> <p>The Council notes that the HBF consider that the housing supply should be higher still. However the existing supply is considered to be realistic, deliverable and provide sufficient flexibility in a wide range of site choices within the plan period.</p>	No change.
6881 - (represented by Featherstones)	There should be flexibility equivalent to 20% of the total housing requirement.	Council should consider removing more sites from the Green Belt and	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>See response to the Home Builders Federation (above).</p>	

<p>2542 - (represented by Featherstones)</p>	<p>allocating them for development.</p>		
<p>4622 - (represented by Featherstones)</p>			
<p>2652 - W Westerman (represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd)</p>	<p>Broxtowe should include a suitable lapse rate and a 20% reserve site allowance. This would mean that Broxtowe should be planning for around 7380 dwellings as opposed to the minimum requirement of 6250 dwellings.</p>		
<p>2685 - Bloor Homes Ltd (represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd)</p>			
<p>6512 - Peveril Homes and UKPP (Toton) (represented by WYG)</p>	<p>The housing trajectory (Table 4) show that housing delivery is low for the first 6 years of the plan period have amounted to 50% of the Core Strategy housing requirement demonstrating significant slippage. The consultation document forecasts annual delivery of over 1,000 dwellings per annum against an average delivery rate of 137 per year thus far, demonstrating that the Part 2 Local plan needs to adopt a flexible approach to ensure delivery is achieved.</p>		<p>Agree in principle. Delivery between 2011 & 2018 has been lower than expected. However, delivery has picked up considerably in the last few years and is expected to continue to do so. A major constraint on delivery thus far has been a lack of available sites which is being rectified by this plan. The significant increase in anticipated future delivery is a result of the allocation of a number of large sites including from the Green Belt across the entire borough. The Council considers that a flexible approach has been taken with a range of</p> <p>None.</p>

			different size sites, a mix of Green Field and Brownfield and a spread distribution across a range of different areas.	
6512 - Peveril Homes and UKPP (Toton) (represented by WYG)	The supply shown in Table 4 aggregates site delivery in to broad locations and without more detail of delivery on specific sites.	Amend the Trajectory to show anticipated delivery on specific site allocations.	Agree. The housing Trajectory has been amended to include a breakdown of delivery on the specific allocated sites.	Technical amendment, none.
6512 - Peveril Homes and UKPP (Toton) (represented by WYG)	The housing trajectory claims that the Council can achieve 6,747 dwellings against an overall target of 6,150 (surplus of just under 600 dwellings). This provides very little room for non-delivery of allocated sites and does not take account of the level of lapse rates which are typically seen for housing sites. The plan does not allocate enough land for housing and should promote the quick release of allocations and commitments.	Allocate more land for housing at Toton.	Disagree.	
3756 - Gladman Development Ltd.	The Plan should distribute housing to a range of sites (mix of size and market locations) to support the strategy and should not be over reliant on SUE sites.	Include additional non-strategic allocations.	Agree in principle. The plan includes a range of size allocations from 10 dwellings to 500+ covering a distribution across the entire borough. There is not considered to be an over-reliance on Sustainable Urban Extensions.	No change.
4193 - (represented by Planning and Design Group)	The land supply should also be refined in order to reflect a wider range of achievable, suitable and deliverable sites to provide more market flexibility and choice.			
6879 - (represented by SSA Planning Limited)	The borough lacks a 5-year land supply and relies on large sites for delivery.	Council should be removing an additional site from the Green Belt and allocating it for development:	Disagree. See response above. Notwithstanding this, the promoted Green Belt site is only promoted for	

		Land at Bramcote.	5 dwellings which would not make a significant contribution to the 5 year land supply in any event.
634 - (represented by Asbury Planning Ltd)	The SHLAA has double counted the allocations in the plan and therefore the shortfall is higher than what is being reported.	Council should remove further land from the Green Belt and allocate it for development including; Land at Alma Hill, Kimberley	Disagree. The SHLAA has not double counted the allocations in the plan.
	Provision should also be made for under or non-delivery of allocated sites based on past delivery and likely delays (including the relocation and remediation of the Council Depot).		Disagree. See response to HBF (above) re: in-built flexibility in supply and site specific response. Additional Green Belt releases are not needed and would not meet the 'exceptional circumstances' test
	The trajectory shows expected delivery of over 1000 per annum. This is unrealistic and relies on major allocations securing permission and building on site by 2020.		Disagree. See response to Peveril Homes and UKPP (Toton) (above).
1436 - (represented by iba Planning)	There has been double counting in the SHLAA with regards to delivery of the sites and then their allocation.	Make additional allocations including; Land north of 38 Alma Hill, Kimberley or at the very least remove it from the Green Belt and safeguard it for future development.	Disagree. See response to Asbury Planning (above).
	The Councils approach to the Green Belt has been to under-allocate in order to limit the amount of land released. The Council should be amending the Green Belt boundary to meet long term needs beyond the plan period and to ensure there is flexibility in the supply.		Agree in principle. No change. The Council has done this. See response to HBF (above) re: flexibility and see site selection document. Additional Green Belt releases are not needed and would not meet the 'exceptional circumstances' test
6880 - Davidsons Developments Ltd. (Represented by	The Councils housing requirement is a minimum figure and should not be treated as a ceiling to restrict housing development. The contingency is below the recommendations of DCLG of 10-	Additional land must be allocated to ensure sufficient flexibility in the supply and that a rolling supply can be	Agree in principle. No change. See response to HBF (above) re supply and flexibility. Additional Green Belt releases are not needed and would not meet the

Pegasus Group)	10% and therefore is unlikely to give the flexibility required.	maintained. Including: land at New Farm Lane, Nuthall.	'exceptional circumstances' test.
4200 - Taylor & Burrows Property (Represented by Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd)	Housing Trajectory: Build out rate is unrealistic. 'Pay back' won't be until 20/21. Concern is raised regarding the deliverability of some of the sites.		Disagree. See response to Peveril Homes and UKPP (Toton) (above).
	SHMA: Housing projections used in evidence base are out-of-date.		Disagree. The housing projections were used in the evidence for setting the requirement in the ACS. This Plan is exceeding that requirement. The projections have also been ratified against the updated 2014 projections from the census which have since been used in the standard methodology for the draft housing need test.
5 Year Housing Land Supply:			
119 - Home Builders Federation	<p>The HBF agrees with the Council's use of the 'Sedgefield' approach to 'shortfalls' with a 20% 'buffer'. However the HBF disagrees with the Council not applying the 'buffer' to the 'shortfall'.</p> <p>The Council needs to demonstrate a 5 years housing land supply on adoption of the Plan which should be maintained throughout the plan period.</p> <p>The HBF considers that the small site windfall allowance of 195 dwellings in the five-year housing land supply is too high and that the windfall should only be applied in the latter years of the 5 years</p>		<p>Disagree. The Council considers that the methodology used for applying the buffer is appropriate.</p> <p>It is considered appropriate (and consistent with the NPPF) to include a windfall allowance. Local evidence shows that small windfall sites consistently come forward for development. Indeed because the SHLAA is so detailed (down to single dwellings) there has been the ability to assess all windfalls as those not included in the previous SHLAA (i.e. weren't known about</p>

	supply to prevent double counting.		last year), this figure is significantly higher than the conservative figure being used by the Council.	
3756 - Gladman Development Ltd.	The Council must ensure that it is able to demonstrate a 5 year rolling housing land supply. Where housing does not come forward as expected the Plan should allow for flexibility to ensure the land supply is maintained.	Include a trigger mechanism to ensure remedial action if monitoring indicates that the Plan is not meeting the housing need.	Agree in principle. However, it is not considered that a trigger mechanism for additional sites would be appropriate as additional flexibility in the supply is already built in. The Aligned Core Strategy Review is due to commence and this will re-assess the requirements and distribution of supply across the HMA.	No change. Will include an aligned SA.
3756 - Gladman Development Ltd.	Broxtowe should include a 20% buffer to take account of previous under delivery and shortfall should be included within the 5 years.		Noted. This is already used as the method for calculating the 5 year supply i.e. a 20% buffer and the Sedgefield approach to the shortfall. No change required.	
3756 - Gladman Development Ltd.	The current approach taken to the buffer is inappropriate as it should also be applied to the shortfall.		Disagree. See response to the Home Builders Federation (above).	
6512 - Peveril Homes and UKPP (Toton) (represented by WYG)	Even if delivery did happen at the rate anticipated then the council only has 5.02 years supply for 2017-22 which is marginal (surplus of 11 dwellings) and does not allow for any slippage or flexibility for the remainder of the plan period. The current approach in the plan is not considered to amount to a sufficiently robust position to ensure the housing needs of the Borough can be met within the current plan period, and	Allocate more land for housing at Toton.	Disagree. The Council has taken a realistic approach to the 5 years supply including removal all sites without extant or pending planning permission, adding a 20% buffer, including a discount rate and using the Sedgefield Approach to the shortfall. This builds in flexibility to the supply.	

	increasing the flexibility of the allocation at Toton will ensure more housing can be delivered in this highly sustainable and deliverable location without further Green Belt release.			
4193 - (represented by Planning and Design Group)	The Council can only currently demonstrate a 3.6 year housing land supply and has a delivery shortfall of 956 dwellings therefore further allocations area needed.		Agree in principle. The 5-year land supply (as quoted) does not include housing delivery on any of the allocations that require Green Belt release which have emerged through the part 2 Local Plan. These allocations will ensure that the Council has a 5 year land supply.	No change.
2652 - W Westerman (represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd) 2685 - Bloor Homes Ltd (represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd)	The Plan does not set out how the 5 year supply has been calculated and it is unclear if the Council can demonstrate a 5 year supply of land.	Include a 5 year land supply calculation to demonstrate that on adoption of the plan there will be a 5 year land supply (or allocate more sites to address the issue if needed).	Disagree The 5-year land supply calculations are set out in the SHLAA. The Council has been open with regards to its lack of a 5 year land supply without the release of additional Green Belt sites however on adoption of the plan the Council will have a 5 year supply.	
2652 - W Westerman (represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd) 2685 - Bloor Homes Ltd (represented by Oxalis Planning	Local Planning authorities should plan positively to ensure the delivery of the area's 'minimum' housing requirements and to ensure they have a 5 years housing land supply.	Broxtowe need to undertake a critical review of the ability of particular sites to deliver new homes.	Agree. The Council has done this. See SHLAA and site schedule document including delivery templates.	No change.

<p>Ltd)</p> <p>718 - J McCann& Co (Nottingham) Ltd (represented by Planning and Design Group)</p>	<p>The current deficit in housing land and delivery in Broxtowe as shown in the SHLAA makes the need for allocating housing sites more pressing and the allocation to the west of Coventry Lane will directly support the delivery of housing.</p>	<p>Adoption of the Part 2 Local Plan will subsequently boost the supply of much needed housing in Broxtowe.</p>	<p>Agree. See the response to W Westerman and Bloor Homes (above).</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>6881 - (represented by Featherstones)</p> <p>2542 - (represented by Featherstones)</p> <p>4622 - (represented by Featherstones)</p>	<p>Additional Housing Sites need to be identified to ensure there is an appropriate 5 year supply.</p>	<p>Council should consider removing more sites from the Green Belt and allocating them for development.</p>	<p>Disagree. See the response to W Westerman and Bloor Homes (above).</p>	
<p>6980 - (represented by GraceMachin Planning & Property)</p>	<p>Concern regarding the 5-year land supply and lack of flexibility within the plan to ensure housing delivery with the suggestion that additional sites are required.</p>		<p>Noted. See the response to W Westerman and Bloor Homes (above).</p>	
<p>119 - Home Builders Federation</p>	<p>The HBF do not comment on the merits or otherwise of individual sites but notes that the Council assumes that all of the allocation's in the Plan will be found sound.</p> <p>It is important that the Councils assumptions on lead-in times, lapse delivery rates for sites are realistic. These assumptions should be supported by parties responsible for delivery of</p>	<p>Further site allocations are required, <i>"to provide a greater overall housing land supply contingency and a five-year housing land supply on adoption of the Plan"</i>.</p> <p>It also says that the Council should</p>	<p>Agree in principle. The Councils lead-in times and lapse and build out rates are considered to be realistic and have been subject to detailed dialogue with the development industry. These have been checked with the house building industry through various workshops. The lapse rate is based on past evidence. Delivery rates are the result of on-going</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	housing sites and sense checked by the Council using historical data and local knowledge.	consider “ <i>the allocation of deliverable reserve sites with an appropriate release mechanism</i> ”.	proactive discussions with site owners and developers. The Council do not consider that further site allocations are required and indeed any further allocations would be within the Green Belt where the assumption has been taken that (other than the included allocations where discussions have been on-going for a number of years) any additional Green Belt release sites are unlikely to provide any significant positive contribution to the 5 year land supply due additional consultation that would be required, further site investigation and development lead-in times.
3756 - Gladman Development Ltd.	The Council should assume delivery rates of approximately 30 dwellings per annum per site per developer.		Disagree. See response to HBF (above).
634 - The Wilds (represented by Aspbury Planning Ltd)	The Council does not have a 5-year land supply. There is an over-reliance on large unconsented sites and additional small/medium sites need to be identified.	Council should remove further land from the Green Belt and allocate it for development including; Land at Alma Hill, Kimberley	Disagree. See response to HBF (above).
4200 - Taylor & Burrows Property (Represented by Phoenix Planning (UK)	SHLAA: Should have been updated prior to consultation. No 5-year land supply. Concern is raised regarding the deliverability of some sites which should be removed from the land supply.		Noted. The SHLAA has been updated to 17/18.

Ltd)			
6880 - Davidsons Developments Ltd. (Represented by Pegasus Group)	The Council does not have a 5 years housing land supply and it has deteriorated since 2016.	Additional land must be allocated to ensure sufficient flexibility in the supply and that a rolling supply can be maintained. Including: land at New Farm Lane, Nuthall.	Disagree. The 5-year land supply position has improved 3.6 years to 3.9 years (March 2018).
	The supply will be even lower when the Council applies the 20% buffer to the shortfall as well as the requirement.		Disagree. See response to the Home Builders Federation (above).
	The Council should be able to demonstrate that the 5 year land supply is maintainable throughout the plan period.		Agree. Supported by the SA.
Delivery / Flexibility			
6881 - (represented by Featherstones)	The plan fails to demonstrate how delivery of allocated sites will be guaranteed.	Increase the number of new homes being planned for and subsequently allocate additional sites.	Disagree. See response to HBF (above).
2542 - (represented by Featherstones)	There is insufficient flexibility to respond to failure of delivery and there is no mechanism for the release of developable 'reserve sites'.		
4622 - (represented by Featherstones)	The Housing Trajectory confirms a significant housing supply shortfall and a persistent history of under delivery.	Council should consider removing more sites from the Green Belt and allocating them for development.	Noted. See response to HBF (above).
	The Council is relying on a number of allocations and commitments from previous plans where delivery is uncertain due to the sites not having come forward thus far.		Disagree. See response to HBF (above).
2652 - W Westerman (represented by Oxalis Planning	The need for flexibility or the identification of 'reserve sites' is particularly pertinent to Broxtowe given its historical under delivery and the		Noted. Strategic sites were included in the ACS, there was only one strategic site removed from the Green Belt

Ltd) 2685 - Bloor Homes Ltd (represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd)	uncertainty surrounding key strategic sites.		and this is under the control of W Westerman.
	Broxtowe is relying on a number of complex sites where the certainty of delivery is low and therefore there is not the prospect that the minimum housing numbers will be achieved.		Disagree. See response to HBF (above).
	The Council is relying on a number of allocations and commitments from previous plans where delivery is uncertain due to the sites not having come forward thus far.		Disagree. See SHLAA and site selection document.
634 - (represented by Aspbury Planning Ltd)	Concern about the over-reliance on commitments, expired consents, old Local Plan allocations and unallocated sites.	Make additional allocations including; Land at Alma Hill, Kimberley	Disagree. See response to W Westerman and Bloor Homes (above).
2418 – (represented by Beech Architects) 4738	The Council has incorrectly interpreted or has ignored the evidence in relation to the choice of housing site allocation in Kimberley.	The Council should ensure that the 600 homes required at Kimberley are delivered.	Disagree. See site selection document.
	The Core Strategy allocated the site for development but the Council have since changed the line of the Green Belt to exclude this site from being developed		Disagree. The Core Strategy did not allocate any sites for development in Kimberley, as with all of the Key Settlements this was a matter for the Part 2 Local Plan (this plan).
	The Green Belt boundary amendment in Kimberley is not defensible and restricts the size of the site so that the housing delivery will fall short of the Core Strategy requirement.	The amended Green Belt boundary (in Kimberley) should follow the line of the A610 and include land at; Ashfield, High Street and High Street, Kimberley.	Disagree. The disused railway embankment and the A160 are considered to be defensible boundaries.
	The removal of Kettlebrook Lodge should		See response to HBF (above) re housing requirement. Noted.

	not form part of the allocation.		Kettlebrook Lodge is not included in the allocation. No change to the policy is required.
Housing Distribution:			
6279 - Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum	Table 4 (Housing Trajectory) shows that Bramcote will house more than 440 of the 2729 houses for the main built up area of Broxtowe meaning its taking 16% of the housing need whilst the Council is allowing low density development or none at all elsewhere.	None Suggested.	Noted. Bramcote forms part of the Main Built up Area of Nottingham where the distribution for the housing requirement as set in the adopted Aligned Core Strategy and is set as a minimum figure. The Main Built up Area of Nottingham is correctly identified as the most sustainable location for development and therefore the housing requirement in this area is higher than the rest of the borough.
634 - (represented by Aspbury Planning Ltd)	Concern about the amended distribution to the Key Settlements (including Kimberley).	Make additional allocations including; Land at Alma Hill, Kimberley	Noted. See response to HBF (above).
1436 - (represented by iba Planning)	Housing distribution (specifically in relation to Kimberley) is not supported. Insufficient allocations have been made in Kimberley to meet the 'up to' figure set out in the Aligned Core Strategy.	Make additional allocations including; Land north of 38 Alma Hill, Kimberley	
Site Selection / All Allocations			
16 - The Coal Authority	All site allocations should have been considered against relevant Development Risk and Surface Coal Resource Plans. All relevant constraints and considerations in respect of coal mining legacy and surface coal resource issues should have been identified at the initial stage when the sites were being		Noted. All known constraints have been considered in the site selection work.

	considered for allocation in order to ensure that potential risks have been identified.			
48 Sport England	The plan lacks justification or relevant consideration to whether any of the sites contains existing sports facilities such as playing fields which justify protection. Where sites contain pitches and the evidence base highlights deficiency in provision there is conflict within the policies.	The extent of development should account for the need to maintain sports facilities and site policies should require the facilities to be protected or replaced.	Agree in principle. Consideration has been given to the potential loss of sports pitches however in accordance with the Playing Pitch Strategy this has been mitigated where a loss occurs. See site specific comments for more detail.	No change.
119 - Home Builders Federation	<p>The HBF do not comment on the merits or otherwise of individual sites but notes that the Council assumes that all of the allocation's in the Plan will be found sound.</p> <p>It is important that the Councils assumptions on lead-in times, lapse delivery rates for sites are realistic. These assumptions should be supported by parties responsible for delivery of housing sites and sense checked by the Council using historical data and local knowledge.</p>	<p>Further site allocations are required, <i>"to provide a greater overall housing land supply contingency and a five-year housing land supply on adoption of the Plan"</i>.</p> <p>It also says that the Council should consider <i>"the allocation of deliverable reserve sites with an appropriate release mechanism"</i>.</p>	Disagree regarding additional sites. The Council has tested its assumptions both with the industry as a whole but also with the site owners/promoters in more detail and including in regards to identified site specific constraints. The Council has sense-checked the responses from all land owners and has used historic evidence and local knowledge to ensure that site delivery is realistic and achievable, and no further sites are therefore required.	
Broxtowe Labour Group	"Broadly welcome" the site allocations but "have some concerns" that there will be "significant pressures on both community and transport infrastructure", including the A6005 and roads at Awsworth and Chilwell.		<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council has worked hard to engage with the respective communities, many of which are producing Neighbourhood Plans for their areas.</p> <p>Please see site specific responses re: transport.</p>	

34 - Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Concern about whether the scale of growth proposed during the plan period is necessary or sustainable. Generally supportive of the spatial strategy however concerned about the scale of some of the allocations (albeit it is recognised that the allocations include provision for things other than buildings and that the 'red line' plan does not denote that the entire area will be built up).		<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Part 2 Local Plan sets to meet the development requirements set out in the Aligned Core Strategy in terms of the scale of growth during the plan period.</p> <p>As recognised the red line plan does not denote solely the developable area as other infrastructure and facilities need to be provided within these sites. It is however considered important to include the whole area within the red line in order to achieve a comprehensive and cohesive development.</p>
6279 - Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum	The Council has not maximised to the greatest possible extent the supply of sites in existing urban areas.	None suggested.	Disagree. The Council has followed the search sequence as set out in the Core Strategy Policy 3 which was ratified through the High Court Challenge.
6279 - Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum	Urban and the Main built up Area is considered by the Council to be the most sustainable locations however, site allocations are being made in the Green Belt instead.		<p>All suitable, developable and deliverable sites within the existing urban areas have been counted towards the supply.</p> <p>Following this the next step in the sequence is to look adjacent to the urban areas and in Broxtowe's case that is inevitably within the Green Belt due to the tightly drawn Green Belt boundaries.</p> <p>The Main Built up Area (which includes Bramcote) is considered to</p>

			be the most sustainable area and hence the distribution was set in the Core Strategy as a minimum requirement.	
6279 - Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum	Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated for development in the Green Belt (specifically in Bramcote).		Disagree. Please see site selection document.	
718 - J McCann& Co (Nottingham) Ltd (represented by Planning and Design Group)	Policy 2 directly supports provision of new homes through allocation and provides market confidence which boosts the supply of new homes delivered. The rapid adoption of the Part 2 Local Plan will subsequently boost the supply of much needed housing in Broxtowe.	None suggested.	Noted.	
		Make amendments as detailed in Policies 15, 17 and 32.	Agree. The Council wants to avoid unnecessary delay to the adoption of the Plan. Please see policy specific response re: policy amendments.	The SA assumes timely making of the local plan.
1436 - (represented by iba Planning)	Site selection process is flawed because site being promoted was not considered in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and therefore the approach is not transparent or robust.	Make additional allocations including; Land north of 38 Alma Hill, Kimberley	No further allocations needed. See site selection document for details. The LVIA assessed all of the landscape surrounding the urban settlements in the borough. It was then refined around the sites which were recommended through the Green Belt review.	
Main Built up Area				
2542 - (represented by Featherstones)	The plan fails to demonstrate how delivery of allocated sites will be guaranteed.	Council should consider removing more sites from the Green Belt and allocating them for development.	Disagree. See response to HBF and site selection document.	
4622 - (represented by Featherstones)	There is insufficient flexibility to respond to failure of delivery and there is no mechanism for the release of developable 'reserve sites'.	Including; • land off Sisley	The Council believes that delivery of the site is achievable at the time envisaged. It is not considered necessary to allocate any additional land for development.	
6881 -				

(represented by Featherstones)		<p>Avenue, Stapleford;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land off Baulk Lane, Stapleford; • North West Hill Top Stapleford; and • Hill Top Farm Stapleford. 	
2652 - W Westerman (represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd)	Local Planning authorities should plan positively to ensure the delivery of the area's 'minimum' housing requirements and to ensure they have a 5 years housing land supply.	Broxtowe need to undertake a critical review of the ability of particular sites to deliver new homes.	Noted. The Council has done this, see SHLAA and site selection document.
2685 - Bloor Homes Ltd (represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd)	The Housing Trajectory shows a significant housing supply shortfall and a persistent history of under delivery.	Increase the number of new homes being planned for and	It is not considered necessary to allocate any additional land for development.
	The need for flexibility or the identification of 'reserve sites' is particularly pertinent to Broxtowe given its historical under delivery and the uncertainty surrounding key strategic sites.	subsequently allocate additional sites. Council should consider removing more sites from the Green Belt and allocating them for development.	Strategic sites were included in the ACS, there was only one strategic site and this is under the control of W Westerman
	Broxtowe is relying on a number of complex sites where the certainty of delivery is low and therefore there is not the prospect that the minimum housing numbers will be achieved.	Including; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Low Wood Road in Nuthall; • Land at Mansfield Road, Eastwood' and; 	

• Additional land at Toton			
718 - J McCann& Co (Nottingham) Ltd (represented by Planning and Design Group)	The 14 housing sites allocated in the Main Built up Area are delivering a total of 2,729 dwellings. This reflects an effective and significant 72% contribution towards the 3,800 Main Built up Area target required.	None suggested.	Agree. No change required.
720	Policy requirements are too vague and need more detail. The statements have no evidenced based judgements.	Difficult to suggest specific modifications.	Noted. Where specific comments have been made through this consultation these have (where possible/necessary) been incorporated into the Key Development Requirements in order to refine the policy and remove ambiguity as to what is expected from development.
64 Derbyshire County Council	Expresses concern that site allocations in Policy 3 at Chilwell, Toton and Stapleford “could potentially have significant effects upon roads in Derbyshire” and therefore “early engagement with the East Midlands Modelling Group would be advisable”.		Noted. The council is currently engaging with the East Midlands Gateway Modelling group and work is on-going.
718 - J McCann& Co (Nottingham) Ltd (represented by Planning and Design Group)	The 14 housing sites allocated in the Main Built up Area are delivering a total of 2,729 dwellings. This reflects an effective and significant 72% contribution towards the 3,800 Main Built up Area target required.	None suggested.	Noted.
4200 - Taylor & Burrows Property (Represented by	Object to the reduction in housing requirement in Eastwood and the increase in the Main Built up Area. Concern is raised regarding the	Allocate additional housing sites in Eastwood	Disagree. This is in line with the spatial strategy as set out in the adopted Core Strategy. Potential S106

Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd)	deliverability of the sites proposed for allocation in the Main Built up Area based on site specific constraints. Over-reliance on higher housing market areas which means that more deprived areas do not benefit from the S106 money that development will bring.		contributions (or lack thereof) do not influence the sustainability credentials of development in specific locations as they are required in all locations to make the development acceptable in planning terms. Notwithstanding this, contributions are often lower in low value areas because of viability issues.
	There are two sites in the SHLAA which may not be delivered within the Plan period due to site specific constraints. Works at Bailey Street Stapleford, and Wadsworth Road Stapleford		Noted. The number of dwellings assumed for delivery at this Bailey Street has been reduced in the 17/18 SHLAA in line with the current planning application. Wadsworth Road has been removed following further discussions with the landowner; this is reflected in the land supply position.
All Brinsley allocations			
4200 - Taylor & Burrows Property (Represented by Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd)	Brinsley is not a sustainable location and constraints on site raise concern regarding delivery.	Alternative sites in Eastwood should be allocated instead.	Disagree. Notwithstanding that even if Brinsley were to take a lower figure the re-distribution would be directed towards the Main Built up Area where the requirement is set as a minimum and would not be off-set to Eastwood.
All Eastwood Allocations			
4200 - Taylor & Burrows Property (Represented by	There is under provision in Eastwood as the ACS figures are not being met. Object to the substantial reduction in housing requirement in Eastwood and	Promoting an alternative greenfield housing site in Eastwood which is not	Disagree. Policy 2 of the ACS set a figure of 'up to' 1,250 at Eastwood with the requirement for the Main Built up

Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd)	the increase in the Main Built up Area.	included as an allocation in the Local Plan.	Area being a minimum figure as it is the most sustainable location in the Borough.
	Eastwood is a sustainable location in need of regeneration and growth of affordable and market housing therefore it is essential that Eastwood maintains a continual supply of housing.	Release Green Field sites to meet the identified needs.	It is not considered appropriate to allocate Green Belt sites in Eastwood in advance of other sites coming forward for development, as this would not meet the 'exceptional circumstances' required.
	Concern is raised regarding the deliverability of the sites in Eastwood and the Main Built up Area. Viability in Eastwood is affected by the low market value but would be improved if greenfield sites were allocated. Over-reliance on higher housing market areas which means that more deprived areas do not benefit from the S106 money that development will bring.	Council should consider removing more Green Field sites from the Green Belt and allocating them for development, including; Wade Printers	It is not considered necessary to allocate any additional land for development. See 17/18 SHLAA for update on urban sites.
	Concern is raised towards the delivery of some of the urban sites within Eastwood as identified in the SHLAA, including; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hilltop House; • Dovecote Bar and Grill; • Beamlight; • 95 South Street 		
6980 - (represented by GraceMachin Planning & Property)	There is under provision in Eastwood and the Core Strategy requirement is not being met.	Promoting an alternative housing site in Eastwood which is not included as an allocation in the Local Plan.	Disagree. The overall housing requirement for the borough is being met (indeed it is being exceeded). Specifically for Eastwood the housing distribution in the Core Strategy was set out as an 'up to' figure and not a minimum (as was the Main Built up Area).
4731 –	Object to the inclusion of Chewton Street	None suggested.	Chewton Street is not included as a

	as a housing site in the Neighbourhood Plan.		housing allocation in the Part 2 Local Plan. No change is required.
All Kimberley Allocations			
4200 - Taylor & Burrows Property (Represented by Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd)	Concern is raised regarding the deliverability of the sites in Kimberley.	Alternative sites in Eastwood should be allocated instead.	Disagree. The Spatial Strategy as set out in the adopted Core Strategy distributes up to 600 homes in Kimberley and the sites are considered to be deliverable (see site selection document). Notwithstanding that even if delivery at the Kimberley sites was not achieved at the rate expected the re-distribution would be directed towards the Main Built up Area where the requirement is set as a minimum and would not be off-set to Eastwood.
6883	Site allocations in Kimberley are all located on the west off Eastwood Road which is already busy. Have cumulative traffic and parking issues been taken into account during the allocation process. Concerned that the volume of proposed development will significantly contribute to local traffic problems.	Consider the cumulative impact of traffic and parking on the western side of Kimberley and subsequent review of planned housing numbers.	Noted. A cumulative traffic assessment was undertaken for the settlement for the Aligned Core Strategy. The County Council (as the local highways authority) have also been consulted at all stages of the Local Plan process (including this consultation) and have raised no concerns.
6973	Object to the allocation of any site within 20 miles of Kimberley due to current over capacity.	Don't allocate any sites for housing within the borough.	
4193 - (represented by Planning and	Three housing sites area allocated for Kimberley delivering 167 houses which is a modest 27% of the 600 dwellings	Allocate additional land south of 121 Kimberley Road,	Noted. See site selection document and the SHLAA.

Design Group)	<p>required by the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Kimberley (including Nuthall) is a suitable location for growth but the identified supply of housing in the area is considered unsound as it fails to meet the housing needs for the area.</p>	Nuthall.	
	<p>Whilst the exceptional circumstances to justify Green Belt amendments are considered acceptable it is important to recognise other urban sites (such as the one being promoted) which is sequentially beneficial and sustainable. Site is owned by a willing landowner and there is active developer interest in bringing the site forward for delivery of 30 dwellings.</p>		<p>Agree.</p> <p>This is not an additional site and Green Belt release is not being made instead.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site promoted is in a suitable urban location and has been identified in the SHLAA as deliverable in the plan period. Therefore, the site is already counting towards achieving the housing requirement for Kimberley. It is not considered necessary to allocate sites that are already considered suitable and deliverable within the plan period.</p>
6880 - Davidsons Developments Ltd. (Represented by Pegasus Group)	<p>The sites allocated in the Part 2 Local Plan do not fulfil the housing requirement for Kimberley and therefore the full housing need for the area has not been met.</p>	<p>The plan should include sites to provide the 600 dwellings identified in the Core Strategy. Allocate more sites and amend the Green Belt boundary to include; Land at New Farm Lane, Nuthall.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>See response to the Mr Turton (above).</p>
Specialist Housing Providers			
403 - McCarthy & Stone	<p>The Plan does not include a policy to promote the delivery of specialist</p>	<p>There should be a presumption in favour</p>	<p>Agree in principle.</p> <p>Delivery of specialist</p> <p>See commentary</p>

Retirement Lifestyles Ltd. (represented by the Planning Bureau Limited)	accommodation for the elderly despite acknowledging that the population is aging. Viability assessments make a fixed land value assumption which jeopardises delivery. There are no specific allocations for elderly accommodation or consideration of sites suitability for specialist housing.	of specialist housing provision including the release of land within a strategic allocation or a separate policy to cover the housing need for the ageing population.	accommodation of the elderly is an important part of the mix of housing type and the borough will seek to support this. Please see amendments to Policy 15.	on Policy 15.
Non Residential Allocations Omitted from the Plan				
178 - Cauntton Engineering Ltd (represented by iPlan Solutions Ltd)	Site allocations focus solely on residential allocations and there is no provision for employment allocations. Sustainable development must encompass economic development and it is imperative and appropriate to remove areas from the Green Belt to facilitate long term economic needs.	The Council should remove land North West of the Plane Building at Lamb Close Drive, Eastwood from the Green Belt and allocate it for vehicle trailer storage associated with Cauntton Engineering.	Disagree. See site selection document. The borough as a whole does not require further employment allocations. Individual circumstances of specific employers may be considered as 'very special circumstances' at Planning application stage. Exceptional Circumstances need to be demonstrated for a Local Plan allocation.	
1201 - Whitehead (Concrete) Ltd & Foulds Investment Ltd (represented by iPlan Solutions Ltd)	There are no specific employment allocations made within the northern part of the borough and the plan does not provide a range of allocations for employment uses.	The Council should remove land at Gin Close Way, Awworth from the Green Belt and Allocate it for B1, B2 & B8 employment use.		
2607 - Harworth Estates (represented by Pegasus Group).	The site does not make sufficient employment land provision and has not considered the need or opportunity for rail related employment development.	Allocate the land at the former Bennerley Coal Disposal Point for rail related employment uses.	Disagree. It is not considered necessary to allocate any additional land for development.	
6882 - Broxtowe Labour Group	The Group proposes an additional allocation for a freight terminal at 'Bennerley Washings'.		This is an important and narrow Green Belt gap immediately adjacent to the Grade II* Listed	

Bennerley Viaduct.

Policy 3.1 Chetwynd Barracks

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
21 - Natural England	Welcomes the Key Development Requirements within the policy for retaining and enhancing green infrastructure, retaining trees and linking open spaces. Provision of accessible open space within the site will take pressure from the nearby Attenborough Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).	None suggested.	Noted.	
34 - Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	<p>Supports the Key Development Requirement to 'retain and enhance Green Infrastructure corridors around the eastern and northern areas of the site'.</p> <p>Hobgoblin Wood and Chilwell Ordinance Depot Local Wildlife Site (which is outside the allocation) should be protected during the construction phase and retained with their management secured in perpetuity.</p> <p>Focusing built development on the previously developed part of the site whilst converting and reusing existing buildings and infrastructure wherever possible would increase the sustainability credentials of the development.</p>	<p>Include a clear statement that Hobgoblin Wood, other woodland areas, mature trees and grasslands will be retained and their long-term management will be secured in perpetuity.</p>	<p>Agree in part. The word 'large' has been replaced by 'mature' with reference to the retention of trees on the site.</p> <p>Specific reference to the retention of Hobgoblin wood has been included in the policy. 'Other woodland areas' is considered to be covered by the above reference to retain 'mature trees'.</p> <p>Securing the long-term management in perpetuity has also been included in the policy.</p> <p>Reference to grassland has not been included in the policy as despite the site being brownfield it does comprise of large areas of open grassland. It is considered inappropriate to</p>	<p>No significant implications.</p> <p>Already assessed, see Table 7 in SA appendix.</p>

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
			protect this through the policy as this would radically restrict the developable area and subsequently the quantum of development on the site and would constitute an inefficient use of an urban site.	
48 - Sport England	<p>There is no mention of playing fields on site within the description. The site contains 3 x full size football pitches, tennis courts, cricket wickets, bowls provision and a sports hall. The site is highlighted within the Playing Pitch Strategy as a football site.</p> <p>The site currently provides training capacity for Toton Tigers and the Playing Pitch Strategy highlights the need to convert the tennis courts to an artificial grass pitch.</p>	The need to maintain, protect or replace such facilities should be accounted for in the policy.	<p>Agree. The description has been amended to include reference to 'playing fields'.</p> <p>The Key Development Requirements have been amended to make specific reference to the retention and enhancement of existing playing fields and sports facilities (including the pavilion) on the south eastern corner of the site.</p>	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
55 - Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign)	Welcomes the policy support for the need for good cycle as well as pedestrian links.	None suggested.	Noted.	
64 - Derbyshire County Council	As previously stated the site is well located in a very sustainable location within the urban area and is well located to take advantage of the NET extension and proposed HS2. The allocation is unlikely to have any significant implications for housing delivery in Erewash (particularly at Stanton). The allocation of the site is supported as a key element of the joint	None Suggested.	Noted.	

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	<p>Housing Infrastructure Fund bid to maximise the delivery of housing growth associated with HS2.</p> <p>There is a significant quanta of development expected in Chilwell, Toton and Stapleford that could potentially have significant impacts upon roads in Derbyshire. The relevant local and national highways bodies have expended considerable effort in agreeing the scoping of the highways assessment required to support the HS2 hub station and given the level of development early engagement with the East Midlands Gateway Modelling Group is advisable.</p>	None Suggested.	<p>Noted</p> <p>The council is currently engaging with the East Midlands Gateway Modelling group and work is on-going.</p>	
142 - Historic England	Key Development Requirement 2 in respect on non-designated heritage assets is welcomed and supported.	None suggested.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The non-designated heritage assets point is currently a 'Key Development Aspiration' but this has been amended to be a 'key Development Requirement'.</p>	
211 - Nottinghamshire County Council	<p>The 'Key Development Requirements' do not specify highways requirements or access opportunities or aspirations.</p> <p>The critical infrastructure section of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (page 36) clearly sets out the aspirations of the highway authority and opportunities to develop the strategic highway linkages. The relative text for the Toton Strategic Location for growth (policy 3.2) advises that the site needs to be considered in</p>	Amend the 'Key Development Requirements' (as set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan) to include highway infrastructure requirements, which should be considered together with those for Toton (Strategic Location for Growth).	<p>Agree.</p> <p>The Policy has been amended to Include a 'Key Development Requirement' for highway infrastructure, to be considered together with those for the Toton Strategic Location for Growth.</p>	Not significant to the assessment, not a sustainable transport option.

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	the round (with Chetwynd Barracks) however this is not specified in this policy.			
	The County may consider it appropriate that amendments with regard to education contributions (and/or further discussions) are appropriate.		Noted.	
222 - Severn Trent	<p>Sewer records do not exist for the site; therefore the current drainage is unknown. It is assumed that the majority of flows will join the combined sewer on Chetwynd Road.</p> <p>The potential impact on the sewage infrastructure is considered to be 'low'.</p> <p>Severn Trent has a duty to provide additional capacity to accommodate planned development. Developers should contact Severn Trent as early as possible to ensure that additional capacity can be planned into their investment programme.</p>	None suggested.	Noted.	
6276 - Nottingham West Clinical Commissioning Group	<p>The nearest facility for this development is Chilwell Valley & Meadows Surgeries. Chilwell Valley (main surgery) has no development potential; Chilwell Meadows (branch surgery) has some expansion potential.</p> <p>Based on similar size developments (in combination with the Toton development) land required would</p>	<p>Land for a Medical Centre is required (and should be reserved) to serve this and the Toton development (no more than 1 acre). Section 106 contributions should be sought.</p>	<p>Agree. The Key Development Requirements have been amended to include reference to the provision of a Medical Centre.</p> <p>As outlined in Policy 32 developer contributions may be sought from this development for</p>	<p>This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the</p>

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	likely to be no more than 1 acre to serve a population of 18,000 patients.		health provision.	site.
6279 - Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum ** Not the Forum preparing a Neighbourhood Plan for the area**	The Key Development Requirements should state the net housing density to be achieved.	A Net housing density of 40 dwellings per hectare should be added, the number of houses that can be delivered as a result should be amended.	Disagree. It is not considered appropriate to include a net minimum density on the site. In any event the number of houses expected to be delivered within the plan period will not be increased if the density on site is specified as 40 dwellings per hectare.	
	The 'Key Development Requirements' for a small retail/service centre fails to recognise the nearby facilities and would jeopardise the viability of existing and new businesses.	Remove the requirement for a small retail/service centre from the 'Key Development Requirements'.	Disagree. It is considered suitable to keep this as a Key Development Requirement as the provision specially relates to meeting local need and therefore will not affect other surrounding local centres. This has however been clarified in the supporting text with reference to the out-of-town retail threshold which is set in Policy 13 as a maximum unit size of 500 metres square gross floor space.	
	The extent of the public space to the south of the memorial is not shown and there is a potential that land suitable for housing may be lost.	The extent of the public space should be made clear and the reason for not allocating that land should be reported.	Disagree. The extent of the public space to the south of the Memorial will need to be of a scale which enhances and does not negatively affect the setting of the Listed Memorial. It is not considered appropriate at this stage to specify the extent as	

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
6577 - Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum	Proposes additions and amendments to the 'Key Development Requirements' for the Chetwynd Barracks.		this will depend on detailed design proposal at planning application stage.	
		To include a new requirement into the 'Key Development Requirements' that: <i>"The Barracks must be treated as one entity and not split up into separate development plots"</i> .	Agree in principle. The principle of masterplanning the whole site so as to achieve a comprehensive and coherent development is sound and the policy as a whole seeks to achieve this. In order to clarify this additional text has been inserted prior to the Key Development Requirements to ensure that the site is considered as a single entity and is not planned in a fragmented way.	
		To expand the existing (bus route) requirement in the 'Key Development Requirements' to include: <i>"including access to the site from Chetwynd Road, Chilwell. However, only buses should be given access to the site from the eastern gateway."</i>	Agree in part. The Key Development Requirement has been amended to include the upgrade of existing accesses points and internal roads with the requirement that Chetwynd Road to be prioritised for buses, cyclists and pedestrians.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
		To include a new requirement into the 'Key Development Requirements' that: <i>"New access road is needed to the site from</i>	Agree in principle. The ability to provide a north/south link road is a key aspect of future-proofing the site and its delivery is currently the subject of a £100m Housing	Long term positive effect but no amendment to assessment.

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
		<i>the north to fall in line with HS2 growth strategy</i> ".	Infrastructure Fund (HIF) bid being prepared by Nottinghamshire County Council. This has been included in the Key Development Requirements.	
		To expand the existing (Green Infrastructure) requirement in the 'Key Development Requirements' to include: <i>"including the creation of footpaths and cycle ways"</i> .	Agree. The principle of footpaths and cycle ways within the development is an important one and the Key Development Requirements have been amended to reflect this. The Key Development Requirement for links to surrounding infrastructure has been expanded to include additional walking and cycling links through the site.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
		To include a new requirement into the 'Key Development Requirements' to: <i>"Enhance the provision of sports facilities at the south east of the site"</i> .	Agree. See response to Sport England (above).	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
		To expand the existing (trees, verges and street scene) requirement in the 'Key Development Requirements' to	Agree in principle. Preserving as many of the mature trees as possible is an important aspect of development of the site as it adds character	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
		include: <i>"All large tress on the Barracks will be subject to Tree Preservation orders once the site is released"</i> .	and a sense of place to the development. It is considered that the amended Key Development Requirement (see response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust) is sufficient to protect the mature trees on the site. Whilst Tree Protection Orders may be appropriate in due course the legal process that has to be complied requires trees to have 'special amenity value to the public' and until the site is publically accessible (which is not likely to be until development has taken place) it may be difficult to prove this. Therefore the policy is the most suitable place to protect the trees in the short term prior to a schedule of TPO assessment.	development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
		To expand the existing (Memorial) requirement in the 'Key Development Requirements' to include: <i>"the associated gardens and all heritage assets (still to be formally registered) on the site"</i> .	Agree in principle. The Memorial and Memorial Gardens are already protected through specific reference in the Policy. With regards to the non-designated heritage assets please see the response to Historic England.	See response to HE.
		To amend the existing	Disagree.	

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
		(retail/service centre) requirement in the 'Key Development Requirements' to: Remove reference to "small" and include the word "sufficient".	See the response to Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum (above). The policy is designed to meet local needs and must be of a scale so as not to compete with other local centres. In any event will be restricted in unit size through Policy 13 which has now been clarified in the justification text.	
6882 - Broxtowe Labour Group	Provision should be made for a network of footpaths running across the site.		Agree. See response to the Chetwynd and Toton Neighbourhood Forum (above).	See response to the Chetwynd and Toton Neighbourhood Forum above.
6963 - East Midlands Councils	Supports the policy. Chetwynd Barracks is also included within the East Midland HS2 Growth Strategy which sets the vision for the area for the future.	None suggested.	Noted.	
Developers / Owners of the Allocation Site				
6284 - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) (represented by JLL)	Support allocation for 500 houses and associated community use within the plan period. Technical work submitted with representations includes: * Transport and movement; * Flood risk and surface water drainage; * Ecology; * Air Quality; * Ground Conditions; * Utilities and Services; * Heritage; and * Retail Need and Impact	Amend the site description to include: <i>"The site is significant in terms of size (circa 75 hectares net of the retained Service Family accommodation in the northern part of the site) and represents an unrivalled opportunity for a large housing led development in a truly</i>	The Council is promoting the site for allocation through the Local Plan process and the level of introductory text is consistent with all of the allocations within the Local Plan. It is not considered appropriate to include the additional information as suggested.	

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	<p>DIO has submitted a Development Concept for the site to demonstrate delivery and capacity which are also summarised in a non-technical SA and Development Delivery Statement.</p> <p>500 houses at a site density of 35 dwellings per ha and the first phase of the local centre is expected to be delivered within the Plan period.</p> <p>The approach to allocation is inconsistent with the Toton site and should set out its vision for development of the site beyond the plan period so as not to limit the sites potential. Considering the site beyond the plan period will assist the comprehensive development of the site.</p>	<p><i>sustainable location on previously developed land. It is surrounded by existing housing and is very well located in respect of accessing existing and proposed infrastructure.</i></p> <p><i>Attenborough Rail Station is located a short distance to the south east of the site and Toton Lane and Inham Road Tram stops are walking distance to the north. The local Area is served by a number of well used and regular bus services which currently have to skirt around the perimeter of the site, but could be comprehensively reconfigured as part of the overall redevelopment proposals.</i></p> <p><i>The site will cease operations and become available for development in 2021. Because of its size and obvious sustainability</i></p>		

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
		<p><i>credentials, it has a capacity for development that goes well beyond the end of the plan period – 2028. The extent of the development beyond 2028 will be the subject for review of the Local Plan following the adoption of this Part 2 Local Plan and discussions with key stakeholders, including full engagement with the recently formed Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum, which intends to produce a neighbourhood plan covering Chetwynd Barracks, the HS2 station at Toton and associated development, and the surrounding area. However, to assist comprehensive development of the site and longer term planning of the area and wider Borough, consideration has also been given to the key development requirements beyond the</i></p>		

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
		<p><i>plan period".</i></p> <p>Include the following Key Development Requirement beyond the Plan Period:</p>	<p>Disagree:</p> <p>The infrastructure required on the site needs to be delivered at the most appropriate point (i.e. when it's needed). The site is being considered as a whole to ensure that it is comprehensively planned. In addition whilst 500 homes is what is expected to be delivered during the plan period it is recognised that the capacity of the site as a whole is much higher and the Key Development Requirement has been amended to reflect this.</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate to split the policy to set out the requirements for 'during the plan period' and 'after the plan period' as the Council does not want to artificially restrict development during the plan period if delivery could be accelerated.</p>	
		<p><i>Up to an additional 1,000 dwellings, at an approximate site density of 40 dwellings per developable hectare, on the remainder of the site.</i></p>	<p>Agree in principle.</p> <p>See above, it is recognised that the site capacity is higher than the 500 dwellings that are expected to be delivered in the plan period. The Key Development Requirement has been amended to ensure that the 500 homes are not seen as a</p>	<p>This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability</p>

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
			cap on development.	appraisal of the site.
		<i>Completion of local centre with retail provision servicing local needs at a scale that does not compete with the retail offer of nearby centres.</i>	Disagree. See response to Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum (above). No amendment to the policy is required however additional justification text has been included to add clarity.	
		<i>Small scale employment of around 5,000 sq m.</i>		
		<i>New community uses, such as primary school and health centre.</i>	Agree. The provision of a new primary school is already included as a specific Key Development Requirement. The Key Development Requirements have been expanded to also include the provision of a medical centre.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
		<i>Integration with adjoining housing, including retained MOD residential accommodation to the north.</i>	Agree. The allocation includes the retained MOD houses to the north and therefore the word 'adjoining' is not required. However the principle of a single cohesive development is sound and the Key Development Requirements have been amended to reflect this.	No change to the environmental effects of the policy.
		<i>Upgrade and</i>	Agree.	See response to

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
		<i>reconfiguration of existing accesses, with Chetwynd Road to be prioritised for buses, cyclists and pedestrians.</i>	See response to Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum (above).	the Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum above.
		<i>Mitigation measures to the local highway network, to be determined as part of an overall transport strategy.</i>	Agree. See responses to Nottinghamshire County Council and Derbyshire County Council.	See responses to Nottinghamshire County Council and Derbyshire County Council.
		<i>New or extended bus routes through the site, through the reconfiguration of existing routes, to be determined as part of an overall transport strategy.</i>	Agree.	Will increase the transport objective assessment by a level. May increase other objectives assessments levels by increasing accessibility.
		<i>Attractive and convenient walking and cycling connections to the surrounding area to the north, east and south.</i>	Agree in principle. See response to Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum (above). Unclear why the west has been omitted from the list of directions for connections however, this could be achieved via the DIO suggestion re: Chetwynd Road.	See response to the Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum above.
		<i>Retention and provision of public access around</i>	Agree. See response to	See response to Nottinghamshire

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
		<i>Hobgoblin Wood, the playing field in the south east corner of the site, and the parkland to the north of the Listed National Shell Filling Factory Memorial.</i>	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust and Sport England (above).	Wildlife Trust and Sport England above.
		<i>Public access to the National Shell Filling Factory Memorial and creation of Public space to the south of the memorial.</i>	Agree. The provision of public space is already included in the Key Development Requirements although the Key Development requirement has been amended to specific mention the provision of 'public accesses'.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
		<i>Retention and enhancement of green infrastructure corridors, provision of public open space that meets the Fields in Trust Guidance, and creation of links with public open space in the first phase of development.</i>	Agree in principle. See response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (above).	See response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust above.
		<i>On-site sustainable drainage network based on natural attenuation.</i>	Agree. See amendments to Policy 1 as suggested by the Environment Agency.	See amendments to Policy 1 as suggested by the Environment Agency.
		<i>Retention and re-use of</i>	Agree in principle.	See response to

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
		<i>existing heritage assets for residential or community use, where feasible and merited in the context of the wider planning benefits of the overall development proposals”.</i>	See response to Historic England (above.)	Historic England above.
	Additional justification text has been provided in order relating to the work that the DIO has undertaken to inform its vision for development.	Additional justification text should be included.		
	Vision for the development of the site has been included.	Include the following vision <i>“The vision for the site is for Chetwynd Barracks to be a vibrant new neighbourhood that provides a sustainable mix of housing, retail, employment and leisure opportunities for the local community. By maintaining and enhancing the sites military heritage, a unique and characterful settlement will help to reconnect Chilwell and Toton. While heritage is at the core of the design, green corridors and public open spaces throughout the</i>	Agree in principle. Justification text has been inserted into the policy to provide clarity for the expectations on the site.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
		<i>development will also help to deliver amenity and biodiversity benefits for people and wildlife alike”.</i>		
Owners / Developers of other sites (not allocated)				
2542 - (represented by Featherstones)	Uncertainty regarding delivery of Chetwynd Barracks as there has been no commitment to release the land.	Council should consider removing more sites from the Green Belt and allocating them for development, including:	Disagree. The Council believes that delivery of the site is achievable at the time envisaged. It is not considered necessary to allocate any additional land for development.	
4622 - (represented by Featherstones)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land at Gilt Hill Farm Kimberley; • land off Back Lane Nuthall; • land off Sisley Avenue Stapleford, • land off Baulk Lane Stapleford, • North West Hill Top Stapleford • Hill Top Farm Stapleford 		
6881 - (represented by Featherstones)				
2652 - W Westerman (represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd)	Uncertainty regarding delivery of Chetwynd Barracks as it is still in active use by the MOD. Whilst the MOD have indicated that the site will come forward for development there have been no firm committed dates and the timing of the closure is subject to change. There is significant risk that the site release will be delayed or cancelled.	The Council should plan for more houses so that there is sufficient flexibility to take account of sites that may be delayed or not deliver.		
2685 - Bloor Homes Ltd (represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd)		Removing more sites from the Green Belt and allocating them for development, including:		

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low Wood Road in Nuthall; • Land at Mansfield Road, Eastwood; • additional land at Toton. 		
4200 - Taylor & Burrows Property (Represented by Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd)	<p>Constraints on site create uncertainty with regard to delivery. Constraints include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listed Building and Memorial Garden which may impact land availability. • The site's historical importance regarding the military. • Previous industrial uses and potential land contamination. • Topography may impact the density of development. • A detailed masterplan is required to show how constraints can be overcome. • 500 dwelling in 5 years (as set out in the SHLAA) is ambitious given land release timescales. 	Consider including more greenfield sites that do not have deliverability or viability issues. This should focus on more marketable areas of Eastwood to support growth and regeneration in a more positive fashion.		
Local Residents				
3 contributors - 1 supporter 2 Objectors	Important that Brownfield sites such as the Barracks are developed.	None Suggested.	Noted.	
623 3855 6809	There is a need for a Travel Plan which incorporates Chetwynd Barracks, Toton and Stapleford South. There is concern that improvements to public transport routes set out in the Chetwynd and Toton areas in isolation	Include a new policy for an overall Travel Plan for the western part of Broxtowe South (rather than piecemeal requirement for	Agree. See response to Derbyshire County Council and Nottinghamshire County Council.	See response to Derbyshire County Council and Nottinghamshire County Council.

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	without a more comprehensive consideration will have a detrimental impact on the existing provision in Stapleford.	individual allocations).		
	Degree of development on the site should match current (800 homes at 25/hectare), plus employment land, plus community infrastructure in a 1:1 ratio to open space (assuming all buildings area demolished).		Disagree. It is not appropriate to set arbitrary development ratio requirements and it is more important to plan the development as a whole to ensure efficient use of land whilst also providing an attractive and well serviced place to live.	

Policy 3.2 Toton (Strategic Location for Growth)

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
4 - Environment Agency	Supports Policy, pleased to see the requirement for 16ha of green space which would create opportunities for blue/green infrastructure and would be keen to work with Broxtowe to connect these new features into existing sites such as Attenborough Nature Reserve. Should residential come forward in areas of flood risk we would expect to see evidence that the sequential test has been passed. Would be supportive of 'green' flood risk solutions should these be pursued in conjunction with more traditional forms. We would welcome the opportunity to develop a partnership approach to managing the environmental risks and securing environmental opportunities.	None suggested.	Noted.	
21 - Natural England	Welcomes the aspiration which aims to provide Green Infrastructure links between Hobgoblin Wood in the east and Toton Fields Wildlife site in the west and the Erewash Canal Corridor. It is essential that development provides	None suggested.	Noted.	

	multifunctional green space and delivers enhancement of the natural environment for people and place.		
34 - Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	<p>Objects to Toton site allocation. Toton sidings is at the very centre of the Erewash Valley Living Landscape. Development would lead to the loss of a substantial area of Green Belt and would result in the merging of Chilwell and Stapleford and would cause the loss of a wildlife corridor between the Erewash Valley and Wollaton Park (via Bramcote Village and Beeston Fields Golf course). Cannot see how transport issues can be addressed. Northern and eastern parts of the sidings are in the floodplain and there should be a presumption against development of these parts of the site and development of this scale could increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the objection if the allocation is taken forward then the quantity of informal open space should be defined in the policy.</p>	<p>Remove the allocation from the part 2 Local Plan.</p> <p>If the allocation remains then all Local Wildlife Site habitats should be removed from the allocation and the policy should be amended to clarify that the 16ha of open space will include a significant amount of informal open space (wildlife habitat), including a 50 metre wide habitat corridor.</p>	<p>Disagree</p> <p>The principle of development in this location was established as part of the Aligned Core Strategy and it is not agreed to remove the allocation from the plan.</p> <p>The principle of providing substantial green infrastructure corridors including wildlife corridors is agreed as part of the allocation which can be amended to make this clearer.</p> <p>This area forms an important part of the 'Trent Valley Vision' which aims to deliver a coordinated approach to development along the Trent Valley to achieve sustainable economic, social and environmental growth.</p>

	Concern that the open space will be located in areas of high disturbance which would never develop as high value for wildlife. Recommend a 50 metres wide buffer for open space to usefully function as wildlife habitat. Concerned about the loss of such a large extent of brownfield land which has regenerated to woodland.		
48 - Sport England	Notes that the allocation includes a school site and playing pitches within the area. And that additional land is being allocated for future provision and the provision of a leisure centre.	None suggested.	Noted.
55 - Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign)	Welcomes the policy support for the need for good cycle routes as well as pedestrian links especially the aspirations to include good routes from Stapleford, Long Easton, the Erewash Trail and main urban areas.	None suggested.	Noted.
60 - Erewash Borough Council	Support the scale and ambition for future development of the site. Welcomes reference to it contributing to access enhancement to Long Eaton as part of an integrated transport system which would	None Suggested.	Noted.

	<p>include an effective traffic system to manage the flow of traffic around the station. It is noted that the Plan requires a tram extension to terminate at a level which facilitates the future tram extension beyond the station which would enter Erewash (and would form part of the Erewash Local Plan).</p> <p>Erewash notes the longer-term aspiration to connect the tram as far as East Midlands Airport and Derby but also notes that there are as yet no agreed tram routes through Erewash to either destination and that the economic viability of such route extensions has not been established.</p>		
63 - Nottingham City Council	<p>The mixed use allocation at Toton appropriately sets the context for the anticipated growth in the area associated with the Hub Station. The Borough might consider providing a bit more detail in terms of the disposition of uses across the mixed use allocation, to provide more certainty and guidance for planning applications.</p>	None Suggested.	Noted.
	<p>The City Council is the promoter of the Nottingham</p>		Noted.

	Express Transit which terminates at the Toton Lane Park and Ride site. The 1400 space car park has been very successful since it opened due to its easy access of the strategic road network. Whilst further park and ride capacity should be considered as part of any NET extension with association with HS2 the City Council would not support the relocation or reduction in capacity of the Park and Ride site, or changes to its access from the strategic and local road network.		
64 - Derbyshire County Council	As previously stated the site forms a logical sustainable urban extension. The scale of housing and employment land identified was supported as the most appropriate for the site. 16ha of Green Infrastructure is welcomed and supported. The Key Development Requirement for good connectivity is also welcomed and supported.	None Suggested.	Noted.
	The allocation of the site for 500 dwellings and the provision of a new primary school could raise cross-boundary issues because of the proximity to Derbyshire.		

	<p>The County considers that an assessment of the potential impact on Derbyshire schools and pupils should be undertaken and it <i>“would welcome the opportunity to engage in on-going discussions with Broxtowe Borough Council on this matter”</i>.</p>			
	<p>There is a significant quanta of development expected in Chilwell, Toton and Stapleford that could potentially have significant impacts upon roads in Derbyshire. The relevant local and national highways bodies have expended considerable effort in agreeing the scoping of the highways assessment required to support the HS2 hub station and given the level of development early engagement with the East Midlands Gateway Modelling Group is advisable.</p>	None Suggested.	Noted. The council is currently engaging with the East Midlands Gateway Modelling group and work is on-going.	
68 - Awsworth Parish Council and	<p>Consider that the justification text should include reference to Ilkeston Station.</p>	<p>Amend justification text (page 80) to include reference to Ilkeston Station.</p>	<p>Agreed. The Traffic / Transport / Connectivity justification text which refers to onward rail service connections now includes specific reference to Ilkeston Station.</p>	<p>This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the</p>

				sustainability appraisal of the site.
6537 - Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group				
73 - Stapleford Town Council	The Town Council is concerned that the proposals in Policy 3.2 are “ <i>different from proposals expressed by D2N2 for the same area</i> ”. Should George Spencer be relocated and a leisure centre is constructed adjacent to the tram stop including new highways infrastructure the new build housing in the Local Plan may need to be partially demolished.	This part of the Plan (pages 76 – 78) should be “ <i>re-written following full consultation with D2N2, the Town Council and other interested parties</i> ”.	Agreed in part. The allocation will be amended to bring it more in line with Growth Strategy proposals.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
211 - Nottinghamshire County Council	Supports the inclusion of the Toton site allocation which will be the most connected on the High Speed Network outside London. The housing numbers (within the plan period and beyond) will need to be flexible to maximise opportunities but development up to 2028 will not necessarily prejudice the wider development of the future site if the location and density of housing is appropriate.	Amend Key Development Requirements to include a new requirement to ensure that applications will be judged against their fit with emerging plans and proposals for the access to and design of the strategic employment site and the HS2 hub station.	Partly agreed. See response to Stapleford Town Council.	See response to Stapleford Town Council.

The County Council notes that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan advises that the allocation needs to be considered in the round with the land at Chetwynd Barracks. This should be reflected in the Policy text for both allocations	Amend the 'Key Development Requirements' to include highway infrastructure requirements, which should be considered together with those for Chetwynd Barracks.	Agreed.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
The location of this policy in the Plan is unusual and out of place. The allocation is expected to deliver development within the plan period and should be included within section 3 (following the Chetwynd Allocation) whilst acknowledging that much of the development is expected outside of the plan period.	Move the policy forward in the plan into section 3 (following the Chetwynd Barracks allocation).	Agreed. The format of the plan has been amended to include Policy 3.2 in numerical order with the other policies.	No SA implications.
	Insert a new 'Key Development Requirement within the Plan period' to state that development should be " <i>located and designed to complement and not prejudice proposals for access to the HS2 Hub Station and Innovation Village which is to be delivered beyond the plan period</i> ".	Agreed. The Key Development Requirements (within the plan period) have been amended to reflect this request.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
The County may consider it appropriate that amendments		Noted. The education contribution	

	with regard to education contributions (and/or further discussions) are appropriate.		associated with the 500 dwelling has been agreed as part of the planning permission.
222 - Severn Trent	<p>It is likely that a capital scheme would be required for a new gravity sewer to take foul flow from the development to Stapleford sewage treatment works. If foul flows were to be discharged to the south the topography suggests a pumping station would be required. Surface water will be able to drain to pre-existing surface water systems in the vicinity of the development.</p> <p>The potential impact on the sewage infrastructure is considered to be 'High'.</p> <p>Severn Trent has a duty to provide additional capacity to accommodate planned development. Developers should contact Severn Trent as early as possible to ensure that additional capacity can be planned into their investment programme.</p>	None suggested.	Noted.
2316 - Borough Councillor Richard MacRae	Not enough attention was being paid to the opportunities that would arise with the development of HS2 and	None suggested.	Noted.

	associated projects.		
3852 - HS2 Ltd	<p>HS2 Ltd. Are “<i>supportive of the Local Plan as it acknowledges the potential benefits that could be gained for the region from the arrival of Phase Two of HS2</i>”.</p> <p>HS2 notes that there is a traffic aspiration in the Local Plan for a well contained traffic interchange in very close proximity to the station (ideally within HS2 operational land).</p> <p>HS2 are unable to fund or build the Nottingham Express Transit project. However, “<i>HS2 have established that a passive provision for the proposed tram can be provided to enable connection to the East Midland Hub</i>”.</p>	None suggested.	Noted.
6276 - Nottingham West Clinical Commissioning Group	<p>The nearest facility for this development is Chilwell Valley & Meadows Surgeries. Chilwell Valley (main surgery) has no development potential; Chilwell Meadows (branch surgery) has some expansion potential.</p> <p>Based on similar size developments (in combination</p>	Land for a Medical Centre is required to serve this and the Chetwynd Barracks development (no more than 1 acre). Section 106 contributions should be sought.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>As outlined in Policy 32 developer contributions may be sought from this development for ‘health’ provision.</p>

	with the Chetwynd Barracks development) land required would likely to be no more than 1 acre to serve a population of 18,000 patients.			
6279 - Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum ** Not the Forum preparing a Neighbourhood Plan for the area**	The Key Development Requirements beyond the plan period that references a leisure centre should not be seen as a replacement to the one at Bramcote.	Amend the policy to clarify that the Leisure Centre should be provided in addition to the one at Bramcote.	Disagree. As with the Bramcote allocation (3.3) the reference to the provision of a Leisure Centre 'if required' relates to the Councils emerging borough wide Leisure Strategy, as yet no decision has been taken as to the location of the replacement Leisure Centre.	
6577 - Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum	Parking by HS2 station owners must not overspill into neighbouring residential streets. A 'residents only' parking scheme may be the solution to this issue however residents must not be disadvantaged by such a scheme (it should be free).	Amend Traffic/Transport/Connectivity aspirations (page 81) to include at the end of the final bullet point the following text; <i>"Any such scheme needs to be implemented at zero cost to residents"</i> .	Agree with the principle. As set out in the Traffic/ Transport / Connectivity justification text parking relating to the HS2 station should not impact on the nearby residential streets. However, the cost of implementing and maintaining such a scheme does not fall within the remit of planning.	No SA implications.
	Viable green corridors on the site (especially the southern boundary) must be a mandatory requirement. A minimum width of the primary corridor along the southern boundary should be included. The northern corridor (south of Stapleford) is less important given the likely creation of the HS2 access	Amend Green Infrastructure Aspirations (page 81) 1 st inset bullet point to include additional text <i>"this will be a significant corridor in the area, and could incorporate both pedestrian and cycle access to HS2 station and so needs to be 50 metres wide"</i> .	Agree in part. The text as suggested has been included into the Green Infrastructure Aspirations text. The width of the corridor should be such that it can accommodate multiple uses however, it is not considered appropriate to set the width of the Green Infrastructure corridor at 50 metres (this part of the suggested text has been	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.

	road and so this can be treated as an informal green space corridor.	<p>Amend 2nd inset bullet point to include additional text <i>“This could comprise a narrow, graded tree and shrub roadside corridor to improve screening of the Innovation Village from the A52”</i>.</p> <p>Amend 3rd inset bullet point to include additional text <i>“and Erewash River (between Toton Washlands and Stapleford)”</i></p>	<p>omitted).</p> <p>Agreed. The Green Infrastructure Aspirations have been amended to reflect this request.</p> <p>Agreed. The Green Infrastructure Aspirations have been amended to reflect this request.</p>	<p>No significant implications.</p> <p>This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.</p>
6882 - Broxtowe Labour Group	Welcome HS2 and the opportunities that it will bring for job creation and local growth. Offers opportunity to build an economic hub around the Station. There we strongly support the provision of economic development and transport provision including a Stapleford Gateway that promotes business growth in the corridor between Toton Sidings and Stapleford.	None suggested.	Noted.	
6963 - East Midlands Councils	Supports the Policy. The Growth Strategy sets out a long term vision of how the	None suggested.	Noted.	

<p>East Midlands can use HS2 to boost economic growth. A mixed use Innovation Campus adjacent to HS2 is central to the vision. East Midlands Councils will continue to work closely with Broxtowe and other relevant authorities and bodies to take forward the East Midlands HS2 Growth Strategy.</p>			
<p>Developers / Owners of the Allocation Site</p>			
<p>6512 - Peveril Homes and UKPP (Toton) (represented by WYG)</p>	<p>Site benefits, in part, from an Outline consent (12/00585/OUT) and a Reserved Matters application (17/00499/REM) is currently pending. As drafted the policy does not fully reflect the requirements of the ACS, and neither does it take account of the principles established by the outline planning permission.</p>		
	<p>It is important to emphasise that the requirement for a 'buffer zone' on the southern side of the allocated site and corridor running west to east should not be regarded as a buffer for amenity purposes. It should be regarded as a green corridor for public access to be available. The corridor will be a functional</p>	<p>Re-assess the need for a wide green 'corridor'</p>	<p>Disagree. The Green Infrastructure Corridor needs to be of sufficient width to provide a multi-purpose, multi-use corridor which is an attractive route for those accessing the station but also act as attractive informal amenity space for the adjacent development. It is not considered appropriate to set the width of the Green Infrastructure</p>

<p>green space that primarily provides an attractive, but well observed, by natural surveillance, corridor from Toton Lane to the Hub station that can be achieved in a lit corridor of 10 metres wide. The need for a wide green corridor fails to efficiently and effectively use non Green Belt land and could make a comprehensive development unviable as it would leave no development value to the south of the point of access route.</p>	<p>corridor at 10 metres.</p>	
<p>The wording of the policy is considered to be overly restrictive as the <u>minimum</u> requirement for 500 homes has been removed, the area with planning permission for 500 homes is only part of the allocation and the policy should be flexible enough to ensure that there is the ability for further housing to be brought forward in the future.</p>	<p>Include reference to the 500 homes at Toton being a 'minimum' figure.</p>	<p>Disagree. The 500 homes are expected to be delivered within the Plan period. Other development is expected to come forward after the Plan period in association with the delivery of the HS2 station and therefore it is not appropriate to increase the housing numbers at this stage. If appropriate the overall number can be assessed as part of the Aligned Core Strategy Review.</p>
<p>The introduction of a minimum net density for the development of 40 dwgs/ha is at odds with other Local Plan allocations (especially given policy 15 requirements). It is</p>	<p>Amend the Key Development Requirements to remove the reference to a minimum net density of 40 dwellings per hectare.</p>	<p>Disagree. Efficient use of the site is a key principle to deliver growth Strategy ambitions. Higher densities adjacent to public transport hubs is consistent with</p>

also at odds with the planning permission which seeks a density of 31 dwgs/ha.	national policy.	
The Part 2 Local Plan policy should ensure sufficient flexibility for a variety of uses to be brought forwards across the strategic Location for Growth; this should include the potential for delivery of additional housing on land to the east of Toton Lane.		
The range of uses should be extended to provide greater flexibility and should be expressed with reference to the Use Class Order.	Include option to develop all A use classes, B1 (a and b), C1, C2, C3, D1 and D2 within the Policy.	Disagree. The range of uses expected to be delivered within the plan period should not be extended beyond 500 homes and 'limited local retail provision' so as to be of an appropriate scale and not competing with nearby centres. Agree in part B2 (General Industrial) and B8 (Storage or Distribution) are unlikely to be appropriate in this location and should not be included within the possible land use mix.
There is no justification why the Japanese water gardens adjacent to Bardills is not excluded from the Green Belt. The site is bound to the north by a belt of tall existing trees and a strong hedge line. It is	Extend the allocation to include the Japanese Water Gardens adjacent to Bardills .	Disagree. It is not considered necessary to allocate any additional land for development.

	unnecessary to keep the land permanently open particularly in the context of housing requirements.		
6877 - (represented by Barton Willmore)	Supports the mixed-use allocation with or without HS2 but considers that a full masterplan should be considered prior to exact details being identified. They would object to any site specific requirements that may prejudice development of their site directly adjacent to the station and reserve the right to be involved in any masterplanning exercise.	None suggested.	Noted.
Owners / Developers of other sites (not allocated)			
2542 - (represented by Featherstones)	Uncertainty of housing delivery at the site due to confused aspirations.	<p>Council should consider removing more sites from the Green Belt and allocating them for development, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land at Gilt Hill Farm Kimberley; • land off Back Lane Nuthall; • land off Sisley Avenue Stapleford, • land off Baulk Lane Stapleford, • North West Hill Top Stapleford • Hill Top Farm 	Disagree. The Council believes that delivery of sites included in the plan is achievable at the time envisaged and in any event flexibility has been included in the supply. It is not considered necessary to allocate any additional land for development.
4622 - (represented by Featherstones)			
6881 - (represented by Featherstones)			The allocation will be brought into line with key growth Strategy principles, but not to include significant additional development land in the Green Belt.

Stapleford		
2652 - W Westerman (represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd)	Whilst planning permission exists on part of the site the permission conflicts with the vision for the site set out in the Policy. The supporting text is confusing and ill-conceived and is largely based on the HS2 Growth Strategy. The Growth Strategy vision for higher density than the extant Outline permission whilst implying the potential for greater housing numbers in the long term it brings into question the ability to deliver housing (including the extant consent) in the short to medium term.	The Council should plan for more houses so that there is sufficient flexibility to take account of sites that may be delayed or not deliver. Removing more sites from the Green Belt and allocating them for development, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Low Wood Road in Nuthall;• Land at Mansfield Road, Eastwood;• Additional land at Toton.
2685 - Bloor Homes Ltd (represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd)	The Councils approach to planning of the Toton area is confused and fundamentally flawed. It is unclear how the development within the plan period will not prejudice the delivery of wider aspirations for the site (beyond the plan period). The Plan ignores the recently granted consent for 500 dwellings on the majority of the land to the west of Toton Lane, where the Growth strategy envisages an 'innovation village'. If the planning permission is not	

implemented the Plan will need additional; land to deliver the houses in the short term. If the planning permission is implemented then a new masterplan and revised vision for Toton will be required and additional land will be required to help deliver the overarching ambitions for the site.

Land to the east of Toton Lane should be included to provide a more comprehensive approach. The tram line is not an appropriate Green Belt or development boundary and an additional allocation to the north of the tramline should be included.

Policy 3.2 is overly restrictive both in terms of its geographical extent and in terms of its ambition. It fails to make best use of the opportunities HS2 will bring and have included an alternative vision (called Broxtowe Gateway) which includes land further north east for a comprehensive development to include

- New works to eliminate traffic congestion

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Up to 4000 new jobs• Retention of the Green Belt north of Toton and Chilwell• Up to 1200 dwellings alongside the NET <p>Detailed landscape work addresses the concerns raised in the Tribal Study regarding development on the east of Toton/ Stapleford Lane with a large landscape buffer including new woodland at the north, and proposes significantly more publicly accessible green infrastructure at various locations within the strategic location including wide publicly accessible space along the southern area of the whole strategic location, with additional housing on land to the east and a transport solution that includes an access point off the A52 east of Bardills Island linking to the second access off the A52 further west.</p>	
4200 - Taylor & Burrows Property (Represented by Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd)	<p>The allocation is for a mixed-use development which will extend beyond the plan period. Concerned that the housing element will not be delivered within the plan period due to uncertainties</p>	<p>Consider including more greenfield sites that do not have deliverability or viability issues. This should focus on more marketable areas of Eastwood to support growth and regeneration in a more</p>

	surrounding the major infrastructure project.	positive fashion.		
Local Residents				
5 contributors - all objectors.				
623	There is a need for a Travel Plan which incorporates Chetwynd Barracks, Toton and Stapleford South. There is concern that improvements to public transport routes set out in the Chetwynd and Toton areas in isolation without a more comprehensive consideration will have a detrimental impact on the existing provision in Stapleford.	Include a new policy for an overall Travel Plan for the western part of Broxtowe South (rather than piecemeal requirement for individual allocations).	Agreed in part. The distribution of homes in the Main Built up Area was modelled through the Aligned Core Strategy.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
1252				
3855			The requirement for public transport and highways improvements to be comprehensive nature of the development of Toton and Chetwynd	
6550				
6809	Banks Road should be re-designed to be a through route to improve traffic flows and enable a comprehensive bus route network.		Agree with the principle of improved accessibility to the proposed HS2 station however, the details are yet to be established.	No SA implications.
571	Residents of Stapleford South will not benefit from the existing improvements to public transport (due to the proposed access to the HS2 station).		Disagree.	
	A long distance local bus service should be provided from Nottingham to East Midlands Airport.		Agreed in principle. The principle of providing high quality public transport connections around the East Midlands (including to the airport) with the Hub Station as a principle node is supported. Public transport connections via Bessell	No SA implications.

		Lane and Toton/Stapleford Lane are a priority for HS2. However, whether these connections are in the form of a bus service is yet to be determined as part of a wider public transport network.
Concern that the required density will promote flatted development which will not be in keeping with local area.		Noted.
It is hoped that access to HS2 will be via direct links from the M1 Motorway to avoid traffic using Toton.		Noted. Access directly from the Motorway is not likely to be achievable. However, it is expected that access to the Station will be created from the direction of the motorway via the A52. Highways improvements to the A52 and wider road network will help to alleviate traffic congestion on the surrounding roads.
Bardills Roundabout needs to be improved to make it safer.		Noted. Improvements to Bardills will be required as part of a strategic highways improvement scheme to support the development of HS2.
Pleased to see a Green Corridor adjacent to existing properties that links to surrounding areas, protects TPO trees and provides additional planting.		Noted.
Do not support the principle of HS2.	Stop support for HS2 and cancel Toton Development.	Disagree. HS2 is a national project and the Plan needs to include allocations

<p>New employment land at Toton is surplus to demand, most of the development land to the west of Toton Lane has already gone to housing and if offices are built overtime they may become occupied by local companies.</p>	<p>and policies to take best advantage of it.</p>	
<p>Toton Sidings is not suitable for housing because of train noises and other buildings in the Sidings would have to be specially designed because of noise deflection.</p>		
<p>The Conservation Area and flood protection device on the west of the sidings should be protected from development.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Reaffirms the assessment.</p>
<p>Land south of the station and north of the floodplain is the most likely to be developed and should be marked as such on maps (Mayfield Grove may be opened up to traffic).</p>		
<p>Site should be designed to match housing (500 houses @ 25/ha) plus employment plus community infrastructure in a 1:1 ration with open space.</p>	<p>Disagree. It is not appropriate to set arbitrary development ratio requirements and it is more important to plan the development as a whole to ensure efficient use of land whilst also providing an attractive and well serviced place to live.</p>	

<p>30% affordable housing should be delivered on-site.</p>	<p>Agreed. This is the minimum expectation as set out in Policy 15.</p>	<p>No SA implications.</p>
<p>The Core Strategy should have allocated sufficient resources and space and there is no justification for further school expansion.</p>	<p>Disagree. The Aligned Core Strategy allocated the area as a 'strategic location for growth' for details to be determined as part of the Part 2 Local Plan. The school expansion is required as part of the comprehensive package of development in the area.</p>	
<p>Development east of Toton/Stapleford Lane should be considered in the next Core Strategy together with the fate of the Green Belt there running through to Bramcote.</p>	<p>Development within the Housing Market Area will be considered in the next Core Strategy. No further sites are needed in this Part 2 Local Plan.</p>	
<p>Leisure Centre Development should be kept separate from the school (in terms of governance).</p>	<p>Noted. Governance arrangements do not fall within the remit of planning policy.</p>	

<p>It is a waste of resources and land to demolish and re-build the secondary school. The area earmarked for the re-location should be used for an infant/junior school as this is what is needed in the area.</p>	<p>Increase the capacity of the existing school (as per the planning application) and use the other site for a new infant/junior school.</p>	<p>Disagree. The existing secondary school campus is dated and is split over two sites with a bridge connection over the A52 for pupils. The relocation of the entire campus to a single site will allow for a modern purpose built campus.</p> <p>A new primary school will also be provided as part of the development.</p>
<p>It is important that new development adjacent to the railway yard maintains the green gap between the railway line and Toton Village.</p>	<p>The Opun Design Review for the site suggests the southern green corridor adjacent to the existing housing should be 'tightened' to allow the central development to expand and to develop SE corner of site. If the Opun suggestion is accepted this would completely invalidate the 'wildlife corridor', which the Committee stated should be a minimum of 50m wide. Any reduction in this distance would render the Part 2 Local Plan unsound.</p>	<p>Relocate the south eastern corner of the development elsewhere and retain the site as an enlargement of the wildlife corridor.</p> <p>Disagree. The text as suggested has been included into the Green Infrastructure Aspirations text. The width of the corridor should be such that it can accommodate multiple uses however, it is not considered appropriate to set the width of the Green Infrastructure corridor at 50 metres.</p>

Policy 3.3 Bramcote (East of Coventry Lane)

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
18 - Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) supported by Nottinghamshire Campaign for Better Transport.	Key Development Requirement includes provision for enhanced bus service ' <u>adjacent to</u> ' the site this is welcomed but insufficient to maximise alternative forms of travel to the car. In most instances the distance to the nearest bus stop would be a deterrent to people using the service.	Amend Key Development Requirement to include provision for bus services ' <u>into and through the sites</u> '.	Disagree. Likely to only be a single point of access and so provision of a circular route through such a small site seems unlikely to be feasible.	
34 - Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Objects to Policy 3.3 if the entire site is to be developed as it would lead to the loss of Bramcote Moor Grassland Local Wildlife Site (LWS). The Trust states that Local Wildlife Sites " <i>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 utmost importance</i> ".	Amend the policy to state that the Local Wildlife Site will not be developed or amend the site allocation boundary to remove the Local Wildlife Site. The Local Wildlife Site would also need to be adequately buffered and the future management of the Local Wildlife Site should be secured.	Agree in part. There is likely to be development on the LWS. However, the policy has now been amended to state that any loss of LWS land should be mitigated / compensated at equivalent quality within close proximity to the site. The quality of the LWS has been reviewed by the Biological Record Centre and the area of interest is restricted to an area in the south west corner (close to Coventry Lane) which can be retained as part of the Green Infrastructure provision.	Policy detail reinforces the assessment.
48 - Sport England	The description of the site as 'unused' is incorrect based on 2013 aerial photographs which show market pitches and is listed within the Playing Pitch Strategy.	If the site is developed then equivalent or better playing pitch provision is required as mitigation.	Disagree. The Playing Pitch Strategy (pg.13) states that " <i>One school playing field site at Bramcote College (known as Coventry Lane Playing Fields),</i>	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	<p>The site contains 7 football pitches, 3 mini football pitches and 3 cricket wickets. The Playing Pitch Strategy states that the site is needed and suggests proposals for cricket nets, artificial grass pitch and a sports barn.</p> <p>It should be ensured that any development does not prejudice the use of existing facilities at Bramcote School and the Leisure Centre.</p>		<p><i>formerly used extensively for community football, is no longer maintained or hired to football clubs”.</i></p> <p>Agree. The ambition in the Playing Pitch Strategy is to achieve high quality sports facilities as a result of the school and leisure centre redevelopment. Any development should not prejudice the use of the existing facilities at Bramcote school or Leisure Centre.</p>	No SA implications.
55 - Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign)	National Policy supports cycling as well as walking and this should be specifically referred to in the policy.	Amend Key Development Requirement to refer specifically to the need for good cycle access, as well as pedestrian access.	Agree. The Key Development Requirement has been amended to make specific reference to cycling as well as pedestrian access.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
73 - Stapleford Town Council	Does not support development on Green Belt land and object to policy 3.3 (and 3.4). The Town Council considers that these are important Green Belt areas, separating the town from		Noted.	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	<p>Bramcote and Wollaton, and are an integral part of an important Green Belt corridor between the Borough and the City.</p> <p>Both sites would be isolated from the main infrastructure of the town, with no public transport which would necessitate the need for a car. There are no nearby schools, shops, health centres, community or leisure facilities and the developments were not large enough to encourage the expansion (or allocation of land) of such services in this area. Residents would therefore merely live within the development and find their needs met elsewhere, and so would contribute little to the local economy or the regeneration of Stapleford. Development would also add to existing traffic problems.</p>		<p>Disagree.</p> <p>The site is immediately adjacent to a primary and secondary school (which is to be rebuilt). There are local shops, a leisure centre and a park within walking distance.</p>	
211 - Nottinghamshire County Council	<p>The allocation covers the Bramcote Moor Grassland Local Wildlife Site, which is of county-level importance which contributes significantly to a network of Green Infrastructure in the area helping to link the Erewash Valley to sites within the City such as Wollaton Hall.</p>	<p>Bramcote Moor Grassland Local Wildlife Site should be omitted from the allocation, or the policy should be amended to specify that the Local Wildlife Site will be retained and</p>	<p>Agree in part.</p> <p>See response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (above).</p> <p>The Key Development Requirements have been amended to provide more detail for the expected Green Infrastructure links.</p>	<p>See response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust above.</p> <p>Detail reinforces the assessment but without modification.</p>

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	<p>The Key Developer Requirements does not mention the Local Wildlife Site or the need for avoiding, mitigating against or compensating the impacts on it.</p> <p>The policy makes no reference to the Green Infrastructure expectations and the policy should consider how green space provision links to the allocation to the west of Coventry lane (and vice versa).</p>	<p>incorporated as part of the green space provision.</p> <p>More detail should also be included on green infrastructure with relation to adjacent allocations.</p>		
		<p>The policy should explain the highways constraints of forming a junction with Coventry Lane or the desire to limit the number of junctions and provide a single junction to serve both of the allocations 3.3 & 3.4.</p>	<p>Agree. The Key Development Requirements have been amended to reference a single junction to serve both allocations.</p>	<p>Technical detail not affecting the assessment.</p>
	<p>The County may consider it appropriate that amendments with regard to education contributions (and/or further discussions) are appropriate.</p>		<p>Noted. As outlined in Policy 32 developer contributions may be sought from this development for education provision.</p>	
222 - Severn Trent	<p>It is likely that foul flows can be connected to the pipe on Latimer Drive. Flows from the east of the site may need to be pumped due</p>	<p>None suggested.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	<p>to the topography of the site.</p> <p>The potential impact on the sewage infrastructure is considered to be 'low'.</p> <p>Severn Trent has a duty to provide additional capacity to accommodate planned development. Developers should contact Severn Trent as early as possible to ensure that additional capacity can be planned into their investment programme.</p>			
6276 - Nottingham West Clinical Commissioning Group	<p>The nearest facilities to this development are Bramcote Surgery and Hickings Lane Medical Centre (which has recently extended but has capacity to extend further). Bramcote Surgery has some potential for small scale development.</p>	<p>Request S106 contribution to support the expansion to the physical capacity of these facilities.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>As outlined in Policy 32 developer contributions may be sought from this development for health provision.</p>	
6279 - Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum	<p>No exceptional circumstances exist for allowing 300 homes to be developed on the green belt – the financial straits of a private company can hardly be considered a matter for planning.</p>		<p>Disagree in part.</p> <p>Exceptional circumstances for the release of sites from the Green Belt have already been tested through the Core Strategy process (including legal challenge) in terms of the requirement to meet the housing need for the borough. However, other land not proposed for development can remain in the Green Belt.</p>	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
			<p>Agree in part.</p> <p>Finances are not a consideration (other than to ensure that the development can be delivered) for planning when determining the suitability of a site for development. Irrespective of the school redevelopment this site is located within the most sustainable part of the borough and was considered to be less important to retain in the Green Belt (as detailed in the Green Belt Review).</p>	
	The allocation does not account for the Local Wildlife Site.		Please see response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (above).	
	The housing figure is not justified and is at odds with the objectively assessed need for Bramcote.		<p>Disagree.</p> <p>The objectively assessed housing need has been done at a Housing Market Area level. The distribution of housing (with minimum figured for the South of the borough) has already been set in the Aligned Core Strategy.</p>	
	No Key Development Requirement for a drop off point on the land (accessed from Coventry Lane) and pedestrian access to the school.	Amend Key Development Requirements to include the provision for a school drop off area and pedestrian access to the school.	<p>Agree in part.</p> <p>Disagree that a vehicular drop off point should be included within the Policy as a Key Development Requirement as this would encourage car journeys. However, the principle of providing safe and attractive pedestrian and cycle links to the school from the site and surrounding areas is important and therefore the Key Development Requirement for a safe crossing point</p>	No impact on the assessment.

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
			on Coventry Lane to provide safe pedestrian and cycle access from the Stapleford side of the road, with links through to the Field Farm development, has been reinforced in the Policy.	
	The removal of vegetation from the cutting should be done in a way that does not compromise its stability.	None suggested.	Agree. The Key Development Requirement has been amended to include this as a stipulation.	No impact on the assessment.
	The policy aspiration for a replacement leisure centre should not be referred to as “(if required)” as local residents wish to see the leisure centre remain in Bramcote.	Amend Key Development Aspiration to remove the reference ‘if required’ with relation to the Leisure Centre.	Agree. The reference to ‘if required’ relates to the Councils emerging borough wide Leisure Strategy, as yet no decision has been taken as to the location of the replacement Leisure Centre. Irrespective of this, the uplift in housing numbers to 500 significantly increases the viability of the site and therefore likelihood of a replacement leisure centre being delivered.	No SA implications.
Developers / Owners of the Allocation Site				
6048 - White Hills Federation Trust (represented by Barton Willmore)	Support principle of Green Belt release and for housing development and acknowledges the exceptional circumstances. Object to the 300 unit capacity which proposes development at 18 dwellings/ha. Masterplanning work has shown that 500 dwellings would be more appropriate whilst still	Amend the Key Development Requirement for the site capacity to 500 dwellings.	Agree. The Key Development Requirement has been amended to include 500 as the indication of the number of homes that could be delivered. There is no ‘in principle’ issue with a higher number of homes being delivered on the site and known constraints can be appropriately addressed taking into account the	The increase in housing numbers does not alter the assessment of the housing criterion, as the threshold used is 300 dwellings. Taking account of mitigation measures, the

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	<p>incorporating access, open space, drainage, and links to neighbouring land.</p> <p>By making more appropriate use of the land it would accommodate a larger number of homes and reduce the impact on the Green Belt by reducing the level of land required to be removed (by taking a large proportion from the neighbouring proposed allocation in Stapleford policy 3.4)</p>		<p>other Key Development Requirements set out in the Policy</p> <p>Irrespective of higher delivery on this site it is considered that the adjacent site to the west of Coventry Lane in Stapleford is needed in order to contribute to the 5 year supply.</p>	<p>increase in housing numbers will also not alter the assessment of the biodiversity criterion.</p>
	Object to the wording of the requirement to incorporate design measures to slow the speed of traffic on Coventry Lane.	Amend the Key Development Requirement so that the commitment to incorporate design measures to slow the speed of traffic along Coventry Lane is linked only to the road frontage of the site where suitably possible.	Disagree. Reducing the speed of vehicles travelling along Coventry Lane is fundamental for creating a safe and attractive environment for pedestrians and cyclist. This is required to link the proposed developments with the wider area and will assist with the provision of a safe crossing point on Coventry Lane. This should be done in conjunction with the development on the opposite side of Coventry Lane.	
	Object to the requirement to provide a replacement school at a location south of the ridgeline and that the ridge should be kept free of built development.	Remove this Key Development Requirement.	Disagree. It is important that the ridgeline is kept free of built development due to its prominence in the landscape.	
	Object to the requirement that the school is delivered in conjunction with or prior to the	Remove this Key Development Requirement.	Disagree. It is acknowledged by the landowner that the existing school is not fit for	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	housing development and that no houses are occupied until the school is substantially complete. Site was previously considered a suitable housing site in its own merit; the site should not be responsible for a replacement school and are not mutually dependent. If this is not removed then the site is undeliverable as the funding for the school is reliant on the sale of the land for housing.		purpose and needs to be rebuilt. Coupled with the additional pressure on education as a result of the surrounding development (including this one) it is imperative that the timing of the school rebuild is directly linked to the enabling development.	
	Given the nature of the enabling development (for the school) the site will not provide 30% affordable housing.	None as this is expected to be deferred until the planning application.	Disagree. The expectation is set out in Policy and this is expected to be provided. The viability model in this case is different to the 'standard model' as the landowner is also a service provider and development is located in a high value area.	
Owners / Developers of other sites (not allocated)				
4200 - Taylor & Burrows Property (Represented by Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd)	Green Belt site that development will have a significant landscape impact. There is significant local objection including from the Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum. There are potential contamination issues from the adjacent landfill site. Ownership issues have been identified as a constraint. The restriction on the school being built before dwellings can be occupied will	Consider including more greenfield sites that do not have deliverability or viability issues. This should focus on more marketable areas of Eastwood to support growth and regeneration in a more positive fashion.	Disagree. The Council believes that delivery of the site is achievable at the time envisaged. It is not considered necessary to allocate any additional land for development.	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
6925 - Hillside Gospel Hall Trust (Represented by Pegasus Group)	The Hillside Gospel Trust land immediately adjacent to the housing allocation consisting of previously developed land and the Moor Farm Inn access off Coventry Lane should be included in the housing allocation. The land is available for development and has potential to accommodate approximately 40 dwellings.	Amend the allocation to include the land owned by the Gospel Hall Trust and amend the Key Development Requirement housing figure by increasing it by 40 dwellings. Map 8 & 10 should be amended to reflect this change.	<p>Agree. Site outline and housing number has been amended to include provision on the previously developed site immediately adjacent to the proposed allocation.</p> <p>It is the aspiration that the existing access road be closed to vehicular traffic so as to reduce the number of junctions along Coventry Lane (see response to Nottinghamshire County Council) and to incorporate this into part of the Green Infrastructure corridor linking the east with the west.</p>	<p>The proposed number of homes has no effect on the housing objective assessment, as the threshold used is 300 dwellings. There are no environmental constraints on the land, so no effect on the assessment in this regard. Negligible positive impact on the natural resources objective, as this land is previously-developed but the vast majority of the overall site is greenfield. There will be some waste as a result of demolition; however it would not be substantial enough to affect the assessment for this objective. Although a community facility</p>

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
				would be lost, there are several other similar facilities in the surrounding area, so the assessment for this objective would not be altered.
Local Residents				
17 Representations from 15 contributors: 14 objectors & 1 'comments only'	<u>Green Belt:</u> Should be kept for future generations and is needed for the wellbeing of existing residents.	Remove housing allocation from the plan.	Noted. The Green Belt plays an important role including preventing urban sprawl and protecting the openness of the countryside and the Council is committed to minimising the amount of Green Belt release whilst still ensuring that development needs are met.	
720 1060 1485 1494 3536 3586 5896 5951 5981 6057 6056 6523 6874 2565 5893 6445	Legal Protection of the Green Belt is being totally ignored.		The Green Belt is a planning policy tool. Green Belt boundaries can be amended and the process for doing this is through the Local Plan (as we are doing). In line with the Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum request all land not proposed for housing development is to remain in the Green Belt.	
	Brownfield sites should be developed first.		Noted. All deliverable brownfield sites have already been counted towards the housing number (and a windfall allowance has been included for future sites that are not yet known about) and there is a shortfall.	
	Bramcote is already built up and has joined to parts of Wollaton		Noted.	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	and Stapleford. <u>Housing Distribution:</u> Accept that housing is needed but Bramcote is taking more than its fair share of the borough wide housing distribution and is already one of the highest density populations of Nottinghamshire.		Noted. See response to Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum (above) re: housing distribution.	
	Concern about the cumulative impact of development.		Noted. The cumulative impact of development was assessed through the ACS.	
	<u>Green Infrastructure:</u> Does not provide enhanced Green Infrastructure when taken in context with adjacent development.		Noted. See the response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (above).	
	Green Corridor has already been eroded.			
	Development would prevent a wildlife corridor from Sandy Lane through the school site onto the canal.			
	No discussion about Bramcote Moor Local Wildlife Site which should be protected.			
	Green Infrastructure link along Moor Road is not wide enough.	A Green Corridor of at least 50 metres should be provided to create a buffer between new and existing houses.	Disagree. The provision of provision of Green Infrastructure Corridors is sound and this has been covered in the response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (above).	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
			However, the purpose of Green Infrastructure is not to act as a buffer between residential areas and it is not considered appropriate to set the width of at least 50 metres.	
	<u>Highways:</u> No evidence that design measures to slow traffic are deliverable.		Noted. Viability work shows that the site is viable and therefore the design measures are deliverable.	
	Highways, road structures and likelihood of increased congestion have not been considered, there is a lack of detailed solutions.	Include further detail on traffic impacts and how these will be mitigated.	Disagree. Highways' modelling for the overall numbers has been undertaken at ACS stage. Further work is underway and a detailed transport assessment including the proposed mitigation will need to be submitted at detailed planning application stage.	
	Coventry Lane is already a busy road and there is concern regarding congestion that the additional housing will create.		Noted. See response above.	
	The aspiration to mitigate the highways impact on the wider road network to ensure that congestion is not made worse should be obligatory.		Noted.	
	Pedestrian and vehicular access to the school should be from Moor Lane and Coventry Lane.	Car Park off Coventry Lane originally proposed by Biffa should be developed providing access to 'drop off' point for the school.	Disagree. See the response to Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum (above). In addition the former Biffa Landfill site is now in the ownership of the Council and is not available for the delivery of a vehicular 'drop off point'.	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	The A52 needs traffic calming to restrict the speed limit to 30 mph.		Noted. The A52 speed limit is outside of the control of the Borough Council and is unlikely to require an amendment as a result of this scheme.	
	<u>Air Quality/Pollution:</u> Will increase as a result of the development in an area of already high emissions, this is a concern considering the proximity to the school.		Noted. Encouraging the use of sustainable forms of travel through the provision of safe and attractive walking and cycling routes (including connections to the wider area) and the provision of a bus route are all including in the Key Development Requirements. In addition Policy 20: Air Quality seeks to ensure that new development considers air quality in its design.	
	<u>Bus Services:</u> Enhanced bus routes adjacent to the site not deliverable.		Noted. Viability work shows that the site is viable with policies as in the publication version of the plan.	
	Bramcote is well served by bus services which may need minor review of frequency and routing.		Noted. The Key Development Requirements include the need to enhance bus routes adjacent to the site as part of the development.	
	<u>Education/School Development:</u> The School should receive Central Government funding any money received from the sale of the land for housing development then the money should be spent on services provided by the County Council.		Noted. The funding for the redevelopment of the school is not within the control of the Borough Council and does not form the basis of planning decisions in the area.	
	Old school is viable and needs		Noted.	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	TLC and investment rather than a re-build.		This is contrary to the representations received by the school and County Council (as education provider) have submitted.	
	Support the provision of a replacement school which is badly needed.		Noted.	
	Delivery of the school looks like it is too onerous (consider Aldi at Stapleford).	Modify text to state: <i>“School redevelopment is to be delivered in conjunction with housing development (within the site outline shown on page 34) and no houses are to be occupied until the school is substantially complete”.</i>	Noted. See the response to The White Hills Federation (above).	
	<u>Leisure Centre:</u> Replacement will soon be needed and should be obligatory as local residents wish to see the leisure centre remain in Bramcote as a valued community facility. This should be funded by increasing the housing density to 40 dwellings per hectare. Leisure Centre should include competition spec pool and be built on the Park School site (prior to the demolition of the existing leisure centre) with the existing Leisure centre site being returned to park land.	Make leisure centre key development requirement (remove ‘if required’) and increase housing density (to 40 dwellings per hectare) to fund it.	Noted. See the response to Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum (above).	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	<p><u>Moor Lane Cutting:</u> Oppose the removal of vegetation as it is unnecessary and will destroy the character of the cutting.</p>		<p>Noted. Heritage advice has suggested that the removal of the vegetation from the cutting is an important way to maintain and reveal the cultural heritage assets (namely the historic graffiti) on the cutting.</p>	
	<p><u>Health Care:</u> Concern regarding the impact that the new homes will have on the existing health care facilities.</p>		<p>Noted. See the response to Nottingham West Clinical Commissioning Group (above).</p>	

Policy 3.4 Stapleford (West of Coventry Lane)

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
18 - Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) supported by Nottinghamshire Campaign for Better Transport.	Key Development Requirement includes provision for enhanced bus service ' <u>adjacent to</u> ' the site this is welcomed but insufficient to maximise alternative forms of travel to the car. In most instances the distance to the nearest bus stop would be a deterrent to people using the service.	Amend Key Development Requirement to include provision for bus services ' <u>into and through the sites</u> '.	Disagree. Likely to only be a single point of access and so provision of a circular route through such a small site seems unlikely to be feasible.	
34 - Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Objects to site allocation because of the significant encroachment into the surrounding countryside and because " <i>local needs have been met by the adjacent Field Farm site</i> ", achieving a strong corridor is very important. However agree with the Key Development Requirements regarding the need for the cemetery and Stapleford Hill to be adequately buffered forming a strong and robust habitat corridor linking to Bramcote Moor Grasslands Local Wildlife Site.	Allocation should be removed from the Plan. Clarify the extent of the corridor and provide policy guidance of how Green Infrastructure linkages will be provided with the adjacent Field Farm development.	Agree in part. Local needs have not been met by the Field Farm development in isolation. Achieving a strong corridor is very important and therefore the Key Development Requirements have been amended to provide more detail for the expected Green Infrastructure links.	Detail for the GI links reinforces the assessment.
211 - Nottinghamshire County Council	The policy makes no reference to the Green Infrastructure expectations	More detail should also be included on	Agree. See the response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (above).	See the response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	and the policy should consider how green space provision links to the allocation to the east of Coventry lane (and vice versa).	green infrastructure with relation to adjacent allocations.		above.
		The policy should explain the highways constraints of forming a junction with Coventry Lane or the desire to limit the number of junctions and provide a single junction to serve both of the allocations 3.3 & 3.4.	Agree. The Key Development Requirements have been amended to reference a single junction to serve both allocations.	Technical adjustment not affecting the assessment.
222 - Severn Trent	It is likely that a capital scheme would be required for a new gravity sewer to take the foul flow from the development to the Stapleford sewage treatment works. If foul flows were discharged to the south the topography suggests that a pumping station would be required. Surface water will be able to drain to pre-	None suggested.	Noted.	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	<p>existing surface water systems in the vicinity of the development.</p> <p>The potential impact on the sewage infrastructure is considered to be 'medium'.</p> <p>Severn Trent has a duty to provide additional capacity to accommodate planned development. Developers should contact Severn Trent as early as possible to ensure that additional capacity can be planned into their investment programme.</p>			
6276 - Nottingham West Clinical Commissioning Group	The nearest facilities to this development are Bramcote Surgery and Hickings Lane Medical Centre (which has recently extended but has capacity to extend further). Bramcote Surgery has some potential for small scale development.	Request S106 contribution to support the expansion to the physical capacity of these facilities.	Agree. As outlined in Policy 32 developer contributions may be sought from this development for health provision.	No SA implications for policy 3.3.
64 - Derbyshire County Council	Expresses concern that site allocations in Policy 3 at Chilwell, Toton and Stapleford "could potentially have significant effects upon roads in Derbyshire" and therefore "early engagement	None suggested.	Noted. The council is currently engaging with the East Midlands Gateway Modelling group and work is on-going.	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	with the East Midlands Modelling Group would be advisable”.			
73 - Stapleford Town Council	Does not support development on Green Belt land and object to policy 3.4 (and 3.3). The Town Council considers that these are important Green Belt areas, separating the town from Bramcote and Wollaton, and are an integral part of an important Green Belt corridor between the Borough and the City.	None suggested.	Noted.	
	Both sites would be isolated from the main infrastructure of the town, with no public transport which would necessitate the need for a car. There are no nearby schools, shops, health centres, community or leisure facilities and the developments were not large enough to encourage the expansion (or allocation of land) of such services in this area. Residents would therefore merely live within the development and find their		Disagree. The site is immediately adjacent to a primary and secondary school (which is to be rebuilt). There are local shops, a leisure centre and a park within walking distance.	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	needs met elsewhere, and so would contribute little to the local economy or the regeneration of Stapleford. Development would also add to existing traffic problems.			
2316 – Borough Councillor MacRae	No more development should take place on the West of Coventry Lane as this will join up with the development on Field Farm. The Council did not make it clear that they own part of the land behind the Crematorium.		Noted. Please see response to Stapleford Town Council (above).	
6882 - Broxtowe Labour Group	<i>“Consideration must be given to the preservation of a green corridor that runs between the North and the South of the borough”.</i>		Agree. See the response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (above).	See the response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust above.
Developers / Owners of the Allocation Site				
718 - J McCann& Co (Nottingham) Ltd (represented by Planning and Design Group)	Support allocation. Site is identified for its ability to provide enhanced Green Infrastructure corridors, improve pedestrian and traffic flows alongside providing a tranquillity buffer between Stapleford Hill and the crematorium.	None suggested.	Noted.	
1462 - (represented by GraceMachin Planning &	Support allocation, site it is available, suitable and deliverable. Site is physically and visually contained and	None suggested.	Noted.	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
Property)	will not extend into open countryside to the north. Site is well connected to nearby amenities and is easily accessible.			
Owners / Developers of other sites				
6048 - White Hills Federation Trust (represented by Barton Willmore)	By making more appropriate use of the Bramcote Allocation (Policy 3.3) it would accommodate a larger number of homes and reduce the impact on the Green Belt by reducing the level of land required to be removed (by taking a large proportion from this allocation).	Remove the allocation from the Plan and amend the Key Development Requirements for Policy 3.3 to increase the site capacity to 500 dwellings.	Disagree. See the response to White Hills Federation Trust (Policy 3.3).	
4200 - Taylor & Burrows Property (Represented by Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd)	Green Belt site that's release in conjunction with Field Farm and the adjacent allocation in Bramcote will cumulatively have a significant effect on the purposes of the Green Belt and should not be supported. Other Green Belt sites in Eastwood should be released first. Sustainability credentials of the site are questioned due to the reliance on cars to access key services and facilities.	Consider including more greenfield sites that do not have deliverability or viability issues. This should focus on more marketable areas of Eastwood to support growth and regeneration in a more positive fashion.	Disagree. This approach would be contrary to the spatial strategy and the site search sequence as set out in Policies 2 & 3 of the Aligned Core Strategy.	
Local Residents				

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
10 contributors - all object (+ 1 late representation reported separately) 720 1060 1485 1494 2565 3536 5951 6057 6056 6908	<u>Green Belt:</u> Should be kept for future generations and is needed for the wellbeing of existing residents.	Remove housing allocation from the plan.	Noted.	
	The Green Belt Assessment does not include ecology as an assessment criteria		Noted. Ecological Assessment is not one of the purposes of the Green Belt (as set out in the NPPF).	
	<u>Highways / Traffic:</u> Local road network unable to accommodate additional traffic.		Disagree. Transport modelling work has already been undertaken to ensure that there is capacity on the roads to accommodate additional housing in the area. More detailed modelling work is being undertaken to support the allocations on both sides of Coventry Lane.	
	Coventry Lane is already a busy road and there is concern regarding congestion that the additional housing will create.			
	Highways, road structures and likelihood of increased congestion have not been considered, there is a lack of detailed solutions.	Include further detail on traffic impacts and how these will be mitigated.		
	<u>Bus Services:</u> Enhanced bus routes adjacent to the site not deliverable.		Noted. Viability work shows that the site is viable with policies as in the publication version of the plan.	
	Unsustainable development on lack of public transport and no access to amenities such as shop.		Noted. The Key Development Requirements include the need to enhance bus routes adjacent to the site as part of the development.	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
			Green Infrastructure is a fundamental part of the development in order to link the site to the wider area (including shops).	
	<u>Air Quality/Pollution:</u> Will increase as a result of the development in an area of already high emissions, this is a concern considering the proximity to the school.		Noted. The spatial strategy (Policy 2 of the Aligned Core Strategy) aims to direct development to the more sustainable south of the borough. Whilst this is already the most built up part of the borough that is the reason why it is more sustainable as existing facilities and services can be more readily accessed via sustainable forms of transport.	
	<u>Green Infrastructure / Wildlife Corridor:</u> Cumulative development will fragment the Green Corridor.		Noted. See response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (above).	
	Bramcote Ridge Green Corridor will be blocked by this development.	Strip of land 50 metres wide should be set aside as Green Infrastructure Corridor and should be located adjacent to Moor Road from Bramcote Ridge to the trees adjacent to the old Nottingham canal and should be planted with trees.	Disagree. The provision of Green Infrastructure Corridors is sound and this has been covered in the response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (above). However, the purpose of Green Infrastructure is not to act as a buffer between residential areas and it is not considered appropriate to set the width of at least 50 metres.	
	Development would prevent		Noted.	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	a wildlife corridor from Sandy Lane through the school site onto the canal.		See response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (above).	
	View from Stapleford Hill will be destroyed		Disagree.	
	The site includes important mature woodland, grassland, hedgerow and freshwater habitats (Boundary Brook). The development of the site will close off two secondary wildlife corridors identified in the Green Infrastructure Strategy.	Buffers of at least 30 metres should be provided around each of these features (50 metres would be more suitable). This would make the site unviable.	Agree in part. Wildlife Corridors are an important aspect of the development and this has been reflected in amendments to the policy. The amendments are designed to ensure that the wildlife corridors are not closed off. However, it is not considered appropriate to include buffers around the features listed as this would sterilise large parts of the site from development.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
	<u>Health Care:</u> Concern regarding the impact that the new homes will have on the existing health care facilities.		Noted. Please see the response to the Nottinghamshire Clinical Commissioning Group (above).	

Policy 3.5 Severn Trent (Lilac Grove)

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
34 - Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Considers that the field at the end of Cornwall Avenue should remain undeveloped and should form part of the Green Infrastructure corridor as it acts as a buffer to the Beeston Canal Local Wildlife Site.	Clarification of the extent of the Green Infrastructure is required. Confirm that the fields along Beeston Canal will not be developed and that long-term management of the Green Infrastructure will be secured.	Agree. The field at the end of Cornwall Avenue has been removed from the Allocation and designated as Local Green Space in policy 27.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
48 - Sport England	Any development should ensure that there will be no negative impacts on the adjacent sports pitches. The Playing Pitch Strategy refers to the Nottingham Casuals site which is stated as overplayed and needs investment of £340,000 for changing room improvements and floodlighting.	The need to maintain, protect or replace such facilities should be accounted for in the policy.	Agree. There is a strip of land between the allocation and sports pitches and therefore it is considered unlikely that there would be any negative impact on the adjacent sports pitches however mitigation has been added in as a Key Development Requirement.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
55 - Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign)	National Policy supports cycling as well as walking and this should be specifically referred to in the policy which includes a proposal for a pedestrian bridge over the canal.	Amend Key Development Requirement to refer specifically to the need for good cycle access, as well as pedestrian access.	Agree. The Key Development Requirements have been amended to specifically reference cycling access as well as pedestrian.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
211 - Nottinghamshire County Council	Concerned that locating housing directly adjacent to the existing Household Waste Recycling Centre on Lilac Grove could lead to complaints from future occupiers. The established operational facility should be safeguarded to ensure that its operation is not unreasonably restricted (particularly with regards to noise issues).	Amend the 'Key Development Requirements' and justification text to reflect the need to safeguard the continued operation of the Household Waste Recycling Centre by ensuring " <i>an appropriate stand-off distance and landscape screening measures</i> " to avoid potential future land use conflict.	Agree. The Key Development Requirements have been amended to reflect the need for an appropriate stand-off distance to the waste-recycling centre and the sewage treatment works.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
1460 - Beeston and District Civic Society	The field at the end of Cornwall Avenue is of value as a natural green space as it forms part of a green corridor abutting the canal and has historic interest. The field is valued by the local community.	Amend the allocation to omit the field at the end of Cornwall Avenue and designate it as Local Green Space. The field to the rear of East Crescent and Elswick Drive " <i>could be included as a green buffer between existing housing and the Severn Trent site</i> ".	Agree. See response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (above).	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
6276 - Nottingham West Clinical Commissioning Group	There are 4 GP practices providing healthcare for the area; Abbey Medical Centre, The Manor Surgery, The Oaks Medical Centre and West End Surgery. The Oaks Medical Centre is currently extending but is unlikely to accommodate the capacity from all of the future planned development.	Request S106 contribution to provide clinical space required as a result of the development.	Noted. As outlined in Policy 32 developer contributions may be sought from this development for health provision.	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
6432, 6816, 6817, 6818, 6819, 6820, 6822, 6825, 6843, 6875, 6906, 6975 - Beeston Wildlife Group	The field at Cornwall Avenue should be removed from the Severn Trent site allocation as it is of great value to the community and wildlife. It is part of a green corridor stretching from the canal to Lilac Grove and is an important route for wildlife. The field is of historic value and contains the remains of an ancient track.	<p>Cornwall Avenue Field (with surrounding hedgerows should be removed from the allocation and designated as Local Green Space.</p> <p>The adjacent field (extending the length of Leyton Crescent Recreation Ground) should also be allocated as Local Green Space.</p>	<p>Agree. See response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (above).</p> <p>The hedgerows will form the boundary to the allocation however; the Key Development Requirements will be amended to ensure that these are retained.</p>	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
6882 - Broxtowe Labour Group	Allocation should exclude the 'Horses Field' at the back of Cornwall Avenue.	Amend the allocation to omit the field at the end of Cornwall Avenue.	Agree. See response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (above).	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
Owners / Developers of other sites (not allocated)				
2542 - (represented by Featherstones)	Uncertainty of housing delivery at the site due to contamination.	<p>Council should consider removing more sites from the Green Belt and allocating them for development, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land at Gilt Hill Farm Kimberley; • land off Back Lane Nuthall; • land off Sisley Avenue 	<p>Disagree. The Council believes that delivery of the site is achievable at the time envisaged. It is not considered necessary to allocate any additional land for development.</p>	
4622 - (represented by Featherstones)				
6881 - (represented by Featherstones)				

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
		Stapleford, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land off Baulk Lane Stapleford, • North West Hill Top Stapleford • Hill Top Farm Stapleford 		
2652 - W Westerman (represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd)	Uncertainty of housing delivery at the site due to former use as a sewage treatment work likely to require complex decontamination and remediation.	The Council should plan for more houses so that there is sufficient flexibility to take account of sites that may be delayed or not deliver.		
2685 - Bloor Homes Ltd (represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd)		Removing more sites from the Green Belt and allocating them for development, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low Wood Road in Nuthall; • Land at Mansfield Road, Eastwood; • Additional land at Toton. 		
4200 - Taylor & Burrows Property (Represented by Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd)	Issues regarding the ecological impact of the development upon Beeston Canal Wildlife Site and potential contamination from landfill site.	Consider including more greenfield sites that do not have deliverability or viability issues. This should focus on more marketable areas of Eastwood to support growth and regeneration in a more positive fashion.		
Local Residents				
30 contributors- all objectors	<u>Cumulative development:</u> Concern regarding cumulative	Site should be removed from the plan as an allocation and	Noted. The cumulative impact of	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
(+ 1 late representation reported separately)	impact of development on sites such as Boots and Beeston Business Park on local infrastructure, traffic, the environment and wildlife.	there should be a permanent ban on building.	development in this location was assessed at the time of the Aligned Core Strategy Examination (and was found to be acceptable); however, since this point the number of homes allocated in the area has been reduced.	
6958 6959 6955 3349 6960 6962 6961 6953	<u>Green Infrastructure:</u> Concern about the impact on the canal and open space given that there is a limited amount in and around Beeston.		Noted. See response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (above).	
6952 6954 6956 6957 6951 1365 2413 3637 6806 6812 6813	Field off Cornwall Avenue is important for the character of the area, habitat and is of high value to the local community for amenity and recreation.	Field off Cornwall Avenue (and surrounding hedgerow) should be removed from the allocation and designated as Local Green Space.	Agree. See response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust and Beeston Wildlife Group (above).	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
6814 6815 6823 6824 6840 6846 6847		Adjacent land at the rear of Layton Crescent (not included in the allocation) is an important route for wildlife and land should be designated as Local Green Space.		
6848 6855 6900	Open spaces are important for health and wellbeing, this area is easily accessible to the local			

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
6913	community and will act as a break			
6989	between built developments			
6990	proposed.			
	The area is of historic interest			
	(including an ancient track).			
	Mature hedgerows surround the			
	area and should be retained for			
	wildlife and historic value.			

Further discussion with the landowner following the close of the consultation has led to a reduction in the site area (and subsequent housing numbers expected to be delivered on the site). This has no significant SA implications.

Policy 3.6 Beeston Maltings

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
34 - Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Transport corridors can provide essential wildlife habitat. Given the lack of a buffer on the south of the railway line some form of green link along the southern development boundary should be provided.	Include a new 'Key Development Requirement' for the provision of a Green link along the railway line.	Agree. The current site allocation does not directly abut the railway line. However, following further discussion with the landowner of the Stallion Garage (which is currently outside the red line) the allocation has been amended to include it within the red line. It would then seem appropriate to include a Green Infrastructure link along the railway line.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site. The increase in the site area, in itself, also does not affect the appraisal.
222 - Severn Trent	<p>Based on the topography it is likely that the development will connect to the sewage system on Cartwright Way, surface water would also drain to the existing system on this road.</p> <p>The potential impact on the sewage infrastructure is considered to be 'low'.</p> <p>Severn Trent has a duty to provide additional capacity to accommodate planned development. Developers should contact Severn Trent as early as possible to ensure that additional capacity can be planned into</p>	None suggested.	Noted.	

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	their investment programme.			
6276 - Nottingham West Clinical Commissioning Group	<p>There are 4 GP practices providing healthcare for the area; Abbey Medical Centre, The Manor Surgery, The Oaks Medical Centre and West End Surgery.</p> <p>The Oaks Medical Centre is currently extending but is unlikely to accommodate the capacity from all of the future planned development.</p>	Request S106 contribution to provide clinical space required as a result of the development.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>As outlined in Policy 32 developer contributions may be sought from this development for health provision.</p>	
Owners / Developers of other sites (not allocated)				
2542 - (represented by Featherstones)	<p>Site was allocated in the 2004 Local Plan and there are obviously reasons why delivery has not taken place sooner, therefore delivery is uncertain.</p>	<p>Council should consider removing more sites from the Green Belt and allocating them for development, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land at Gilt Hill Farm Kimberley; • land off Back Lane Nuthall; • land off Sisley Avenue Stapleford, • land off Baulk Lane Stapleford, • North West Hill Top Stapleford • Hill Top Farm Stapleford 	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>The Council believes that delivery of the site is achievable at the time envisaged. It is not considered necessary to allocate any additional land for development.</p>	
4622 - (represented by Featherstones)				
6881 - (represented by Featherstones)				
2652 - W Westerman	Site has been allocated since 2004. It remains a difficult and	The Council should plan for more houses so that there		

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
<p>(represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd)</p> <p>2685 - Bloor Homes Ltd (represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd)</p>	<p>complex site and delivery is highly uncertain.</p>	<p>is sufficient flexibility to take account of sites that may be delayed or not deliver. Removing more sites from the Green Belt and allocating them for development, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low Wood Road in Nuthall; • Land at Mansfield Road, Eastwood; • Additional land at Toton. 		
<p>4200 - Taylor & Burrows Property (Represented by Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd)</p>	<p>Site was allocated in 2004 and cleared in 2012, delivery within the plan period is questioned due to lack of delivery to date. Development could result in harm to non-designated heritage assets in Dovecote Lane area. Network rail discussions show there are some legal issues bringing this site forward with regards to objections from freight operators. Therefore there is uncertainty regarding the delivery of the site.</p>	<p>Consider including more greenfield sites that do not have deliverability or viability issues. This should focus on more marketable areas of Eastwood to support growth and regeneration in a more positive fashion.</p>		

Policy 3.7 Beeston Cement Depot

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
18 - Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) supported by Nottinghamshire Campaign for Better Transport.	Key Development Requirement includes provision for enhanced bus service ' <u>adjacent to</u> ' the site this is welcomed but insufficient to maximise alternative forms of travel to the car. In most instances the distance to the nearest bus stop would be a deterrent to people using the service.	Amend Key Development Requirement to include provision for bus services ' <u>into and through the sites</u> '.	Disagree. Likely to only be a single point of access and so provision of a circular route through such a small site in close proximity to the train station seems unlikely to be feasible.	
34 - Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Transport corridors can provide essential wildlife habitat. Given the lack of a buffer on the south of the railway line some form of green link along the southern development boundary should be provided.	Include a new 'Key Development Requirement' for the provision of a Green link along the railway line.	Agree. Key Development Requirement has been amended to include the need to provide a Green link along the railway line.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
55 - Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign)	Welcome the inclusion of cycle access as a Key Development Requirement as this is of direct relevance to improving the substandard stretch of Sustrans National Cycle Network Route 6 and is of particular importance to improving cycle access to and from the station.	None suggested.	Agree. Key Development Requirement has been amended to ensure that a Green Link is provided and that this includes provision for Pedestrian and cycling footpath.	
222 – Severn	Sewage from the development is	None suggested.	Noted.	

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
Trent	<p>likely to join the network on Station Road; surface water can be connected to the local network.</p> <p>The potential impact on the sewage infrastructure is considered to be 'low'.</p> <p>Severn Trent has a duty to provide additional capacity to accommodate planned development. Developers should contact Severn Trent as early as possible to ensure that additional capacity can be planned into their investment programme.</p>			
6276 - Nottingham West Clinical Commissioning Group	<p>There are 4 GP practices providing healthcare for the area; Abbey Medical Centre, The Manor Surgery, The Oaks Medical Centre and West End Surgery.</p> <p>The Oaks Medical Centre is currently extending but is unlikely to accommodate the capacity from all of the future planned development.</p>	Request S106 contribution to provide clinical space required as a result of the development.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>As outlined in Policy 32 developer contributions may be sought from this development for health provision.</p>	
Developers / Owners of the Allocation Site				
2716 - Network Rail	Support allocation in principle but the level of development proposed represents a significant under-use of a brownfield site. Site can support a higher density with a minimum of 40 dwellings and the potential for up to 100 dwellings.	Amend the Key Development Requirements to provide at least 40 dwellings, with a caveat that this could be higher subject to suitable design.	Agree in part. Urban regeneration and concentration is an important part of the Councils Spatial Strategy. Therefore if a higher density is achievable the Council support this.	The increase in the housing numbers does not significantly alter the SA implications.

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
			The Key Development Requirements has been amended to reference 40 homes.	
Owners / Developers of other sites (not allocated)				
4200 - Taylor & Burrows Property (Represented by Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd)	Potential contamination issues which might impact upon the delivery of the site.	Consider including more greenfield sites that do not have deliverability or viability issues. This should focus on more marketable areas of Eastwood to support growth and regeneration in a more positive fashion.	Disagree. The Council believes that delivery of the site is achievable at the time envisaged. It is not considered necessary to allocate any additional land for development.	
Local Residents				
2 contributors 1 supporter, 1 objector	Important that brownfield sites are redeveloped.	None suggested.	Agree.	No SA implications.
6809 6810	Insufficient space for housing development on the land.	None suggested.	Disagree. See response to Network Rail (above).	

Policy 3.8 Wollaton Road Beeston

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
222 - Severn Trent	<p>The building adjacent to the proposed development site has experienced flooding recently. The development is unlikely to have a noticeable impact on Severn Trent sewage infrastructure but is likely to flood.</p> <p>The potential impact on the sewage infrastructure is considered to be 'low'.</p> <p>Severn Trent has a duty to provide additional capacity to accommodate planned development. Developers should contact Severn Trent as early as possible to ensure that additional capacity can be planned into their investment programme.</p>	None suggested.	Noted.	
6276 - Nottingham West Clinical Commissioning Group	<p>There are 4 GP practices providing healthcare for the area; Abbey Medical Centre, The Manor Surgery, The Oaks Medical Centre and West End Surgery.</p> <p>The Oaks Medical Centre is currently extending but is unlikely to accommodate the capacity from all of the future planned development.</p>	Request S106 contribution to provide clinical space required as a result of the development.	Noted. As outlined in Policy 32 developer contributions may be sought from this development for health provision.	

Policy 4.1 Land west of Awsworth (inside the Bypass)

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
18 - Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) supported by Nottinghamshire Campaign for Better Transport.	Key Development Requirement includes provision for enhanced bus service ' <u>adjacent to</u> ' the site this is welcomed but insufficient to maximise alternative forms of travel to the car. In most instances the distance to the nearest bus stop would be a deterrent to people using the service.	Amend Key Development Requirement to include provision for bus services ' <u>into and through the sites</u> '.	Disagree. One of the Key Development Aspirations is the internal road layout of the site should be designed in a way to deter rat-running therefore it is unlikely that a bus route through a convoluted layout would be feasible.	
34 - Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	A substantial population of common toad was known to be present in the vicinity of the site. Toad tunnels were installed underneath the bypass to allow for their migration (although the tunnels have not been maintained). The allocated site could still provide terrestrial habitat for the common toad (which is a biodiversity asset) and the strong hedgerow network will provide habitat for other species. Surveys are required for the common toad and other wildlife with the possible reinstatement of the toad tunnels if required.	Remove the allocation from the Plan.	Disagree. The allocation will not be removed from the plan.	
		If the allocation remains substantial green infrastructure should be provided including the retention of the existing hedges and some meadows.	Agree in part. Green Infrastructure is an important part of the allocation and the expectations for this will be set out more clearly in the Key Development Requirements including the retention of hedgerows where possible. Reference to retaining some meadows has not been included in the policy as this would restrict the developable area and subsequently the quantum of development achievable on the site which in turn would mean that further Green Belt release was required.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
		Common toads should be protected if they still occur.	Agree. The Key Development Requirements have been amended so that common	This change will improve the sustainability of

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
			loads should be protected if found on the site and mitigation would be required.	the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
55 - Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign)	The plan should make it clear that good cycle links are required as well as pedestrian links. The need for good cycle as well as pedestrian crossings of the bypass should be specifically mentioned especially in the context of the need to upgrade the cycle route to and from Bennerley Viaduct. Endorse the detailed comments made by Sustrans.	Amend the Key Development Requirements to make specific reference to good cycle (as well as pedestrian) connections specifically relating to crossing the bypass and routes to and from Bennerley Viaduct.	Agree. The Key Development Requirements have been amended to make specific reference to the need for good pedestrian and cycle links and crossing points towards the Viaduct.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
68 - Awsworth Parish Council 6537 - Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	Currently the requirement to mitigate the highways impact on the wider road network is a Key development Aspiration and it is considered that this is a fundamental issue to ensure highway safety; it is therefore considered that this should be part of the Key Development Requirements in the Policy itself.	Move the Key Development Aspiration relating to highways impact into the Key Development Requirement section above. Clarify mitigation to include specific reference to highways safety and the need to address the detrimental impact on local	Agree in principle. Safe highway access to and through catering for different modes of transport are a fundamental requirement for all development. This is set out in Policy 14 of the Aligned Core Strategy and Paragraph 2.5 of the Part 2 Local Plan. It is not considered necessary to reiterate this in every allocation in the plan as the policies expected to be read as a whole and not applied in isolation.	No SA implications.

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
		residents and the environment.		
68 - Awsworth Parish Council 6537 - Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	The current Key development Aspirations refers to 'more limited vehicular access if expected from Newton's Lane and Barlow Drive North' which is against the wishes of the local community. Site promoters have discussed this with the Parish and have amended plans to remove this connection. Park Hill is unsuitable as it is an extremely narrow access road and Station Road (which is a continuation of Park Hill) is over capacity already.	Amend the Key Developer Aspirations to state that there should be no vehicular connection between the proposed new housing site and the existing housing estate via Park Hill or Barlow Drive North.	Disagree. Dialogue regarding the most appropriate access to the site is on-going with both the Landowner and the County Council. The vehicular connection between Barlow Drive North and the site is currently set out as an aspiration (i.e. it is not a requirement for the development) however without detail of the design of the scheme (which will be submitted at detailed planning application stage). It is not considered appropriate to prevent this from being a possibility.	
68 - Awsworth Parish Council 6537 - Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	Description of the allocation states that it includes a small number of existing dwellings which is unclear.	Amend the site description to state that the allocation includes two existing dwellings one of which (The View) would be retained.	Agree in part. The site description has been amended to reference 'two existing dwellings'. The retention of the dwellings is an issue for the landowners.	Insignificant in the context of the numbers of homes involved.
68 - Awsworth Parish Council 6537 - Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	The provision of adequate and timely infrastructure is key for the local community.	The Plan " <i>should make clear the infrastructure likely to be required to adequately support the proposed new housing development</i> ".	Agree in principle. The provision of adequate and timely infrastructure is also important for Broxtowe Borough Council. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out the infrastructure requirements for the development and this will be provided at	No SA implications.

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
68 - Awsworth Parish Council	The local community have concerns regarding the potential adverse implications for traffic flows and highways safety (particularly at peak times). Concerns are raised regarding:	The Plan should “ <i>more accurately and clearly set out the requirements for any new housing development in relation to satisfactorily addressing traffic implications for the local highway network</i> ”.	the appropriate time (via a S106 agreement). Agree in principle. The bypass should not be compromised by any new development.	Insignificant given the transport modelling evidence.
6537 - Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congestion on the bypass as a result of a new access point. • Impact on existing residents of creating an access onto Newtons Lane which currently is a no through route. • Impact on the Main Street. • Concern that drivers will use the new route to avoid delay on the bypass. • Any vehicular access via Park Hill and Barlow Drive North. 	“ <i>The local community are especially concerned that the purpose of the A6096 Shilo Way Bypass should not be compromised</i> ”	Transport modelling to ensure that the highways have capacity for the number of new homes at Awsworth has already been undertaken as part of the Core Strategy work. Further detailed work will be required to be submitted at detailed planning application stage.	
68 - Awsworth Parish Council	It is unclear what the significant benefits are (particularly with regards to health and transport) that the justification text purports to with regarding ‘what the sustainability appraisal says’.	The justification text should be clearer regarding the benefits of the policy that are reported in the Sustainability Appraisal.	Noted. The ‘what the Sustainability Appraisal says’ text reported in the Plan is a very brief summary. The full justification can be found in the Sustainability Appraisal document and appendix which was published for consultation alongside the	
6537 - Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group				

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
			Plan. To include a more detailed summary in the plan would not be practical as it would increase the size of the plan significantly.	
142 - Historic England	Heritage assets are not mentioned in the policy or subsequent text even though the Grade II* Bennerley Viaduct forms a key feature in relation to the site.	Insert reference to the conservation or enhancement of heritage assets and their setting into the Key Development Requirements or Aspirations.	Agree. A new Key Development Requirement has been inserted regarding the need to conserve or enhance heritage assets and their setting making specific reference to Bennerley Viaduct.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
211 - Nottinghamshire County Council	The proposed access from the bypass <i>"is only to be considered as a last resort and wouldn't be favoured by the highway authority"</i> the policy seems to be inconsistent with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.		Noted. See response to Awsworth Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan Steering group (above).	
222 - Severn Trent	Surface water from the development will be able to drain to a local watercourse. Foul water from the development will join a combined sewer running through the site. The potential impact on the sewage infrastructure is considered to be 'medium'.	None suggested.	Noted.	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	Severn Trent has a duty to provide additional capacity to accommodate planned development. Developers should contact Severn Trent as early as possible to ensure that additional capacity can be planned into their investment programme.			
5908 - Sustrans	The network cycling and walking routes within the borough should be improved. Particularly that of the former Great Northern Path which runs through the borough from Hemphill Vale through Kimberley and Awsworth across Bennerley Viaduct. The policy does not adequately the opportunity to enhance the Great Northern Path (and connections) into a good quality multi-purpose route.	Request S106 contributions area sought for improvements along the trail.	Noted. Please see amended Policy 32, developer contributions may be sought from this development for cycling and footpath routes.	
	The policy does not incorporate requirements for creating good quality walking and cycling routes within and through the site.	Amend Key Development Requirements to include: Provide safe pedestrian and cycling crossing points across the bypass.	Agree. The Key Development Requirements already require the provision of safe pedestrian crossing points across the bypass but this has been expanded to include the provision for cyclists.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
				not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
		Provide a toucan crossing across the bypass for the Great Northern Path.	Agree in principle. Agree that a safe crossing point is required however, it is yet to be determined what the most appropriate form of crossing will be and therefore this has not been included in the policy as a specific requirement.	No SA implications.
		Enhance walking and cycling routes to Ilkeston Station	This is already included in the Key Development Requirements.	
		Enhance the Erewash Valley Trail in the vicinity of the site.	This would be covered by the existing Key Development Requirement to enhance the Green Infrastructure Corridors linking Awsworth with Ilkeston/Cotmanhay. In addition the amended Policy 32 may seek developer contribution from this development for cycling and footpath routes.	
		Create good quality walking and cycling routes through the site and connect to the surrounding network of paths and trails.	Agree. The Key Development Requirements have been amended to include reference to walking and cycling routes through the site with connections to the wider walking and cycling network.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	Initial assessments have been carried out along this section of the Great Northern Path and Sustrans have some preliminary recommendations on where improvements are required. However a detailed feasibility study of the whole route is necessary and any improvements should be based on the recommendations of the study.	Amend the policy to include reference to a feasibility study of the Great Northern Path corridor. Which will inform the enhancement and improvement's required to the Great Northern Path and its Green Infrastructure Corridor both east, linking to Kimberley and west, linking to Bennerley Viaduct.	Agree in principle. The Key Development Requirements have been amended to include specific reference to the Great Northern Path with regards to the need to enhance the Green Infrastructure corridors. However, the policy cannot include a caveat which could affect the delivery of the site until a feasibility study is undertaken. It is unclear what the timescales are for the feasibility study and it would not be appropriate to stall development until a third party has undertaken additional work.	Detail reinforces the assessment.
6276 - Nottingham West Clinical Commissioning Group	<p>The nearest facilities for this development are Church St Medical Centre and Church Walk Eastwood.</p> <p>A new health centre for Eastwood is the CCG's top priority as the old health centre is no longer fit for purpose and has recently been disposed of. The existing facilities cannot be extended and are due to merge into a single practice in April 2018 which is then going to be relocated to a new facility on the Walker Street site.</p>	Request S106 contributions to facilitate the new health centre in Eastwood.	Noted. As outlined in Policy 32 developer contributions may be sought from this development for health provision.	
Developers / Owners of the Allocation Site				

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
2607 - Harworth Group (Represented by Pegasus Group)	Support the allocation. The Councils evidence demonstrates that the site is sustainable and that exceptional circumstances exist to justify its release from the Green Belt. The developer has engaged with the Council and local community in order to masterplan the site.	None suggested.	Noted	
	It is considered that the limited vehicular access from Barlow Drive North (set out in the Key Developer Aspirations) is not necessary as the site can be accessed from Shiloh Way and Newtons Lane.	Amend Key Developer Aspirations to remove the reference to a potential vehicular connection to Barlow Drive North.	Noted. See response to Awsworth Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan Steering group (above).	
	The proposed new access from Shiloh Way will provide traffic calming measures through the provision of a new traffic light controlled junction which will facilitate easier access to Bennerley Viaduct.	None suggested.	Noted.	
	Site can largely be delivered in the 5 years period and makes an important contribution towards the Council's development strategy.	None suggested.	Noted.	
Local Residents				

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
4 contributors - all objectors 2339 4169 4214 6856	Green Belt site and only open space to the west of the Village.	Build opposite Cossall Industrial Estate and land off the A610 instead as it has better access to transport and there would be less objections from residents.	Noted. Please see site selection document.	
	Development will make traffic congestion worse. Main Street and Park Hill are inadequate for extra traffic. Additional access to/from the Bypass will cause further congestion along the Bypass which is gridlocked at peak times.		Noted. See response to Awsworth Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan Steering group (above).	
	More houses and connections to Ilkeston or Cotmanhay will increase crime.	Maintain status quo and improve areas affected by crime.	Noted.	
	Bennerley Viaduct should be left as it is.		Noted. See response to Historic England (above).	
	Inadequate services in the village including school and health facilities.		Noted. As outlined in Policy 32 developer contributions may be sought from this development for education or health provision.	
	Schools cannot accommodate the additional pupils without extension and unclear where funding is coming from.			
	Site floods and has drainage issues which would get worse if houses were built	Allocate a different site without flooding issues.	Disagree. Policy 1 will ensure that the site will mitigate any flood risk to the	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	and only possible place to drain would be Nature Reserve.		surrounding area.	
	Increase of emissions will have an impact on air quality and noise pollution.	Allocate a different site where air quality is better.	Noted.	
	Development will have a negative impact on biodiversity and wildlife.	Allocate a different site where wildlife will not be affected.	Disagree. See response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (above).	
	Object to access from Barlow Drive North due to increased risk of accidents and pollution.	Avoid opening up existing roads.	Noted. See response to Awsworth Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan Steering group (above).	
	Concern about the design of the housing and the potential overlooking impact on the existing houses.	Provide landscaping between existing and new houses and prevent existing houses being overlooked.	Noted. The detailed design of the development will be considered during the planning application stage. There will be a requirement for a landscaping scheme that mitigates the impact on the amenity of the existing residents.	
	Concern regarding impact on house price through loss of view.		Noted. Impact on house prices is not a planning consideration.	
1 lead petitioner 5965 with 140 signatories.	Do not oppose the housing site allocation however they are concerned about the proposal of a road exit onto The Lane via Newtons Lane. The By Pass (Shiloh Way) was built to move traffic away from the school, crèche and playing fields on The Lane. It is important to prevent more traffic from passing the		Noted. See response to Awsworth Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan Steering group (above).	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	<p>school due to the health of the children. Therefore the road layout should be re-configuring so that a new junction be provided onto the Bypass off Newtons Lane and bollards be used to prevent new residents and other traffic from entering Awsworth.</p>			

Policy 5.1 East of Church Lane, Brinsley

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
18 - Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) supported by Nottinghamshire Campaign for Better Transport.	Key Development Requirement includes provision for enhanced bus service ' <u>adjacent to</u> ' the site this is welcomed but insufficient to maximise alternative forms of travel to the car. In most instances the distance to the nearest bus stop would be a deterrent to people using the service.	Amend Key Development Requirement to include provision for bus services ' <u>into and through the sites</u> '.	Disagree. Likely to only be a single point of access and so provision of a circular route through such a small site seems unlikely to be feasible.	
34 - Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Objects to site allocation. It is located immediately adjacent to Brinsley Headstocks Local Nature Reserve, Brinsley Brook Grassland Local Wildlife Site and Brinsley Headstocks Local Wildlife Site which are identified for their botanical interest.	Remove allocation from the Plan and substitute with 'Option 2'.	Disagree. The site allocation will not be removed from the plan. However, the Key Development Requirements have been amended to include the requirement to include additional planting to the south of the residential allocation which will assist in providing a buffer. The south/eastern corner of the allocation is adjacent to Brinsley Brook and the Key Development Requirement has been amended to include the provision of an appropriate buffer or other mitigation to ensure that the Local Wildlife Site is not detrimentally impacted upon.	
	The fields in the vicinity of the allocation are considered important for wintering farmland birds and other kinds of wildlife. Concerned about possible hydrological impacts on Brinsley		Noted. See response (above). The Key Development Requirement for SuDS to be provided to the South of the allocation has now been shown on an additional plan for clarity with land not	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	Brook and potential for adverse impact on the ecology.		required for SuDS to include additional planting to form a publically accessible amenity area. The aim of this Key Development Requirement is to provide an area which will militate against any hydrological impact on the brook and ecology and will provide a long term defensible Green Belt boundary to the south of the residential allocation.	
67 - Brinsley Parish Council 6939 - Brinsley Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	Oppose the allocation as is not consistent with National Policy because in Green Belt terms it encroaches into the countryside on a previously undeveloped location.	Remove the allocation from the plan and allocate Land north of Cordy Lane instead.	Disagree. See Green Belt Review.	
	Development would damage the character of the village.		Disagree.	
	Development will create sprawl away from existing residential area, school and other amenities and would create a new settlement which would not integrate with the rest of the village.		Disagree.	
	Land of least environmental value should be chosen for development.		Noted. This is one of many criteria used to assess the impact of development. See the Sustainability Appraisal and the Green Belt Review.	
	Heritage assets should be protected. Church Lane is home to D H Lawrence and mining history through the Headstocks		Agree. See representations from Historic England.	See representations from Historic England.

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	Country Park. Site should be within walking distance of amenities (without having to cross a busy road).		Agree in principle. This site is within close proximity (walking distance) to the amenities within the village. The road is already serviced by a crossing point which is used to access the adjacent recreation ground.	No amendment to assessment necessary.
	The natural environment should be protected, development will cause harm to wildlife, on the site and on the adjacent Local Wildlife Site and Nature Reserve.		Noted. See response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (above).	
	Broxtowe Borough Council has not complied with English Heritage response to the Green Belt Review in which English Heritage maintain that building to the East of Church Lane would breach the Green Belt and that the point system should be reassessed.		Disagree. See response from Historic England (below). The Council significantly reduced the size of the site being promoted for development (from 28.25ha to 4.2ha) in the allocation to address the concerns of Historic England.	
	The Plan states that several villages in Broxtowe have special historic character which needs the protection of the Green Belt. Brinsley is the last true village in Broxtowe with strong heritage connections.		Noted. That specific reference in the plan relates specifically to the historic villages which are washed over with the Green Belt which is needed to protect the villages' historic character (e.g. Cossall and Strelley).	
	The Church Lane site is an area of rural countryside which is unpolluted by artificial lighting. Light pollution created by new		Noted. Development would need to comply with the Policy 19 requirement 1 b) which seeks to minimise any adverse effect of	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	development would destroy habitat and impact on three species of bat which are protected by UK Law.		lighting beyond the site.	
	Broxtowe have attached much greater importance to the views of Ashfield District Council than the wishes of their own residents. With specific reference to the Green Belt north of the village.		Noted. The Green Belt Review was undertaken independently by the Borough Council and came to the conclusion that the Church Lane site performed 'least well' in relation to the purposes of the Green Belt.	
	Do not believe that the Green Belt review evidence is robust or credible. The Green Belt Review which uses a flawed points system and inaccurate features. Considers that environmental value of land, heritage assets and landscape should have been included in the Green Belt assessment.		Noted. The Green Belt Review did not include environmental features, specific heritage assets or a landscape assessment as these issues do not relate specifically to the purpose of the Green Belt as set out in the NPPF.	
	Doubts the ownership of the land on Cordy Lane at the point of access, is it of sufficient width?		Evidence has been provided that the land is owned by the promoter of the site and that sufficient width can be achieved.	
	Concern that the land to the south of the allocation will be developed in the future.		Noted. The land surrounding the allocation will remain in the Green Belt and therefore development would not be appropriate. See also response to Historic England regarding the heritage sensitivities towards the land to the south of the allocation (particularly the view from the Church to the Headstocks).	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	<p>Concern regarding the site selection process and bias shown towards the allocated site.</p> <p>DH Lawrence links to the area should be protected (like they are at Eastwood) and tourism should be encouraged, building on Church Lane would destroy this.</p>		<p>Disagree. See site selection document.</p> <p>Agree in part. DH Lawrence tourism links should be encouraged. However, this is not an embargo on development for the north of the borough. Land closer to the Headstocks is considered to be of greater heritage value.</p>	<p>No amendment to assessment necessary.</p>
142 - Historic England	<p>“Conserve” should be used instead of “preserve” with regards to the setting of St James the Great Church. It is noted that the site area has been reduced from that of earlier consultation on the site to mitigate the impact on heritage assets.</p>	<p>Amend the Key Development Requirement to “conserve”, rather than “preserve”.</p>	<p>Agree. The Key Development Requirement has been amended to use the word ‘conserve’ rather than ‘preserve’.</p>	<p>No impact on the assessment.</p>
222 - Severn Trent	<p>Foul flows from the development will join a combined sewer running adjacent to the site. Surface water from the development will be able to drain to Brinsley Brook.</p> <p>The potential impact on the sewage infrastructure is considered to be ‘low’.</p> <p>Severn Trent has a duty to provide additional capacity to accommodate planned development. Developers should</p>	<p>None suggested.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	contact Severn Trent as early as possible to ensure that additional capacity can be planned into their investment programme.			
1190 - North Broxtowe Conservation Society	Church Lane site is unsound as encroaches into green countryside.	Remove the allocation from the plan and allocate Land north of Cordy Lane instead.	Disagree. See Green Belt Review.	No SA implications.
	Would negate a nationally important heritage landscape.		Disagree. See response from Historic England (above).	
	Land is of high value to conservation.		See response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (above).	
	Would necessitate the crossing of a busy road.		This site is within close proximity (walking distance) to the amenities within the village. The road is already serviced by a crossing point which is used to access the adjacent recreation ground.	
	Would devalue the historic importance of the Headstocks site, which is an important tourist attraction.		Disagree. See response from Historic England (above).	
	Would reduce wildlife numbers on the heritage site. It would remove an important section of the landscape's food chain.		Disagree. See response from Historic England (above).	
	Church Lane site should be local and nationally-important green space.		Disagree.	
	The landscape is currently a 'dark, night-time' landscape. It would be harmful to creatures such as bats.		Noted. See response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust and to Brinsley Parish Council and Brinsley Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (above).	
	Adverse impact of drainage upon		The Key Development Requirement for	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	the Brook.		the provision of SuDS and planting to the south of the allocation will mitigate any adverse effect caused by the development.	
6276 - Nottingham West Clinical Commissioning Group	<p>The nearest facilities for this development are Church St Medical Centre and Church Walk Eastwood.</p> <p>A new health centre for Eastwood is the CCG's top priority as the old health centre is no longer fit for purpose and has recently been disposed of. The existing facilities cannot be extended and are due to merge into a single practice in April 2018 which is then going to be relocated to a new facility on the Walker Street site.</p>	Request S106 contributions to facilitate the new health centre in Eastwood.	As outlined in Policy 32 developer contributions may be sought from this development for health provision.	No SA implications.
6757 - Friends of Brinsley Headstocks Heritage and Nature Reserve	Church Lane development would damage the nature and wildlife on Headstocks Reserve.	Remove the allocation from the plan and allocate Land north of Cordy Lane instead.	Disagree. See response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (above).	
6943 - Spring Bank Farm Care Home, Brinsley (including 45 others)	<p>The Church Lane development would create noise which would be "intolerable" for many of the people with learning disabilities who use the Care Home.</p> <p>A road associated with the development would damage the</p>	Remove the allocation from the plan and allocate Land north of Cordy Lane instead.	<p>Noted. Noise associated with the construction of any development is of a temporary nature and is monitored / measured by Environmental Health to ensure it does not cause a statutory nuisance.</p> <p>Noted. The detail of the design and road access</p>	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	quiet safe place.		together with an appropriate landscaping scheme to mitigate the impacts on adjacent residents will be required at detailed planning application stage.	
	Development near the Saints Coppice woodland together with the field next door and hedgerows would damage the wildlife.		Noted. See response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (above).	
6944 - Brinsley Vision (representing 70 residents of Brinsley)	Supports the Brinsley site allocation.	Include requirement to plant mature trees between the development and existing properties at the north east of the site on Cordy Lane.	Noted. The detail of the design together with an appropriate landscaping scheme to mitigate the impacts on adjacent residents will be required at detailed planning application stage.	
	Two photographs used in the plan are out-dated.	Remove photograph on page 52 and 53 (Robin Hood Inn - no longer a public house and Pear Tree Farm – no longer a farm.)	Agree. These have been removed from the plan.	No SA implications.
	Concern that some of the opposition to this allocation may partly be based on a misunderstanding of the extent of the site.	None suggested.	Noted.	
Developers / Owners of the Allocation Site				
717 - (represented by Guy Taylor Associates)	Support allocation. The site has good access to public transport and walking and cycling routes. The site has as an access point onto Church Lane which was	None suggested.	Noted.	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	<p>identified by the County Council as underused and capable of taking more traffic. The site has good access to amenities within the village and is not affected by flooding issues which cannot be mitigated with by SuDS. There are no heritage issues.</p> <p>The site will deliver a mix of housing types and the houses will be designed to Lifetime Homes Standard. The 30% affordable housing requirement will be delivered.</p> <p>The site is available now and should be defined as deliverable within 5 years.</p>			
Owners / Developers of other sites (not allocated)				
6566 - Richborough Estates (represented by Fisher German)	<p>Concerns regarding the delivery of the allocation off Church Lane in Brinsley specifically the deliverability of the vehicular access off Cordy Lane due to land ownership issues and surface water flooding at this point.</p> <p>Considers that the SA evidence regarding site selection is misleading particularly with relation to heritage, social, biodiversity and Green</p>	<p>Remove the allocation from the plan.</p> <p>Include site north of Cordy Lane Brinsley as an allocation or remove from the Green Belt and safeguard for development and include a mechanism for its development.</p>	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>The Council believes that delivery of the site is achievable at the time envisaged. It is not considered necessary to allocate any additional land for development.</p>	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	Infrastructure, environment and landscape and natural resources and flooding. If allocation is not deliverable then the exceptional circumstances for removal from the Green Belt cannot exist.			
4200 – Taylor & Burrows Property (represented by Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd.)	Object to the proposed allocation east of Church Lane or the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brinsley is not sustainable due to limited facilities and limited connections to public transport. • The SA identifies that the site is poorly; related to the strategic road network; • Flooding from Brinsley Brook is a constraint to the development; • Visual impact and loss of a Green Belt site; • Deliverability in question due to low market area. 	Allocate more sustainable options in Eastwood such as: Wade Printers, Eastwood.		
5920 - (represented by GPS Planning and Design Ltd)	Site allocation is inadequately justified on the basis that the evidence is insufficiently robust and credible. Particularly with regards to the site selection process in Brinsley. Unclear how previous comments	Allocate an alternative site: to the rear of Broad Lane and Clumber Avenue Brinsley		

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	<p>have been taken into account and addressed. Concern regarding the transparency of the process and whether consultation was conducted in a way that allowed others to make representations.</p> <p>Over reliance on the ability of a single site to deliver housing rather than a number of smaller sites. Reasonable alternatives have not been adequately assessed.</p>			
Local Residents				
191 contributors 184 objectors, 7 supporters.	<u>Highways:</u> Concern for road safety and the need to calm the traffic to address speed of vehicles travelling through the village.	Implement speed reminders / measures.	Agree. Key Development Requirements have been amended to include the provision of traffic calming measures to reinforce the existing 30 mph speed limit.	No SA implications.
4928 5121 6590 1206 2431	Concern that new residents will have to cross the busy A608 to reach amenities.		Noted. See response to Brinsley Parish Council and Brinsley Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (above).	
4242 4338 1944 2098 5465 3423 6776	Junction improvements are needed at Cordy Lane/Willey Lane to ease the congestion at peak times.		Noted. Further detailed work will be required to be submitted at detailed planning application stage however, improvements have to be linked to mitigating impacts of the new development and cannot be required for improving existing issues.	
3598 6774	Traffic on Broad Lane will increase as people cut-through to	Take bollards off Broad Lane and create parking	Noted. The creation of parking bays on Broad	

[illegible]

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
1935 1983 6941 3482 6899 6931 4309 5065	heritage with links to DH Lawrence and mining.		The whole of the north of the borough has links to DH Lawrence. It is acknowledged that the area including the pit head and Headstocks are located hold particular merit for the village's heritage. This was the reason the site allocation was reduced to address the request of Historic England.	
4299 6891 6929	Close proximity to the Conservation Area.		Disagree. The allocation is not within close proximity to the Conservation Area.	
6897 6923 6589 6413	The Core Strategy Inspector stated that Brinsley was a heritage landscape and should be protected.		Disagree. The Core Strategy Inspector endorsed the Spatial Strategy that distributed up to 150 new homes in Brinsley.	
5127 4354 3861 3409 5128	<u>Green Infrastructure / Wildlife:</u> Site will impact upon the pace and tranquillity of the wildlife areas and picnic sites including the Headstocks Nature Reserve.	The whole of Church Lane should be designated as Local Green Space.	Disagree. See response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (above).	
4295 5058 3400 6938 6886	Wildlife will suffer from disturbance due to increased proximity to development (including from light pollution) and should be protected.	Remove the allocation from the plan.	Noted. See response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust and to Brinsley Parish Council and Brinsley Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (above).	
3867 2133 3423	Development will close off wildlife corridor		Disagree. See response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (above).	
5289 3474 4248 5742 5079	Development will have a negative impact on footpaths in the area.		Disagree. There is already a Key Development Requirement to enhance routes adjacent to the site, although clarity has been included that this refers to walking &	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
6772			cycling routes and bridleways.	
6773	Mature hedgerows should be protected.		Agree.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
4993			The Key Development Requirements have been amended to include the provision for the retention of existing hedgerows.	
6948				
6940				
1940				
6930				
6487				
5393				
6928				
4291				
1975				
1209				
2786	Presence of bats and red listed willow tit.		Noted.	
2375				
6885	Site does not fit with the shape of the village and will be visible from the main road which will spoil the rural character of the village (which is the last in Broxtowe) and will encroach into the countryside.		Disagree.	
6894			See response to Brinsley Parish Council (above).	
6909				
1204				
1189				
5564				
6888	Concern that future development of adjacent areas will be more easily achieved.		Noted.	
2102			See response to the Parish Council (above).	
2045				
2868				
1506	Plan fails in its Duty to Cooperate with the Parish Council.		Noted.	
938			The Duty to Cooperate test of soundness (as prescribed by the Regulations) does not include Parish Council's.	
6895			Notwithstanding this, Broxtowe has consistently and actively engaged with the Parish Council.	
6896				
3820				
1207				
1923				
6917	This is not the site selected in the		Noted.	

Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
1563 6783 6784 3415 3868 4226 4366 5055 5064 5761 6415 6594 6942 6945 6946 6947 6949 6529 6988	Neighbourhood Plan and its development is against the wishes of the village. The view will be spoilt. Site is valued by the local community. <u>Recreation Ground:</u> The feel of the recreation ground and park will be destroyed as it becomes urbanised. Tourism to the area will be negatively affected. <u>Green Belt:</u> Green Belt Review used flawed information. Development of Church Lane would be inconsistent with Green Belt policy. Loss of green barrier between the rest of Broxtowe. <u>Noise and Light Pollution:</u> Development would not comply with the NPPF regarding noise and light pollution. <u>Flooding:</u> The brook floods in bad weather.	 Remove the allocation from the plan.	The Brinsley Neighbourhood Plan has not been independently examined and in any event it does not make site specific allocations. Noted. Noted. Noted. Disagree. See response to Historic England. Disagree. See Green Belt Review. Noted. See response to Brinsley Parish Council and Brinsley Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (above). Noted. The Key Development Requirement for the provision of SuDS and planting to the south of the allocation will mitigate any adverse effect caused by the development.	

Policy 6.1 Walker Street, Eastwood

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
34 - Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Walker Street is an important green space in the centre of Eastwood. Welcomes the retention of The Canyons as open space and would like to see Green Infrastructure / habitat corridors enhanced throughout the site.	Include a commitment to provide Green Infrastructure links across the wider site.	Agree. The Key Development Requirements have been amended to reflect the need for Green Infrastructure and habitat corridor enhancements throughout the site.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
48 - Sport England	There is no mention of playing fields on the site within the description. Cricket wickets, 3 football pitches and a rounders pitches are shown on Google images. The site is not covered by the Playing Pitch Strategy where there is a deficiency and no justification for pitches to be lost.	The pitches should be protected from development. The need to maintain, protect or replace such facilities should be accounted for in the policy.	Disagree. Playing pitches shown were formerly used by Eastwood Comprehensive Secondary (Lower) School which was demolished (and relocated) in 2005. The relocation of the existing Lynncroft Primary school (and associated play facilities) on part of the former secondary school playing fields received no objection from Sport England who stated that: <i>“The re-use of the former Eastwood Comprehensive Lower School playing fields [for the new school development] is considered to be an appropriate replacement for the loss (at some point in the future) of the existing Lynncroft school playing fields. The replacement playing field area is not considered to have a formal status as a playing field, as it has not been used for a period greater than 5 years, but is</i>	

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
			<p><i>allocated on an adopted plan as a housing site”.</i></p> <p>The adopted houses site as referenced is the 2004 Local Plan allocation which this allocation supersedes (therefore there is no deviation in policy for the development of the former playing pitches) albeit in a different format so as to retain the Canyons as open space.</p>	
142 - Historic England	Welcome and support the need to conserve the views of D H Lawrence related heritage.	None suggested.	Noted.	
222 - Severn Trent	<p>Foul and surface flows will join pipes on Greenhills Avenue.</p> <p>The potential impact on the sewage infrastructure is considered to be ‘low’.</p> <p>Severn Trent has a duty to provide additional capacity to accommodate planned development. Developers should contact Severn Trent as early as possible to ensure that additional capacity can be planned into their investment programme.</p>	None suggested.	Noted.	
6276 - Nottingham	The nearest facilities for this development are Church St	Part of the Walker Street site should be allocated	<p>Agree.</p> <p>The Key Development Requirements have</p>	No impact on the already

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
West Clinical Commissioning Group	<p>Medical Centre and Church Walk Eastwood.</p> <p>A new health centre for Eastwood is the Clinical Commissioning Group's top priority as the old health centre is no longer fit for purpose and has recently been disposed of. The existing facilities cannot be extended and are due to merge into a single practice in April 2018 which is then going to be relocated to a new facility on the Walker Street site.</p>	<p>for a new, purpose built health facility (behind the library with direct access to the main road). A 1 acre site is required.</p> <p>Request S106 contributions to facilitate the new health centre in Eastwood.</p>	<p>been amended to reflect the need to provide a 1 acre site within the development for a new health facility.</p> <p>As outlined in Policy 32 developer contributions may be sought from this development for health provision.</p>	highest health objective assessment.
Owners / Developers of other sites (not allocated)				
2542 - (represented by Featherstones)	Site was allocated in the 2004 Local Plan and there are obviously reasons why delivery has not taken place sooner, therefore delivery is uncertain.	<p>Council should consider removing more sites from the Green Belt and allocating them for development, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land at Gilt Hill Farm Kimberley; • land off Back Lane Nuthall; • land off Sisley Avenue Stapleford, • land off Baulk Lane Stapleford, • North West Hill Top 	<p>Disagree.</p> <p>The Council believes that delivery of the site is achievable at the time envisaged. It is not considered necessary to allocate any additional land for development.</p>	
4622 - (represented by Featherstones)				
6881 - (represented by Featherstones)				

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
		Stapleford <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hill Top Farm Stapleford 		
2652 - W Westerman (represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd)	Site forms part of a school and recreational facility. The site has been allocated (although different parts of the overall site) since 2004 with no development progressing. Given the status of the site and the wider uncertainty regarding school places and the quality and quantity of sports and recreation space delivery of the site is highly uncertain.	<p>The Council should plan for more houses so that there is sufficient flexibility to take account of sites that may be delayed or not deliver. Removing more sites from the Green Belt and allocating them for development, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low Wood Road in Nuthall; Land at Mansfield Road, Eastwood; additional land at Toton. 		
2685 - Bloor Homes Ltd (represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd)				
4200 – Taylor & Burrows Property (Represented by Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd)	<p>Potential contamination issues which might impact upon the delivery of the site.</p> <p>Concern is raised regarding the deliverability of the site within the plan period. Part of the site includes the existing Lynncroft Primary School and the site is not available for development until the new school has been completed.</p>	<p>The council should include additional greenfield sites that do not have deliverability or viability issues. This should focus on more marketable areas of Eastwood to support growth and regeneration in a more positive fashion.</p>		
	The housing delivery	Include additional site		

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	<p>trajectory is considered overly ambitious given the timeframe for starting delivery (1st 5 years) and the expected completion rate (50 dwellings / year).</p> <p>Site will bring forward limited S106 contributions due to viability issues.</p>	Land off Baker Road, Giltbrook as an allocation.		
Local Residents				
3 contributors- all objectors. 6849 6921 6935	<p>There is a high bank between the site and the properties on Garden Road which is a haven for wildlife.</p>	<p>Include additional Key Development Requirement for the preservation / enhancement of the wildlife corridor with native trees planting behind Garden Road.</p>	<p>Agree. See response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (above).</p>	<p>See response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust above.</p>
	<p>Drainage is a concern due to the topography and level differences between the site and the existing houses on Garden Road.</p>		<p>Agree in principle. The Key Development Requirements have been amended to ensure that development does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.</p>	<p>This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.</p>
	<p>Stability/ disturbance/ contamination are a concern. Understood that there was a 'waiting time' following</p>		<p>Noted. Any works on land that may be unstable (as per policy 21) must demonstrate that the land can be made safe, and stable. Only a</p>	

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	mining works before development could take place.		very small proportion of the site falls within the Coal Authorities Coal Referral Area and it is not considered that this will impeded the development of the site.	
	Concern regarding additional traffic and parking problems on Garden Road / Lynncroft and Walker Street.		Agree in principle. Key development aspirations have been amended to reflect the emerging position with regards to a dual access to the site (with the aspiration for a secondary access from Wellington Place) which will provide direct access into the site and reduce vehicular traffic on neighbouring roads.	No significant implications.

Policy 7.1 Land south of Kimberley including Kimberley Depot

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
18 - Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) supported by Nottinghamshire Campaign for Better Transport.	Key Development Requirement includes provision for enhanced bus service ' <u>adjacent to</u> ' the site this is welcomed but insufficient to maximise alternative forms of travel to the car. In most instances the distance to the nearest bus stop would be a deterrent to people using the service.	Amend Key Development Requirement to include provision for bus services ' <u>into and through the sites</u> '.	Disagree. Likely to only be a single point of access and so provision of a circular route through such a small site in close proximity to the town centre seems unlikely to be feasible. Church Hill is narrow and is unlikely to be suitable for buses and Eastwood Road is already served by existing bus stops. In line with Policy 32 contributions may be sought from this development for sustainable transport measures such as upgrades to the existing public transport facilities.	
34 - Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Proposals to develop the existing built up part of the site are acceptable but are concerned about the impact on wildlife from the loss of surrounding farmland and plantation woodland. Kimberley Disused Railway, on the southern boundary is a Local Wildlife Site and important wildlife corridor which should be buffered from any development.	Include a statement about the extent of the developable area, ideally limiting it to the existing built up part of the site. The allocation should be sensitive to, and secure future positive management of the Local Wildlife Site.	Agree in part. The developable area of the allocation will extend beyond the existing built up part of the site. However, the Key Development Requirements have been amended to include reference to the need to mitigate the impact on the Local Wildlife Site and secure its future management.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
55 - Pedals	Good cycle routes as well as	Request changes	Agree in principle.	See the

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
(Nottingham Cycling Campaign)	pedestrian links are need through the site as well as part of the need to upgrader the cycle route to and from Bennerley Viaduct. Endorse the detailed comments made by Sustrans.	suggested by Sustrans.	See the response to Sustrans (below).	response to Sustrans below.
63 - Nottingham City Council	The site allocation affects two route options for potential tram extensions from Phoenix Park to Kimberley. The City Council supports the Opun view that the site should be designed to allow for the potential new route for the Nottingham Tram.	Include an additional Key Development Requirement that development should be designed to allow for a potential new tram route.	<p>Disagree. The allocation as currently proposed does not prejudice the potential for the tram and so no specific reference is required, and it will not be realistic or good design to have housing on top of the embankment</p> <p>Route option 1 (which has two different route alignment options) will traverse along the existing road serving the depot and then cross the allocation site.</p> <p>Route Option 2 utilises the disused railway line (outside the allocation site) the embankment of which forms the boundary of the allocation.</p>	No SA implications.
70 - Kimberley Town Council	Would wish to see reference to a development brief to be prepared through the Neighbourhood Plan that will include a green network within the site which will broaden the number of bridleways that currently cross the site.	Amend Key Development Requirements to include reference to a development brief prepared by the Neighbourhood Plan.	<p>Noted. There is no need to reference the Neighbourhood Plan as this will sit alongside the Part 2 Local Plan once 'made'.</p>	

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	<p>Happy to accept an informal agreement that there can be an element of flexibility around the housing capacity in order to meet the Town Councils ambitions for a well-designed and landscaped development.</p>		<p>The provisions of Green Infrastructure corridors are already included in the key development requirements and will be enhanced as part of the allocation.</p>	
	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan includes the caravan site to the North of this allocation as part of the allocation. However the owners would object to this unless an alternative site is found.</p>	<p>Identify the Caravan site as a potential brownfield site for future development.</p>	<p>Agree. The site is identified in the SHLAA as a suitable brownfield site in the urban area and is now included as part of the allocation. In addition a new Key Development Requirement has also been included to ensure that a suitable alternative site is found and the Council is actively working with the owners to identify a suitable location.</p>	
<p>222 - Severn Trent</p>	<p>Foul flows from the development will join the existing combined sewer which runs through the site. Surface water can join the existing surface water network. There is a repeat internal flooding caused by the combined sewer and development is likely to exacerbate the flooding.</p> <p>The potential impact on the sewage infrastructure is considered to be 'medium'.</p> <p>Severn Trent has a duty to provide</p>	<p>None suggested.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	additional capacity to accommodate planned development. Developers should contact Severn Trent as early as possible to ensure that additional capacity can be planned into their investment programme.			
5908 - Sustrans	<p>The network cycling and walking routes within the borough should be improved. Particularly that of the former Great Northern Railway which runs through the borough from Hempsill Vale through Kimberley and Awsworth across Bennerley Viaduct. The policy does not adequately the opportunity to enhance the Great Northern Path (and connections) into a good quality multi-purpose route.</p> <p>The policy does not incorporate requirements for creating good quality walking and cycling routes within and through the site. Required improvements to the Great Northern Path include; <u>Newdigate Street to the station (east to west)</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate crossing of Newdigate Street, dropped kerbs etc. • Re-engineering of large level difference within the site to create multi-use path suitable for all abilities including those 	<p>Request S106 contributions area sought for improvements along the trail.</p> <p>Amend Key Development Requirements to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance and make improvements to the Great Northern Path and its Green Infrastructure corridor both through Kimberley and west to Awsworth. • Create a new good quality and direct section of the Great Northern Path 	<p>Noted. Please see amended Policy 32, developer contributions may be sought from this development for cycling and footpath routes.</p> <p>Agree. Specific reference has been included in the Key Development Requirements to create a new section of the Great Northern Path by providing a Green Infrastructure connection along the existing Kimberley Depot access road to Goodwin Drive and enhancement to the route which connects via the underpass to Awsworth.</p>	<p>Detail reinforces the assessment.</p>

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	<p>with impaired mobility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Widening of existing paths to multi-use standards. <p><u>Station Road to Kimberley Depot:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Route through the centre of Kimberley is omitted and this is a main obstacle. The path should take the following route:• Through the Station Road Car Park and then north west along Station Road to Nine Corners• Left along Nine Corners to the junction with Eastwood Road / Main Street• Route would then follow the footpaths along Eastwood Road as far as the depot and then go through the development site. <p><u>Route through Kimberley Depot and crossing the A610.</u> The Policies map shows the route running south along the former Kimberley embankment south from Church Hill, this route is unlikely to be suitable as Church Hill is steep and would discourage use. A good quality route should be provided through the development site from the Eastwood Road access to Goodwin Drive and the Awsworth Lane subway under the A610.</p>	<p>through the site to create a link from the existing Kimberley Depot access on Eastwood Road to Goodwin Drive.</p>		

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	<p>Recommend that the route be created so as to connect to the former railway embankment and across the A610 via a new foot/cycle bridge crossing the A610 (the feasibility of which would need to be investigated further). This route would allow for a traffic free trail which would form a pleasant stretch of greenway.</p> <p>Works are required to enable multi-use access to Goodwin Drive and access improvements are required in the vicinity of the subway.</p> <p>From the A610 to Awsorth the Awsorth end of the embankment would require re-engineering to enable access down Awsorth Lane.</p>			
	<p>Initial assessments have been carried out along this section of the Great Northern Path and Sustrans have some preliminary recommendations on where improvements are required. However a detailed feasibility study of the whole route is necessary and any improvements should be based on the recommendations of the study.</p>	<p>Amend the policy to include reference to a feasibility study of the Great Northern Path corridor which will inform the improvement's required through this policy.</p>	<p>Disagree. The policy cannot include a caveat which could affect the delivery of the site until a feasibility study is undertaken. It is unclear what the timescales are for the feasibility study and it would not be appropriate to stall development until a third party has undertaken additional work.</p>	

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
6276 - Nottingham West Clinical Commissioning Group	The nearest facility to this site is the Hama Medical Centre in Kimberley which has potential to expand their clinical space through internal re-organisation.	Request S106 contributions to facilitate the increase of clinical space required.	Noted. As outlined in Policy 32 developer contributions may be sought from this development for health provision.	
6882 - Broxtowe Labour Group	Site allocation should not include Kettlebrook Lodge.		Noted. Kettlebrook Lodge was not included in the proposed site allocation. No change to the policy is required.	
6905 - Nottinghamshire Scouts, Beauvale Scouts and 1st Kimberley Guides	Site allocation should not include Kettlebrook Lodge.			
Owners / Developers of other sites (not allocated)				
634 - (represented by Aspbury Planning Ltd)	<p>Site is in a suitable location and is well located to the town centre however; availability and delivery is uncertain. The site includes the Depot and significant areas of green landscape infrastructure including tree belts and hedgerows. The site is partly Green Belt and is currently operational and there is no proposal in place for its closure and/or relocation. Given its current function there is potential for contamination and therefore the delivery of the site remains uncertain.</p> <p>The site is ideal for its current operation as a Council Depot as it is contained and well screened and located away from residential</p>	Council should allocate more sites including land off Alma Hill Kimberley.	Disagree. The Council believes that delivery of the site is achievable at the time envisaged. It is not considered necessary to allocate any additional land for development.	

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	properties and serves the whole of the borough and alternative sites may not be available. Additional allocations area required to provide for the under/non-delivery from the current allocated sites based on their past history and likely delay in the closure/re-location of the Kimberley Depot and remediation required to ensure that the site is capable of accommodating residential development.			
1436 - (represented by iba Planning)	Two of the allocations (particularly in Kimberley) were allocated in the last Local Plan and therefore the delivery of these sites should be questioned. The Inspector should be confident that all of the sites will be developed within the plan period.	Make additional allocations including; Land north of 38 Alma Hill, Kimberley		
2542 - (represented by Featherstones)	Kimberley Depot is a refuse depot and tip where inherent contamination could preclude or limit development.	Council should consider removing more sites from the Green Belt and allocating them for development, including:		
4622 - (represented by Featherstones)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land at Gilt Hill Farm Kimberley; • land off Back Lane Nuthall; • land off Sisley Avenue Stapleford, • land off Baulk Lane Stapleford, 		
6881 - (represented by Featherstones)				

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North West Hill Top Stapleford • Hill Top Farm Stapleford 		
2652 - W Westerman (represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd)	The site is currently a refuse depot with a refuse tip. It is unclear if new facilities have been found to facilitate relocation. Notwithstanding, the site will contain areas of contamination which could preclude or limit development. Delivery on the site is uncertain.	The Council should plan for more houses so that there is sufficient flexibility to take account of sites that may be delayed or not deliver. Removing more sites from the Green Belt and allocating them for development, including:		
2685 - Bloor Homes Ltd (represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low Wood Road in Nuthall; • Land at Mansfield Road, Eastwood; • Additional land at Toton. 		
4200 - Taylor & Burrows Property (Represented by Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd)	Concerned about the delivery and viability of the site with regards to the landscape impact on the Babbington/Swingate/Verge Wood Mature Landscape Area. Noise impact from the A610, the SA identified that a potential buffer is within third party ownership. Contamination from the tip site – surveys should be required to prove that the site is deliverable.	Additional housing sites should be allocated within Eastwood.		
Local Residents				
1 objector	Concerned that part of the	Remove the inferred	Disagree.	

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
6883	justification for building on Kimberley Depot Site is that the site is no longer designated as a Mature Landscape Area. The removal of the designation should not automatically mean that it is suitable for development.	suggestion that removal of the Mature Landscape Area designation means that the landscape is of little value and is therefore suitable for development.	Development of the site is considered by the Sustainability Appraisal to have significant positive housing and health effects <u>despite</u> (not because of) the Mature landscape Area designation (which in any event is no longer an appropriate criterion to assess against).	
48 Objectors to Kettlebrook Lodge 6826 6836 6827 6829 6830 6831 6832 6833 2571 6834 6837 6838 6839 6857 6858 6860 1214 6861 6862 6863	Site allocation should not include Kettlebrook Lodge.		Noted. Kettlebrook Lodge was not included in the proposed site allocation. No change to the policy is required.	

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
6865				
6866				
6867				
6868				
6869				
6870				
6872				
6871				
6873				
6876				
6907				
6911				
6914				
6918				
6920				
6922				
5992				
6967				
6968				
6969				
6970				
6971				
6972				
6973				
6974				
6976				
6977				
6937				

The proposed number of dwellings has increased from 105 to 118 since the Publication Version. This has no significant SA implications.

Policy 7.2 South of Eastwood Road Kimberley

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
34 - Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	The site 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.	Remove the allocation from the Plan.	Agree in part. The Key Development Requirements have been amended to ensure that the triangular shaped field to the rear of 29-47 Eastwood Road is incorporated into the Green Infrastructure provision.	Insignificant.
55 - Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign)	Good cycle routes as well as pedestrian links are need through the site as well as part of the need to upgrader the cycle route to and from Bennerley Viaduct. Endorse the detailed comments made by Sustrans.	Request changes suggested by Sustrans.	Agree in principle. See the response to Sustrans (below).	See the response to Sustrans below.
70 - Kimberley Town Council	Triangle of land behind 29-47 Eastwood Road and east of Speedwell Drive (within the allocation) is of high biodiversity value.	Remove the piece of land from the allocation	Agree. See response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (above).	See response to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust above.
222 - Severn Trent	Foul flows form the development will join the existing combined sewer which runs through the site. Surface water can join the existing surface water network. There is a repeat internal flooding caused by the combined sewer and development is likely to exacerbate the flooding.	None.	Noted.	

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	<p>The potential impact on the sewage infrastructure is considered to be 'medium'.</p> <p>Severn Trent has a duty to provide additional capacity to accommodate planned development. Developers should contact Severn Trent as early as possible to ensure that additional capacity can be planned into their investment programme.</p>			
5908 - Sustrans	<p>The network cycling and walking routes within the borough should be improved. Particularly that of the former Great Northern Railway which runs through the borough from Hemphill Vale through Kimberley and Awsworth across Bennerley Viaduct. The policy does not adequately the opportunity to enhance the Great Northern Path (and connections) into a good quality multi-purpose route.</p> <p>The policy does not incorporate requirements for creating good quality walking and cycling routes within and through the site. Required improvements to the Great Northern Path include;</p>	<p>Request S106 contributions area sought for improvements along the trail.</p> <p>Amend Key Development Requirements to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhance and make improvements to the Great Northern Path and its Green Infrastructure corridor 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Please see amended Policy 32, developer contributions may be sought from this development for cycling and footpath routes.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Specific reference has been included in the Key Development Requirements to create a new section of the Great Northern Path by providing a Green Infrastructure connection along</p>	<p>Detail reinforces the assessment.</p>

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	<p><u>Newdigate Street to the station (east to west):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate crossing of Newdigate Street, dropped kerbs etc. • Re-engineering of large level difference within the site to create multi-use path suitable for all abilities including those with impaired mobility. • Widening of existing paths to multi-use standards. <p><u>Station Road to Kimberley Depot:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Route through the centre of Kimberley is omitted and this is a main obstacle. The path should take the following route: • Through the Station Road Car Park and then north west along Station Road to Nine Corners • Left along Nine Corners to the junction with Eastwood Road / Main Street • Route would then follow the footpaths along Eastwood Road as far as the depot and then 	<p>both through Kimberley and west to Awsworth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a new good quality and direct section of the Great Northern Path through the site to create a link from the existing Kimberley Depot access on Eastwood Road to Goodwin Drive. 	<p>the existing Kimberley Depot access road to Goodwin Drive and enhancement to the route which connects via the underpass to Awsworth.</p>	

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	<p>go through the development site.</p> <p><u>Route through Kimberley Depot and crossing the A610.</u> The Policies map shows the route running south along the former Kimberley embankment south from Church Hill, this route is unlikely to be suitable as Church Hill is steep and would discourage use. A good quality route should be provided through the development site from the Eastwood Road access to Goodwin Drive and the Awsworth Lane subway under the A610.</p> <p>Recommend that the route be created so as to connect to the former railway embankment and across the A610 via a new foot/cycle bridge crossing the A610 (the feasibility of which would need to be investigated further). This route would allow for a traffic free trail which would form a pleasant stretch of greenway.</p> <p>Works are required to enable multi-use access to Goodwin Drive and access improvements are required in</p>			

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	<p>the vicinity of the subway.</p> <p>From the A610 to Awsworth the Awsworth end of the embankment would require re-engineering to enable access down Awsworth Lane.</p>			
	Initial assessments have been carried out along this section of the Great Northern Path and Sustrans have some preliminary recommendations on where improvements are required. However a detailed feasibility study of the whole route is necessary and any improvements should be based on the recommendations of the study.	Amend the policy to include reference to a feasibility study of the Great Northern Path corridor which will inform the improvement's required through this policy.	Disagree. The policy cannot include a caveat which could affect the delivery of the site until a feasibility study is undertaken. It is unclear what the timescales are for the feasibility study and it would not be appropriate to stall development until a third party has undertaken additional work.	
6276 - Nottingham West Clinical Commissioning Group	The nearest facility to this site is the Hama Medical Centre in Kimberley which has potential to expand their clinical space through internal re-organisation.	Request S106 contributions to facilitate the increase of clinical space required.	Noted. As outlined in Policy 32 developer contributions may be sought from this development for health provision.	
Owners / Developers of other sites (not allocated)				
634 - (represented by Aspbury Planning Ltd)	Site is in a suitable location and is well located to the town centre however; availability and delivery is uncertain. The site was allocated in the 2004 Local Plan but does not appear to have been the subject of a residential application since its adoption.	Council should allocate more sites including land off Alma Hill Kimberley .	Disagree. The Council believes that delivery of the site is achievable at the time envisaged. It is not considered necessary to allocate any additional land for development.	

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	<p>The site is not regular in shape and it may not be feasible to demolish the existing property that fronts Eastwood Road (no 59). The site tapers to the east and a belt of mature trees along the southern boundary may impact upon the ability of the site to deliver houses due to root protection issues. Number of dwellings proposed seems too high.</p> <p>Additional allocations area required to provide for the under/non-delivery from the current allocated sites based on their past history.</p>			
1436 - (represented by iba Planning)	Two of the allocations (particularly in Kimberley) were allocated in the last Local Plan and therefore the delivery of these sites should be questioned. The Inspector should be confident that all of the sites will be developed within the plan period.	Make additional allocations including; Land north of 38 Alma Hill, Kimberley		
2542 - (represented by Featherstones)	Site was allocated in the 2004 Local Plan and there are obviously reasons why delivery has not taken place sooner, therefore delivery is uncertain.	Council should consider removing more sites from the Green Belt and allocating them for development, including:		
4622 (represented by Featherstones)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land at Gilt Hill Farm 		

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
6881 - (represented by Featherstones)		Kimberley; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land off Back Lane Nuthall; • land off Sisley Avenue Stapleford, • land off Baulk Lane Stapleford, • North West Hill Top Stapleford • Hill Top Farm Stapleford 		
2652 - W Westerman (represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd)	The site has been allocated since 2004. Development of the site remains complex and delivery is highly uncertain.	The Council should plan for more houses so that there is sufficient flexibility to take account of sites that may be delayed or not deliver.		
2685 - Bloor Homes Ltd (represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd)		Removing more sites from the Green Belt and allocating them for development, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low Wood Road in Nuthall; • Land at Mansfield Road, Eastwood; • Additional land at Toton. 		
4200 - Taylor & Burrows Property (Represented by Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd)	Concerned about the delivery of the site as it has been allocated since 2004 and hasn't come forward to date.	Additional housing sites should be allocated within Eastwood.		

Policy 7.3 Builders Yard Kimberley

ID - Organisation	Reps.	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
222 - Severn Trent	<p>Foul flows from the development will join the existing combined sewer which runs through the site. Surface water can join the existing surface water network. There is a repeat internal flooding caused by the combined sewer and development is likely to exacerbate the flooding.</p> <p>The potential impact on the sewage infrastructure is considered to be 'medium'.</p> <p>Severn Trent has a duty to provide additional capacity to accommodate planned development. Developers should contact Severn Trent as early as possible to ensure that additional capacity can be planned into their investment programme.</p>	None Suggested.	Noted.	
6276 - Nottingham West Clinical Commissioning Group	The nearest facility to this site is the Hama Medical Centre in Kimberley which has potential to expand their clinical space through internal re-organisation.	Request S106 contributions to facilitate the increase of clinical space required.	Noted. As outlined in Policy 32 developer contributions may be sought from this development for health provision.	
Owners / Developers of other sites (not allocated)				
634 - (represented by Aspbury Planning Ltd)	Site is in a suitable location and is well located to the town centre however; availability and delivery is uncertain. The site was allocated in	Council should allocate more sites including land off Alma Hill Kimberley.	Disagree. The Council believes that delivery of the site is achievable at the time envisaged. It is not considered	

ID - Organisation	Reps.	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	<p>the 2004 Local Plan but does not appear to have been the subject of a residential application since its adoption.</p> <p>The site is not regular in shape and is a backland site surrounded by residential properties. Unless the scheme is flattened than the expected delivery is overly optimistic.</p> <p>Additional allocations area required to provide for the under/non-delivery from the current allocated sites based on their past history.</p>		necessary to allocate any additional land for development.	
2542 - (represented by Featherstones)	Site was allocated in the 2004 Local Plan and there are obviously reasons why delivery has not taken place sooner, therefore delivery is uncertain.	<p>Council should consider removing more sites from the Green Belt and allocating them for development, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • land at Gilt Hill Farm Kimberley; • land off Back Lane Nuthall; • land off Sisley Avenue Stapleford, • land off Baulk Lane Stapleford, • North West Hill Top Stapleford • Hill Top Farm Stapleford 		
4622 - (represented by Featherstones)				
6881 - (represented by Featherstones)				
2652 - W	The site has been allocated since	The Council should plan		

ID - Organisation	Reps.	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
Westerman (represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd) 2685 - Bloor Homes Ltd (represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd)	2004. Development of the site remains uncertain.	for more houses so that there is sufficient flexibility to take account of sites that may be delayed or not deliver. Removing more sites from the Green Belt and allocating them for development, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low Wood Road in Nuthall; • Land at Mansfield Road, Eastwood; • Additional land at Toton. 		
4200 -Taylor & Burrows Property (Represented by Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd)	Concerned about the delivery of the site as it has been allocated since 2004 and hasn't come forward to date.	Additional housing sites should be allocated within Eastwood.		

Policy 8: Development in the Green Belt

ID	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
211	Nottinghamshire County Council	Welcomes the recognition of health and well-being benefits in the policy, and suggests further references, including to 'active ageing'.	See previous column.	Disagree. Such further references would not be appropriate in the Green Belt policy; however issues relating to 'active ageing' are referred to in the Health Impact Assessment Checklist, to which policy 24 relates.	
18	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	Welcomes the policy.	None.	Noted.	
1201	Whitehead (Concrete) Ltd & Foulds Investment Ltd (represented by iPlan Solutions Ltd)	Site allocations focus solely on residential and there is no provision for employment allocations. Object to landscape evidence as area assessed is too broad. Promoting a site in Awsworth which should be allocated for employment development.	See previous column.	Disagree. The Plan makes appropriate provision for employment development, without the need to release further Green Belt sites. Site-specific issues are addressed in a separate section of the report.	
178	Caunton (represented by iPlan Solutions Ltd)	Site allocations focus solely on residential and there is no provision for employment allocations. Object to landscape evidence as area assessed is too broad. Promoting a site in Eastwood which should be allocated for employment development.	See previous column.	Disagree. The Plan makes appropriate provision for employment development, without the need to release further Green Belt sites. Site-specific issues are addressed in a separate section of the report.	
6879	Crampin, Barden and Scott (represented by	Unclear whether the Council has a 5 year land supply and smaller sites can help to contribute towards achieving one. Promoting an alternative housing	See previous column.	Disagree. The Plan provides for a 5 year land supply without the need to release further Green Belt sites. Site-specific issues are	

	SSA Planning Limited)	site in the Main Built up Area (in Bramcote) which is not included as an allocation in the Local Plan.		addressed in a separate section of the report.
460	5 contributors –	Use brownfield sites as an alternative.	See previous column.	The Plan proposes making optimum use of brownfield sites. These representations do not relate to the contents of policy 8.
1060	4 objectors, 1			
1494	supporter			
2565				
6062				

Policy 9: Retention of Good Quality Existing Employment Sites

ID	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
73	Stapleford Town Council (supported by Borough Councillor Richard MacRae)	Considers that the policy gives “no clear indication of how these aspirations would be met”.	Not specified.	Disagree. The policy is sufficiently clear.	
2607	Harworth Group (represented by Pegasus Group)	Plan fails to consider the need for new rail related employment opportunities that relate to HS2. Promoting a site in Awsworth which should be allocated for employment development.	See previous column.	Disagree that a change to the policy is needed. Site-specific issues are addressed in a separate section of the report.	
720	1 contributor - objector	Good quality not defined, therefore subjective.	See previous column.	Disagree. The sites are defined, at paragraph 9.1.	

Policy 10: Town Centre and District Centre Uses

ID	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
211	Nottinghamshire County Council	Proposes that a reference to health and well-being benefits is added to the justification text for the policy.	See previous column.	Agreed. A reference is to be added.	No significant implications.
73	Stapleford Town Council	Does not want to see the area of Stapleford District Centre contracted, as is proposed in the policy, and Map 37, as it is not considered that this would help business expansion.	Retain current boundary.	Disagree. The proposed contraction is likely to be helpful.	
2316	Borough Councillor Richard MacRae	Considers that the boundary of the Centre should be extended.	See previous column.	Disagree. An extension is unlikely to be helpful	
1460	Beeston and District Civic Society	“Largely agree” with the policy. However Beeston Town centre should include the Town Hall and Library on Foster Avenue and the properties on Broadgate on the eastern side of Marlborough Road. It also “could” include Lidl on Wollaton Road. Also, there “could” be a policy requiring large retail/entertainment venues to contain public toilet facilities.	See previous column.	Disagree. The properties referred to are outside the retail core and the proposed extension of the Centre would not be helpful. A requirement for public toilet facilities would be unreasonable.	
6882	Broxtowe Labour Group	Proposes that the policy should not change the boundaries of the centres.	Retain current boundaries.	Disagree. The proposed boundary changes are likely to be helpful.	
6053	British Land Company (represented by WYG)	Primary frontage should be defined in the justification text. Primary frontage calculation should be set out more clearly. The policy will have negative implications for the vitality and viability	See previous column.	Partially agreed. The wording is to be amended so that it is clear that the primary frontage calculation relates to all elements of the frontage	None- no change to the purpose of the policy.

		of the town centre and criteria (i) should be removed from the policy.		combined. The policy will also be slightly re-structured for greater clarity. However, criterion i is considered to be an essential part of the policy.
720	1 contributor - objector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stapleford centre should not contract. • Policy 6.2 of the Core Strategy not implemented, lack of identified sites. • Prime shops not now included within the boundary. 	See previous column.	Disagree. The proposed boundaries are considered to be appropriate, and additional site allocations are not considered to be necessary.

Policy 11 The Square, Beeston

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
211 - Nottinghamshire County Council	The County may consider it appropriate that amendments with regard to education contributions (and/or further discussions) are appropriate.		Noted. As outlined in Policy 32 developer contributions may be sought from this development for education provision.	
1460 - Beeston and District Civic Society	The policy should include “a coherent detailed design policy” rather than “a review process”. There needs to be an emphasis on value to the community. Residential development should include “a requirement for a mix of types/affordability”.	Amend Key Development Requirements to include: Active frontages at ground floor level	Agree. This has been incorporated into the Key Development Requirements.	No significant implications.
		Coherent and future-proof development	Agree. Detailed design proposals will have to satisfy the requirements as set out in Policy 17.	No SA implications.
		Public realm should include flexible public open space with a community feel.	Agree. The Key Development Requirements have been amended to reflect the need for the provision of high quality public realm enhancements including seating and landscaping (particularly adjacent to the Conservation Area).	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
		Reflect and enhance the quality of adjacent		

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
		open space and Conservation Areas Pedestrian connectivity to surrounding areas (e.g. Middle Street and Station Road) should be emphasised.	Agree. The Key Development Requirements have been amended to include the requirement for pedestrian (and cycling) links to the surrounding areas.	This change will improve the sustainability of the policy and the subsequent development; however it does not affect the sustainability appraisal of the site.
6276 - Nottingham West Clinical Commissioning Group	There are 4 GP practices providing healthcare for the area; Abbey Medical Centre, The Manor Surgery, The Oaks Medical Centre and West End Surgery. The Oaks Medical Centre is currently extending but is unlikely to accommodate the capacity from all of the future planned development.	Request S106 contribution to provide clinical space required as a result of the development.	Noted. As outlined in Policy 32 developer contributions may be sought from this development for health provision.	
6279 - Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum ** Not the Forum preparing a Neighbourhood	Strongly supports the site allocation at The Square, Beeston. The allocation should include the 'air space' above the tram interchange for residential development. Residential development should have	Would encourage the proposed cinema to be of flexible use including movable partition and a stage.	Noted. Unclear what is meant by 'airspace' above the tram interchange however, the open aspect of the interchange (particularly having regards to the setting of the Listed Church) is currently appealing to	

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
Plan for the area**	been included in phase 1 of the Square redevelopment.		users of the public transport interchange and there is no evidence that building above the interchange would be desirable, viable or deliverable.	
6882 - Broxtowe Labour Group	Supports Policy to develop The Square in Beeston. Redevelopment should maximise economic rental revenue for the Council.	Amend Key Development Requirements to include: Provision of cultural and community space;	Agree. See response to Beeston Civic Society (above).	See response to Beeston Civic Society above.
		Expanse of public realm (extending between current site and the church) including a water feature.		
		Provision for the demolition of the existing 'Argos' block.	Noted. Evidence suggests that the demolition of the Argos block would make the redevelopment of the area as a whole unviable and is therefore unlikely to take place. The demolition of any of the buildings would be the subject of a detailed planning application, and whilst it is not considered appropriate to include it as a 'Requirement' the allocation is flexible enough to accommodate this should this be proposed at a later date.	
4 contributors- all	No provision of a community centre	Amend Key	Disagree.	

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
objectors. 2565 5893 6912 6919	and some local groups are having difficulty finding suitable places for large groups to meet.	Development Requirements to include provision for a community centre.	There are a number of large meeting rooms within the locality (including the Pearson Community Centre) which is within walking distance of The Square. The Square is located within a prime town centre position and it is entirely appropriate that the allocation should provide for main town centre uses (such as a cinema) which would not be appropriate in other out-of town locations.	
	The Council has not released land within the Square (including the car park and derelict land opposite Tesco) for dwellings.	Include the Square as a housing allocation.	Disagree. Policy 11 allocates The Square (which includes the land referenced) for development including a minimum of 132 dwellings (previously 110). No further change required.	The increase in the housing numbers has no significant SA implications.
	There should be a requirement to provide a public toilet as this would benefit the town and also the people using the transport interchange. It will also be required if people are attracted to drink in the area in the evening.	Amend Key Development Requirements to include provision for a fully accessible public toilet.	Noted. Whilst publically accessible toilets are an important aspect of an evening economy it is expected that this will be provided by the businesses that will operate in the development (including the cinema). This is required by separate legislation which governs premises serving food and drink to be consumed on the premises. It is not considered necessary to allocate space for the provision of 'stand-alone' public toilets.	No SA implications.
	Green or communal space with	Amend Key	Agree.	See response

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	seating should be a requirement as this has proven health benefits and would encourage visitors to the area which would in turn economically benefit the town.	Development Requirements to include provision of publicly accessible green space.	See response to Beeston Civic Society (above).	to Beeston Civic Society above.

Policy 12: Edge-of-Centre A1 Retail in Eastwood

ID	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
6053	British Land Company (represented by WYG)	No need for this policy given that Morrisons is now 'out-of-town' retail and therefore covered by Policy 13, unclear why it should be treated differently. Primary Frontage is not defined in policy text and extends beyond what is considered reasonable.	Delete the policy.	Disagree. The policy is considered to be reasonable in its current form.	

Policy 13: Proposals for Main town Centre Uses in Edge-of Centre and Out-of-Centre Locations

ID	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
6053	British Land Company (represented by WYG)	Town centres in Broxtowe cannot accommodate all the different types of retail development. Giltbrook Retail Park should be recognised as the most appropriate location for out-of town development to allow it to grow/develop in the future.	See previous column.	Disagree. Undue growth at Giltbrook Retail Park or other out-of-centre locations would be contrary to national policy, Core Strategy policy and the findings of the Carter Jonas Retail Study.	
6901	Henderson UK Retail Warehouse Fund (represented by Burnett Planning)	Out-of-town retail should be supported and allowed to grow in tandem with the town centres. The retail study has been taken out of context. The local floorspace threshold is unnecessary (part 1 of the policy) because part 2 of the policy deals with the possible impact. Part 1 (b) threshold introduces a test of 'need' for smaller retail developments which is contrary to the NPPF requirements. Part 1(c) would render the threshold ineffective as every proposal would need an impact assessment. The threshold should not be applied around Beeston Centre as this is more viable and therefore should not be subject to the same thresholds as other smaller centres in the borough. 1,000sqm around Beeston would be more appropriate. Floorspace impact should not apply to 'food and drink', 'leisure' or 'office'.	See previous column.	Disagree. The policy is considered to be justified and necessary in its current form.	

Policy 14: Centre of Neighbourhood Importance (Chilwell Road / High Road – no representations received.

Policy 15: Housing Size, Mix and Choice

ID	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
73	Stapleford Town Council (supported by Borough Councillor Richard MacRae)	Considers that Stapleford needs more than the 10% proportion of affordable housing that is proposed in the policy.	Increase the proportion specified for Stapleford.	Disagree. The viability work that has been commissioned supports the 10% figure, in most cases. However the new allocation will be expected to provide 30%.	
119	Home Builders Federation	The Home Builders Federation makes various comments relating to the policy. It considers that the word “size” should be removed, “so there is no conjecture that the Council is seeking to adopt the Nationally Described Space Standard”. With regard to affordable housing requirements, it considers that the percentages should not be expressed as minima. It also says that the Nottingham Core Viability Update Study (September 2013) is “somewhat out of date” and that that the Council has presented no new evidence to support the policy. With regard to the requirement for ‘accessible and adaptable dwellings’, the HBF considers that “it is incumbent on the Council to provide a local assessment evidencing the specific case for Broxtowe which justifies the case for the optional higher standard”. With regard to self-	See previous column.	<p>Disagree. Regarding “size”, the policy is considered to be sufficiently clear.</p> <p>The 2018 viability work supplements the 2013 Study and supports the figures in the policy.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that local evidence is limited, the elements of the policy that relate to accessible and adaptable dwellings, self-build and custom-build have the support of national policy and are considered necessary in order to achieve local progress on these issues.</p> <p>The Council’s Housing Committee has commissioned research into the precise housing needs in all parts of the borough and this research will be referred to when applying the policy.</p>	

		build or custom-build housing, the HBF considers that there is no publicly available evidence to justify the Council's approach, and that the Council has not undertaken any viability assessment of the proposal.		
1460	Beeston and District Civic Society	Considers that the policy should manage the proportion of Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs). It should require consideration of whether a new HMO, by itself or cumulatively, would harm the character and amenity of a street or residential area and should take into account the proximity of purpose-built student accommodation. Also, "local character appraisals could be in place to support design policies".	See previous column.	Disagree, as a policy on HMOs is not considered to be necessary or appropriate. However the situation will be kept under review and the Council will consider introducing a new policy or SPD in the future, if the situation requires.
6882	Broxtowe Labour Group	Considers that the policy should include "strengthened commitments to the provision of dementia friendly housing and supported living" and a "specific commitment" to "an increased development of Council owned social housing".	See previous column.	<p>Partially agreed. Reference to dementia friendly housing and supported living will be added at paragraph 15.5. The Council's Housing Committee has commissioned research into the precise housing needs in all parts of the borough and this research will be referred to when applying the policy.</p> <p>No significant implications, as the scope of the policy is still the same.</p> <p>It is beyond the scope of the Plan to commit to an increased development of Council-owned social housing.</p>
718	J McCann & Co (Nottingham)	Paragraph 8 of policy (re: custom & self-build) is unsound. Not evidenced and Council haven't documented	Paragraph 8 should be amended to read:	Disagree. Whilst it is acknowledged that local evidence is limited, the element of the policy that relates to

	Ltd (represented by Planning and Design Group)	demand from the register. Policy should support delivery rather than mandate it.	“For developments of more than 20 dwellings, a provision for serviced self-build or custom-build, and/or custom-build by other delivery routes will be supported where evidence indicates local demand to the site”.	self-build and custom-build has the support of national policy and is considered necessary in order to achieve local progress on this issue. The Council’s Housing Committee has commissioned research into the precise housing needs in all parts of the borough and this research will be referred to when applying the policy.
2685	Bloor Homes Ltd (represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd)	Object to the requirement for custom/self-build homes on large sites as it creates issues for the housebuilder (including impact on viability). It would be more appropriate to identify small sites.	Paragraph 8 should be deleted and specific small sites should be identified instead.	Disagree. Whilst it is acknowledged that local evidence is limited, the element of the policy that relates to self-build and custom-build has the support of national policy and is considered necessary in order to achieve local progress on this issue. The Council’s Housing Committee has commissioned research into the precise housing needs in all parts of the borough and this research will be referred to when applying the policy.
3756	Gladman Development Ltd	Concern regarding the viability of the plan as a whole. Self-build need is missing from the evidence base (SHMA). Provision of starter homes should be considered equivalent to affordable homes.	See previous column.	Disagree. Recently-commissioned work has confirmed the viability of the Plan as a whole. Whilst it is acknowledged that local evidence is limited, the element of the policy that relates to self-build and custom-build has the support of national policy and is considered necessary in order to

				achieve local progress on this issue. The NPPF definition of ‘affordable homes’ will be applied.	
6916	Rentplus (represented by Tetlow King Planning)	Part 6 of the Policy is well drafted in terms of flexibility and the ability it gives developers to bring forward appropriate housing to meet local need. The mix of affordable housing should be set out clearly in the Local Plan. The justification text should include detail of the general expectation for tenure split and should specify that a full range of tenures is encouraged with reference to national affordable housing policy (which is expected to change in the revised iteration of the NPPF).	See previous column.	Disagree. The Council’s Housing Committee has commissioned research into the precise housing needs in all parts of the borough and this research will be referred to when applying the policy. Both national and local policy will be referred to when making decisions.	
403	McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd (represented by the Planning Bureau Limited)	Part 7 requirement for compliance with optional building regulations M4(2) standard whilst desirable is not practical or viable. Despite the justification text this policy will not be sufficient to meet the needs of the elderly population in the borough. Policy should encourage the delivery of specialist forms of sheltered/retirement housing (C3) and Extra Care (C2). The affordable housing requirement will mean that retirement housing will always be subject to review (as it won’t meet the threshold) which could jeopardise delivery. The assumption of a fixed land value is not reflective of the market and is not consistent with the	See previous column.	Partially agreed. As a general principle the Council will be supportive of proposals for dementia-friendly and other forms of homes for elderly people, and paragraph 15.5 will be expanded to refer to this. Part 6 of the policy is relevant in this regard, and this will be expanded to refer to all age groups, including the elderly. Changes to other parts of the policy are not considered to be appropriate.	No significant implications, as this only clarifies existing policy.

NPPF.					
460	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Should explicitly include social housing.Should not differentiate housing sub-markets.	See previous column.	Disagree. No changes are considered to be appropriate.	
720	contributors – 2 objectors				

Policy 16: Gypsies and Travellers – no representations received

Policy 17: Place-making, Design and Amenity

ID	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
68 and 6537	Awsorth Parish Council and Awsorth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	Considers that the policy should include a criterion “ensuring porous boundary treatment in new development to allow small mammals (especially hedgehogs), amphibians etc to pass through unhindered”.	See previous column.	Partially agreed. This issue is covered in general terms by part 1.n) of the policy. However, a specific reference will be added to the justification text.	No significant implications.
6577	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum	Proposes additional references to walking and cycling in the policy. The Forum also considers that a requirement to provide high speed broadband services should be included in this policy.	See previous column.	Partially agreed. An additional criterion relating to walking and cycling will be added to the policy. Broadband speeds are not considered to be a problem locally and would not therefore justify a policy requirement.	The policy is already assessed highly against the health and transport objectives, so the policy change does not result in a change to the SA.
48	Sport England	With regard to Policies 17 and 24, Place-making, Design and Amenity and The Health Impacts of Development, Sport England (SE) “supports the idea of health impact to be a design consideration for new communities and would encourage the inclusion of a design policy which encourages developments to be designed to promote active lifestyles”.	See previous column.	Partially agreed. An additional criterion relating to walking and cycling will be added to the policy.	The policy is already assessed highly against the health and transport objectives, so the policy change does not result in a change to the SA.
119	Home Builders Federation	Considers that the reference in the policy to ‘Building for Life 12’ design standards should be moved from the policy to the justification text, because “the use of Building for Life 12 should remain voluntary”. It considers that “the	See previous column.	Disagree. ‘Building for Life 12’ is a valuable design tool. It has the explicit support of paragraph 128 in the draft revised NPPF.	

		requirement for 9 or more greens is also a misinterpretation of the use of Building for Life 12”.		
6841	Active Notts (previously Sport Nottinghamshire)	Policy 17, Place-making, Design and Amenity, “and/or” Policy 27, Local Green Space, should require “developments to be inclusive of the ten principles identified in Sport England’s Active Design Guide, the TCPA Guidance on Healthy Living Environments”.	See previous column.	Partially agreed. It would not be appropriate for the Plan to cross-refer to a large element of another document. However, an additional criterion relating to walking and cycling will be added to the policy.
34	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Supports the inclusion in the policy of clauses relating to wildlife. However it proposes the addition of references to specific issues, including insect houses and gaps under fences for hedgehogs. It also considers that the policy should address management of habitats in perpetuity.	See previous column.	<p>Partially agreed. These issues are covered in general terms by part 1.n) of the policy. However, a specific reference will be added to the justification text.</p> <p>Management requirements may be appropriate in certain circumstances, however it would not be appropriate in relation to, for example, domestic gardens and it should not therefore be included in the policy.</p>
6053	British Land Company (represented by WYG)	Policy is too prescriptive and Council should solely rely on Policy 10 of the ACS.	Parts 1a-1q of the policy should be deleted.	Disagree. It is important to add local detail in the Part 2 Local Plan.
718	J McCann and Co (represented by Planning and Design Group)	Paragraph 3 of policy (re: Building for Life 12) unsound because not justified. Building for Life has been withdrawn from planning guidance and therefore should not be included, should use	Part 3 of the policy should be deleted.	Disagree. ‘Building for Life 12’ is a valuable design tool. It has the explicit support of paragraph 128 in the draft revised NPPF.

		reference to wider good design principles to assure high-quality development.		
2685	Bloor Homes (represented by Oxalis Planning Ltd)	Criteria 1b and 1c should be removed as they are concerned with the location of development and not its built form.	Parts 1b and 1c of the policy should be deleted.	Disagree. Criteria 1b and 1c address important issues, which can be enhanced by good design.
3756	Gladman Development Ltd	Not appropriate to have a requirement for sites of 10 or more dwellings to score 9 or more 'greens' on building for life 12 or equivalent.	Part 3 of the policy should be deleted.	Disagree. 'Building for Life 12' is a valuable design tool. It has the explicit support of paragraph 128 in the draft revised NPPF.

Policy 18: Shopfronts, Signage and Security Measures

ID	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
142	Historic England	Welcomes and supports the policy.	None.	Noted.	
460	1 contributor - objector	Should be stricter criteria.	See previous column.	Disagree. The support of Historic England confirms that no changes are needed.	

Policy 19: Pollution, Hazardous Substances and Ground Conditions

ID	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
4	Environment Agency	Is “satisfied” with the policy.	None.	Noted.	
6279	Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum	The justification text “should be amended to reflect the need for a competent person to carry out the site investigation”.	See previous column.	Disagree. It can be treated as a given that all assessments submitted with any planning applications need to be carried out by competent persons.	
34	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Supports the inclusion of the point about darkness and nature conservation in part 1b.	None.	Noted.	
460	1 contributor - objector	Fracking should be included as a negative development.	See previous column.	Disagree. Fracking is an issue for the Minerals Planning Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) and not for this Plan.	

Policy 20: Air Quality

ID	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
73	Stapleford Town Council (supported by Borough Councillor Richard MacRae)	The policy should make “particular mention” of Stapleford.	See previous column.	Disagree. It would not be appropriate to make particular mention of certain areas in a borough-wide policy.	
6279	Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum	Welcomes the policy.	None.	Noted.	
119	Home Builders Federation	Considers that the second part of the policy is “a vaguely expressed aspiration” and that “it is doubtful if this aspect of the policy can be effectively implemented”.	Part 2 of the policy should be deleted.	Disagree. The policy is considered to be as clear as reasonably possible.	
18	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England (supported by Nottinghamshire Campaign for Better Transport)	Welcomes the policy.	None.	Noted.	
6053	British Land Company (represented by WYG)	Definition of ‘significant deterioration of air quality’ required. Level of provision of electric charging points that will be required for different types of development should be set out and justified.	See previous column.	Disagree. The policy is considered to be as clear as reasonably possible.	

720 2565 5951	3 contributors – 3 objectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Town centres should be referenced, especially traffic calming.• Insufficient evidence and it is dated.• Electric Vehicles not significant enough in plan period to justify policy.• Negative impact of road junctions should be referenced.• Should include tree planting mitigation.• Development in Bramcote/Stapleford, especially Moor Lane, should be referenced.	See previous column.	Disagree. No changes are considered to be appropriate.
--	---------------------------------	---	----------------------	--

Policy 21: Unstable Land

ID	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
16	The Coal Authority	Supports the policy and its justification text.	None.	Noted.	

Policy 22: Minerals

ID	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
211	Nottinghamshire County Council	Welcomes the policy.	None.	Noted.	
16	The Coal Authority	Supports the policy and its justification text.	None.	Noted.	
6882	Broxtowe Labour Group	The policy should “assert a commitment to a frack free Broxtowe”.	See previous column.	Disagree. Fracking is an issue for the Minerals Planning Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) and not for this Plan.	
3756	Gladman Development Ltd	Policy is overly onerous and will prevent sustainable growth.	See previous column.	Disagree. The policy would only restrict or prevent developments that would have serious adverse consequences for minerals resources.	

Policy 23: Proposals Affecting Designated and Non-designated Heritage Assets

ID	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
142	Historic England	Recommends the use of the term “conserve” rather than “preserve” in the policy. For the justification text it recommends “a balanced view” in that heritage protection can be seen as “a positive element contributing to heritage led regeneration” as well a constraint on development.	See previous column.	Agreed. Amendments will be made to the policy and justification text.	No significant implications.
68 and 6537	Awsorth Parish Council and Awsorth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	Considers that the justification text for the policy should include reference to Bennerley Viaduct.	See previous column.	Agreed. References will be added in the justification text to Bennerley Viaduct, Boots and DH Lawrence. Appendix 6 also contains relevant information.	
73	Stapleford Town Council (supported by Borough Councillor Richard MacRae)	Considers that the policy does not sufficiently emphasise the heritage assets within Stapleford.	See previous column.	Disagree. It would not be appropriate to make particular mention of certain areas in a borough-wide policy. However, the policy relates to Conservation Areas including the two in Stapleford, as listed at paragraph 23.3.	
6577	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum	Proposes additions to the justification text.	The proposed additions would: say that the policy applies to “immediate associated areas (such as green spaces / gardens etc)”; refer to heritage assets at Chetwynd Barracks which	Disagree. The first two points are dealt with in the site-specific policy for the Barracks. With regard to the third point, the Council will, as a matter of routine, work proactively with Neighbourhood Forums and with town and parish councils.	

			may not yet have been formally registered; and confirm that the Council will work pro-actively with Neighbourhood Forums.	
1460	Beeston and District Civic Society	With regard to the policy and its justification text, the Society considers that the Plan must contain adopted criteria that will be used to determine whether buildings, landscapes or areas are worthy of “designation as non-designated heritage assets” or new Conservation Areas and there should be “an accessible local list of assets linked to the policy”. There should be “a positive policy with reference to buildings at risk rather than just an intention to monitor them” and “a positive policy that refers to the possible creation of new Conservation Areas”. The justification text should say that the Council “will produce” (rather than “will consider the production of”) a Local List of non-designated assets and “will” (rather than “will look to”) work pro-actively with	See previous column.	<p>Disagree. There is no list of assets or criteria that can be linked to the policy at present. However, as indicated in paragraph 23.5, the Council will consider the merits of producing an SPD, with associated lists and criteria, in the future.</p> <p>Other changes to the policy are not considered to be appropriate.</p>

		established Civic Societies.		
6944	Brinsley Vision (representing 70 residents of Brinsley)	Proposes that the justification text for the policy should refer to two potential additional Article 4 Directions, to the south-west and north-east of Brinsley. Proposes updates/corrections to the description of the Conservation Area and suggests its extension to Hall Farm. Proposes that the text should refer to the Council working with local voluntary groups and Local History Societies, as well as with Civic Societies.	See previous column.	<p>Partially agreed. Brinsley Vision has not suggested which permitted development rights might be removed as a result of the Article 4 Direction, and as things stand the Council does not consider that any Direction would be appropriate. However, any Direction or any amendment to the Conservation Area boundary would be matters to be considered separately from the Plan.</p> <p>Factual updates/corrections will be made where necessary.</p> <p>The justification text will be amended to include reference to local voluntary groups and Local History Societies.</p>
18	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	Welcomes the policy.	None.	Noted.
6284	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) (represented by JLL)	Policy is too generic; there should be a clear distinction between designated and non-designated heritage assets and how they will be treated, policy should be separated to clarify the distinction made in national	See previous column.	Disagree. The support of Historic England, subject to the amendments referred to above, indicates that the policy is satisfactory in its current form. No further changes are therefore considered to be appropriate.

		policy. Point 2 of the policy does not appropriately define harm (i.e. substantial and less than substantial).		
3756	Gladman Development Ltd	Policy should recognise that there are two separate balancing exercises to be undertaken for designated and non-designated heritage assets. Designated heritage assets are assessed against their importance (with greater weight given to more important), non- designated heritage assets are assessed as a balanced judgement regarding the scale of harm and significance.	See previous column.	Disagree. The support of Historic England, subject to the amendments referred to above, indicates that the policy is satisfactory in its current form. No further changes are therefore considered to be appropriate.

Policy 24: The Health Impacts of Development

ID	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
211	Nottinghamshire County Council	Welcomes the policy, although suggests that the title should include “well-being”.	See previous column.	Agreed; the title will be expanded.	No significant implications.
6279	Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum	Welcomes the policy.	None.	Noted.	
48	Sport England	With regard to Policies 17 and 24, Place-making, Design and Amenity and The Health Impacts of Development, Sport England (SE) “supports the idea of health impact to be a design consideration for new communities and would encourage the inclusion of a design policy which encourages developments to be designed to promote active lifestyles”.	See previous column.	Partially agreed. An additional criterion relating to walking and cycling will be added to policy 17.	See Policy 17 assessment.
6053	British Land Company (represented by WYG)	Further clarity required as to definition of ‘significant adverse impact’ within policy justification. Unclear how criteria ‘c’ would be triggered if a Health Impact Assessment hadn’t already been carried out. Possibly no need for criteria ‘b’. More information is needed regarding the type of mitigation that may be required.	See previous column.	Partially agreed. Mitigation requirements will be clarified by an amendment to the wording of the final part of the policy and by an addition to the justification text referring to the ‘Healthier Options Takeaway (HOT)’ scheme. The remainder of the policy is considered to be as clear as reasonably possible.	Mitigation does not alter the assessment.
4122	McDonalds (represented by Planware Ltd)	Not appropriate to have a blanket restriction of A5 uses near schools and a lack of evidence to justify policy. No maps to show where the restriction would apply and	See previous column.	Disagree. This is not a ‘blanket’ restriction and the Policies Map shows the schools to which the policy relates. No further change	

therefore unclear/conflict with the
NPPF.

is considered to be appropriate.

Policy 25: Culture, Tourism and Sport

ID	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
6577	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum	Proposes additions to the policy and its justification text.	The proposed additions would refer to artificial, all-weather '3G' pitches and "the legacy of Chetwynd Barracks (especially relating to the WW1 shell factory and associated memorial".	Disagree. The site-specific policy for the Barracks sets out expectations in detail.	
48	Sport England	SE "are pleased that it is the council's intention to ensure policies provide adequate sport and recreation facilities as part of new developments. However, the level of provision should be determined locally and should be informed by the Playing Pitch Strategy and Green Infrastructure Strategy".	See previous column.	Noted. The Playing Pitch Strategy and Green Infrastructure Strategy will be carefully considered in all cases.	
6841	Active Notts (previously Sport Nottinghamshire)	The policy should say that "the refresh of the Leisure Facilities Strategy for the district will identify future priorities that meet the needs of the local communities to lead healthy and active lives".	See previous column.	Disagree. Detail of this sort would not be appropriate for inclusion in the policy.	
6944	Brinsley Vision (representing 70 residents of Brinsley)	Supports the policy but "do not think it goes far enough". Proposes that further links between DH Lawrence and Brinsley should be investigated and established.	See previous column.	Disagree. This could be a matter for the Brinsley Neighbourhood Plan and/or further supplementary work.	

Policy 26: Travel Plans

ID	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
6279	Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum	Welcomes the policy.	None.	Noted.	
6577	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum	Proposes an additional paragraph of reasoned justification.	The additional text would read: “We expect Travel Plans to include specific sections detailing how developments will encourage more walking, cycling and public transport (bus routes both frequency and operating times) to/from and through the sites.”	Partially agreed. Additional justification text will be added, to give more information as to what Travel Plans will be expected to contain. However it would not be reasonable to expect bus routes to pass through all new sites.	No significant implications.
119	Home Builders Federation	Points to a suggested inconsistency between the policy and its justification text and in any case considers that “Travel Plans should only be required if there is an identified impact to warrant such a requirement”.	See previous column.	Agreed that it needs to be clarified that the policy relates to all large sites. The word “other” will therefore be deleted in paragraph 26.1. Disagree with the second point, as the use of Travel Plans will help to identify any impacts.	No significant implications.
18	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England (supported by Nottinghamshire Campaign for Better	Welcomes the policy.	None.	Noted.	

	Transport)			
55	Pedals (Nottingham Cycling Campaign)	Supports the policy.	None.	Noted.
6053	British Land Company (represented by WYG)	Threshold used is arbitrary and should be circumstantial.	Travel Plans should instead be expected for developments “which generate significant amounts of transport movements”.	Disagree. The threshold in the policy is based on the definition of ‘major’ development that is used with regard to planning applications and a circumstantial basis for applying the policy would be more arbitrary.
720	1 contributor - objector	The policy is “worthless”.	Not specified.	No further change is considered to be appropriate.

Policy 27: Local Green Space

ID	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
211	Nottinghamshire County Council	Considers that the Bramcote Moor Grassland Local Wildlife Site should be designated as Local Green Space in Policy 27.	See previous column.	Disagree. Local Wildlife Sites are designated for specific ecological reasons and Local Green Space for other reasons based on the opinions of local communities. In any case, it is understood that the County Council no longer wishes to pursue this point following additional investigation into the LWS as referenced in the SA.	
6279	Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum	Supports the designations of Local Green Space in Bramcote in Policy 27, but would like additional designations, including part of Bramcote Hills Golf Course, and proposes an amendment to the justification text (regarding “a former area of Green Belt”).	See previous column.	Disagree. The Council does not consider that further designations of Local Green Space are appropriate; however the matter could be addressed in the Bramcote Neighbourhood Plan. The proposed amendment to the justification text would not be appropriate, as the current text would be correct if the Plan were to be adopted in its proposed form.	
6577	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum	Proposes additional justification text to say that the Council “expect to receive an application” for Local Green Space designation at Toton and Chetwynd.	See previous column.	Disagree. This sort of comment, which may quickly become outdated, would not be appropriate for inclusion in the Plan.	
48	Sport England	SE “is encouraged that the emerging local plan looks to include policies to protect existing sport/leisure facilities”. However, “it is thought that the plan should	See previous column.	Disagree. The Council’s view is that new allocations for playing fields, etc, are not needed. In any case, this issue is distinct from that of Local Green Space.	

		also include policies and to provide new sports/leisure facilities that are required to meet identified needs e.g. site allocations for new playing fields, requirements in major housing and mixed-use developments for sport/leisure provision, sports hubs allocations etc”.		
119	Home Builders Federation	Questions whether the designation of land east and west of Coventry Lane as Local Green Space in Policy 27 is appropriate, because “this designation could be construed as a re-designation as Green Belt by another name via the back door”.	See previous column.	This land is now to be designated as Green Belt rather than Local Green Space.
6975	Beeston Wildlife Group	Considers that two fields adjacent to Cornwall Avenue and Leyton Crescent Recreation Ground should be designated as Local Green Space in Policy 27.	See previous column.	Partially agreed. The field at Cornwall Avenue will be designated as Local Green Space. However the Council does not consider that the field adjacent to the Recreation Ground merits this designation.
				An additional LGS would not amend the principle of the policy and therefore its assessment.
6944	Brinsley Vision (representing 70 residents of Brinsley)	Supports Policy 27, Local Green Space, but proposes two additional designations, to the south-east and north-east of the village.	See previous column.	Disagree. The proposed areas are in the Green Belt and so may not need designation as Local Green Space; however this is a matter that could be addressed through the Brinsley Neighbourhood Plan.
34	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Supports the policy. However, considers that the phrase “except in very special circumstances” should be removed because “this will undermine the policy	See previous column.	Disagree. The proposed wording is consistent with the advice in paragraph 78 of the NPPF.

protection”.					
6903	Beeston Fields Golf Club (represented by Stone Planning Services)	Object to the Golf Course being designated as Local Green Space in its entirety as it does not meet the criteria. Paddocks off Beeston Fields Drive and the area north of Bramcote Drive could meet the criteria for Local Green Space and do not form part of the functional Golf Course but believe that none of it should be designated as such.	Beeston Fields Golf Course should not be designated as Local Green Space,	This land is now to be designated as a Green Infrastructure Asset in policy 28, rather than as Local Green Space in policy 27.	An omission of a proposed LGS would not amend the principle of the policy and therefore its assessment.
6925	Hillside Gospel Hall Trust (represented by Pegasus Group)	Gospel Hall Trust land should not be included in the Local Green Space designation as it does not meet the designation criteria (it is previously developed and not accessible by the public). It should be included within the housing allocation to the north.	Gospel Hall Trust land should not be designated as Local Green Space.	Agreed. This land will be removed from the Local Green Space designation and included in the housing allocation.	An omission of a proposed LGS would not amend the principle of the policy and therefore its assessment.
6879	Crampin, Barden and Scott (represented by SSA Planning Limited)	Replacement of ‘prominent areas for special protection’ with ‘local green space’ is inappropriate in the case of Burnt Hill Bramcote which could be protected by the Landscape policy and does not meet the criteria. This would allow the development of their site which is being promoted as an alternative housing site in the Main Built up Area (in Bramcote) which is not included as an allocation in the Local Plan.	Burnt Hill should not be designated as Local Green Space.	Disagree. The Council considers that Burnt Hill merits designation as Local Green Space.	
3756	Gladman	Question the justification of the	Land at	This land is now to be designated as	An omission of

Development Ltd.	Local Green Space at Bramcote/Stapleford as it appears to be an extensive tract of land and therefore doesn't meet the criteria.	Bramcote/Stapleford should not be designated as Local Green Space.	Green Belt rather than Local Green Space.	a proposed LGS would not amend the principle of the policy and therefore its assessment.	
460 720 1329 2413 2565 3349 3586 5896 6955 6958 6959 6960 6965	13 contributors – all objectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Merely duplicates Broxtowe Core Strategy policy and there is no evidence of consultation.Land east and west of Coventry Lane should remain Green Belt; therefore Local Green Space designation is unjustified and unnecessary.Extent too limited. Reduces existing protections to more limited area.Designate two fields off Cornwall Avenue and Leyton Crescent as Local Green Space.	See previous column.	Partially agreed. The field off Cornwall Avenue will be designated as Local Green Space. The field off Leyton Crescent is not considered to justify Local Green Space designation. Land at Coventry Lane is now to be designated as Green Belt rather than Local Green Space. No further changes are considered to be appropriate.	No significant implications.

Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets

ID	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
142	Historic England	Welcomes the policy.	None.	Noted.	
21	Natural England	Welcomes the policy, however proposes amended policy wording, which would refer to the loss of assets.	In the first line of the policy, replace "...increased use..." with "...loss or increased use".	Agree with the principle of clarifying the policy. However it is felt that this would be better done by amending the second part of the policy rather than the first. "...any harm to the Green Infrastructure Asset..." will therefore be replaced by "...any harm or loss to the Green Infrastructure Asset..."	The policy is already assessed very highly against the biodiversity and green infrastructure objective, so there is no SA change in this regard. There would be a minor adverse impact on the economic structure objective, as site options available to developers would be somewhat more restricted.
68 and 6537	Awsworth Parish Council and Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	Considers that the justification text for Policy 28, Green Infrastructure Assets, should include references to Sustrans and the 'Great Northern Greenway'.	See previous column.	Disagree. The Great Northern Path is referred to at paragraph 28.4 and there is no need for a reference to Sustrans. These issues are also covered in the site-specific policy for Awsworth.	
71	Greasley Parish Council (supported by Borough Councillors Margaret and John Handley)	Considers that a new sub-clause should be added ; this should be called 'A mix of Informal Open Spaces and flood mitigation measures' and it should apply to land off Thorn Drive, Newthorpe.	See previous column.	Agreed. A new sub-clause will be added.	This would result in an improvement for the natural resources and flooding objective.
		Supports the inclusion of Green Infrastructure Corridor 2.2, as referred to in the policy.	None.	Noted.	

6279	Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum	Welcomes the policy.	None.	Noted.	
6577	Chetwynd: The Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum	Proposes additions to the policy and its justification text.	The additions would: refer to artificial, all-weather '3G' pitches; say that Green Infrastructure corridors should be 50 metres wide; and say that the Council will re-route the Erewash Valley Trail though the eastern side of Chetwynd Barracks.	Disagree. It is not considered to be appropriate to specify a width for Green Infrastructure corridors. Green Infrastructure is dealt with extensively in the policies for Toton and Chetwynd, and it would not be appropriate to repeat site-specific issues in this policy.	
48	Sport England	SE "welcomes the inclusion of policies which ensure adequate provision for new development (especially residential) to provide for the additional sport/leisure facility needs that they generate through CIL and/or planning obligations".	None.	Noted.	
5908	Sustrans	'Recreational routes' should be re-named "to reflect their multifunctional use and potential" including "sustainable active travel infrastructure for everyday journeys and for accessing services".	A specific alternative name is not suggested.	Agree with the principle. Their main use is likely to be recreational; however the justification text will be expanded to make clear that the routes may be used for these other purposes too.	No significant implications.
6944	Brinsley Vision (representing 70 residents of	Supports the policy but proposes the designation of an additional recreational	See previous column.	Disagree. The routes referred to in this policy are of a larger scale than the	

	Brinsley)	route, the 'Brinsley Steeplechase' (a 5.5 mile circular walk around the village).		one that is suggested. However the proposed route might be addressed in the Brinsley Neighbourhood Plan.
6882	Broxtowe Labour Group	Considers that a Green Infrastructure Corridor should be added between HS2 and Bramcote Woods, "with a view towards creating a single extended green infrastructure corridor between the North and South of the Borough".	See previous column.	Disagree. The corridors have been carefully chosen, following public consultation. Various north-south corridors, and corridors between Toton and woods at Bramcote, are included (as shown on Map 62).
18	Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England	Considers that the phrase "unless the benefits of the development are clearly shown to outweigh the harm" should be removed, because it "leaves so much room for interpretation" that it would "undermine the overall policy intention".	See previous column.	Disagree. The current wording is considered to be appropriate.
34	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Supports the policy. However, considers that the policy should state that corridors must be at least 50 metres wide, and proposes an amendment to the justification text so as not to say that development provides 'the greatest' opportunities for enhancement..	See previous column.	Disagree. It is not considered to be appropriate to specify a width for Green Infrastructure corridors, and the current wording is considered to be appropriate.
55	Pedals	Supports the policy.	None.	Noted.

(Nottingham cycling Campaign)				
6877	Barton Wilmore	Objects to the inclusion of land in the vicinity of the HS2 station being restricted via a policy when wider opportunities for management and enhancement may arise in accordance with a wider masterplan. Also concern with the wording of the policy that requires improvement of the asset itself where there may be opportunities for off-site enhancements. The policy should be more flexible.	See previous column.	Disagree. The policy protects important assets, while providing an appropriate degree of flexibility.
2195 2565 4131 4132 4145 4435 4436 4515 4706 5896 6828 6842 6844 6845 6850	26 contributors – 1 supporter and 25 objectors	Land at Thorn Drive should be protected by the policy. An additional 50m-wide Green Infrastructure corridor should be designated to the east of Coventry Lane.	See previous column.	Agreed regarding the land at Thorn Drive, which will be protected by the policy. Disagree regarding adding an extra corridor, as the corridors have been carefully chosen, following public consultation.

6851
6852
6853
6854
6904
6934
6936
6950
4601
6987

Policy 29: Cemetery Extensions

ID	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
68 and 6537	Awsworth Parish Council and Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	Asks the Borough Council to consider whether the policy should include an extension at St Peter's Church, Awsworth.	See previous column.	Disagree. There is not considered to be a need for an extension to this cemetery.	
6944	Brinsley Vision (representing 70 residents of Brinsley)	Supports the policy.	None.	Noted.	
34	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Supports the policy.	None	Noted.	

Policy 30: Landscape

ID	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
67	Brinsley Parish Council	Considers that “the landscape of Church Lane” should be added to the list of local landscape character areas, as defined in the 2009 Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment.	See previous column.	Disagree. The Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment was carried out carefully and comprehensively, and it would be inappropriate to effectively amend its conclusions without clear justification.	
6279	Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum	Considers that the policy should “make provision for suitable compensation to be provided” in the case of housing development on land currently within the Green Belt.	Not specified.	Disagree. It is unclear what sort of compensation is envisaged, and the policy is considered to be appropriate in its current form.	
6944	Brinsley Vision (representing 70 residents of Brinsley)	Supports the policy.	None.	Noted.	
3630 6883	2 contributors – both objectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “River Trent landscape” should be added. • Mature Landscape Area at Kimberley should be retained. 	See previous column.	Disagree. The River Trent is covered by the Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment. The previous Mature Landscape Area designation is not being continued as the County Council, whose work formed the basis for them, considers the designation to be obsolete.	

Policy 31: Biodiversity Assets

ID	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
21	Natural England	Objects to the policy and proposes alternative policy wording which “builds on the approach set out within the Aligned Core Strategy”.	The proposed policy wording, which the authority “may want to consider”, “could include”: “All development proposals should seek to deliver a net gain in biodiversity and geodiversity and contribute to the Borough’s ecological network. Permission will not be granted for development which would cause significant harm to sites and habitats of nature conservation and geological value, together with species that are protected or under threat. Support will be given to the enhancement and increase in the number of sites and habitats of nature conservation value, and in particular to meeting objectives and targets identified in the Nottinghamshire Biodiversity Action Plan.”	Agreed. Natural England’s wording will be added as a new first part of the policy. Also, in the final part of the policy, “harm” will be replaced by “significant harm or loss”.	The assessment against the biodiversity objective has increased, There are negative effects on the housing and economic structure objectives,
6279	Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum	Considers that the Moor Lane cutting should be added to the list of Local Geological Sites in Appendix 4, which is referred to in Policy 31.	See previous column.	Agreed. The cutting will be included in the appendix.	A technical issue not affecting the assessment.
6944	Brinsley Vision (representing 70 residents of Brinsley)	Supports the policy.	None.	Noted.	
34	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Proposes additions to the definition of Biodiversity Assets	See previous column.	Partially agreed. Amendments will be	The additional information will

		in the policy, to include references to UK priority species and habitats as identified in the NERC Act (not the same as Nottinghamshire ones) and legally protected species (not the same as priority ones). It also proposes a Biodiversity SPD.		made to the detailed wording of the policy. It would not be appropriate to commit to the production of an SPD, although this will be considered for the future.	increase the biodiversity objective assessment to a very major positive effect.
6053	British Land Company (represented by WYG)	Criteria 'g' (re: trees and hedges) unnecessary and disproportionate as could negatively hinder any development – should be restricted to trees and hedges in a Conservation Area or within the setting of a Listed Building.	Part g) should read: "Other trees and hedgerows within designated conservation areas or within the setting of a listed building".	Disagree. Trees and hedgerows can be valuable to the local environment in many circumstances (while not all those within Conservation Areas or the setting of Listed Buildings may necessarily be of high biodiversity value).	
6903	Beeston Fields Golf Club (represented by Stone Planning Services)	Biodiversity designation for the golf course should be removed, only the eastern side of the golf course has any biodiversity merit.	See previous column.	Disagree. Local Wildlife Sites are designated on an independent and objective basis, and it would not be appropriate to seek to amend them.	
6877	Barton Willmore	Objects to the inclusion of land in the vicinity of the HS2 station being restricted via a policy when wider opportunities for management and enhancement may arise in	See previous column.	Disagree. The policy protects important assets, while providing an appropriate degree of flexibility.	

accordance with a wider masterplan. Section 2 is welcomed re benefits can be considered to outweigh harm and there may be opportunities for off-site enhancements. The policy should be more flexible.

Policy 32: Developer Contributions

ID	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
142	Historic England	Proposes that the policy should be expanded to refer to contributions for “the historic environment, heritage assets and/or their setting”, or similar, to cover situations where mitigation measures are required.	See previous column.	Agreed. Reference to the historic environment will be added to the policy.	The assessment against the heritage objective has increased. There are negative effects on the housing and economic structure objectives, because of the risk of effects on viability and the supply of sites.
6276	Nottinghamshire West Clinical Commissioning Group	Make various site-specific requests for developer contributions for health purposes, which could perhaps be reflected in policy 32.	See previous column.	Disagree. Health is referred to in the policy, and it would not be appropriate to include site-specific references in this policy.	
211	Nottinghamshire County Council	Wants a reference to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) to be added. (The County also makes various detailed comments on the IDP itself.)	See previous column.	Disagree. The IDP will be taken into account in all cases; however it is not appropriate to refer to it in the policy.	
2316	Councillor Richard MacRae	Proposes that developer contributions should be used to improve community facilities in Stapleford such as the pavilion and play area on Hickings Lane.	See previous column.	Disagree. It would not be appropriate to include site-specific details in the policy.	
6577	Chetwynd: The	Proposes additions to the	The additions would highlight	Disagree. Education is referred	

	Toton and Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum	justification text.	the importance of education contributions and say that “all Section 106 contributions will be directed in the first instance to the Borough wards/town & parish councils affected by developments”.	to in the policy. The tests for Section 106 contributions are clear in the NPPF and include a requirement that they are related to the development in question. No change is therefore needed.	
5908	Sustrans	Considers that the policy, in order to help fund improvements to routes and trails including the Great Northern Path, should include “reference to green infrastructure assets including multi-user non-motorised transport routes and trails”.	See previous column.	Partially agreed. The reference to ‘Green Space’ will be changed to ‘Green Infrastructure Assets’. Reference will also be added to cycling, footpaths and public transport.	The assessment against the transport objective has increased. There are negative effects on the housing and economic structure objectives, because of the risk of effects on viability and the supply of sites.
119	Home Builders Federation	Considers that “it should be clear that any improvements to existing facilities is related to the proposed development and is not rectifying an existing deficiency”.	See previous column.	Disagree. This point is covered by the NPPF and no change is needed.	
34	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Supports the policy.	None.	Noted.	
6053	British Land Company (represented by WYG)	Threshold within policy should be removed so should apply regardless of size or type of development. Policy is too	Reference to thresholds should be removed and references to CIL Regulations criteria should	Disagree. Removing the threshold would make the policy unduly onerous. The policy does not inhibit on- or	

		focused on financial contributions and doesn't recognise on/off-site mitigation that could be achieved.	be added.	off-site mitigation.
718	J McCann & Co (Nottingham) Ltd (represented by Planning and Design Group)	Policy should be based on viability information (specifically that provided by developers) and the approach should be collaborative. Reference to submissions of viability appraisals should be included within the text.	See previous column: an additional paragraph to this effect should be added.	Disagree. These points are covered by paragraph 32.1 and no change is considered to be appropriate.
720	1 contributor - objector	The policy should say that developers' contributions will be spent in the area where the development is.	See previous column.	Disagree. Contributions must be directly related to the development but do not necessarily have to be spent in the immediate vicinity.

Proposed Additional Policies:

ID	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
4	Environment Agency	Recommends the inclusion of a policy on Sustainable Drainage Systems and proposes a detailed wording. (However the EA does not object to the soundness or legal compliance of the Plan on this basis.)	<p>The EA “suggest you explore the possibility of incorporating at least the following wording”:</p> <p>“All developments will be encouraged to include Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) where appropriate to manage surface water effectively on site, to reduce surface water runoff and to ensure flooding is not increased elsewhere. Where possible SuDS should also be designed to enhance biodiversity value. A two stage SuDS treatment should be used in order to improve water quality. An appropriate maintenance and management plan, agreed with the Council, will be required for all Sustainable Drainage systems and where appropriate, S106 Agreements will be sought.</p> <p>Other than in exceptional circumstances (for example where it is not technically feasible or where the benefits of the scheme clearly outweigh other factors):</p> <p>a) development on greenfield sites should maintain greenfield surface water run off rates;</p> <p>b) brownfield sites should achieve as close to greenfield runoff rates as possible and must achieve betterment</p>	Partially agreed. A reference to SuDS will be added to part 4c of policy 1, regarding flood risk. A reference to ‘flood mitigation measures including SuDS’ will also be added to part 1 of policy 32, regarding developer contributions.	For policies 1 and 32, the assessment against the natural resources and flooding objective has increased. There are negative effects on the housing and economic structure objectives, because of the risk of effects on the viability and supply of sites.

			to existing runoff rates. A minimum of 30% reduction in run off rates will be expected; c) applicants should supply sufficient technical evidence to demonstrate that the maximum possible reduction in runoff rates has been achieved.”	
6882	Broxtowe Labour Group	Considers that a corridor of land should be protected for a new tram route to Kimberley and Eastwood.	A particular route is not specified.	Disagree. Feasibility work is at too early a stage for any clear proposed route to be identified yet. However, part of a potential route is safeguarded where development is proposed at Kimberley.
		Would like a policy dealing with situations “where community facilities do need to be moved in order to make way for proposed development”.	The policy should ensure that “they are provided with a guaranteed site allocation and an enhanced facility to compensate the community for any loss”.	Disagree. Such a policy is not considered to be necessary.
6978, 307 & 2767	KENTAG (Kimberley, Eastwood, Nuthall Tram Action Group) (supported by Borough Councillor Richard Robinson and 2767 - Gloria De Piero MP)	Considers that the Plan should protect a route for the extension of the tram to Kimberley and Eastwood and ensure that any future housing development “saves space for the tram”.	A particular route is not specified.	Disagree. Feasibility work is at too early a stage for any clear proposed route to be identified yet. However, part of a potential route is safeguarded where development is proposed at Kimberley.

Other issues

ID	Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
211	Nottinghamshire County Council	Asks for a reference to its 'Transport Statement for Funding' document to be added to Table 2 (which concerns strategic policies).	See previous column.	Disagree. This representation appears to be based on a misunderstanding, and no change is needed.	
68 and 6537	Awsworth Parish Council and Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	Makes various comments on the OPUN Awsworth Design Review Panel Workshop Report and asks the Borough Council to consider whether the Plan requires any amendment to reflect these comments.	See previous column.	Disagree. OPUN's advice has been carefully taken into account in the preparation of the policies for Awsworth and elsewhere.	
73	Stapleford Town Council (supported by Borough Councillor Richard MacRae)	Makes various detailed, and more general, observations relating to the Plan, including criticisms of some of the Plan's descriptions of Stapleford, a desire for "a clear identification of the number of units of new housing that the Town was expected to accommodate" and opinions that the Plan "had to a great extent ignored Stapleford" and that "the Local Plan document and the process that led up to it is lacking in transparency". The Town Council also considers that there should be a review of the Core Strategy "so as to either change the size of the overall housing figure for greater Nottingham or revise the way it is distributed".	See previous column.	Disagree. No further changes are considered to be appropriate. A review of the Core Strategy will start shortly.	
6279	Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum	"Corrections", updates and/or amendments should be made to maps 1 and 2 (Main Built-up Area), 4	See previous column.	Partially agreed. Minor factual corrections will be made where necessary.	No implications.

		(housing commitments) and 62 (Green Infrastructure corridors).		
6882	Broxtowe Labour Group	Considers that “additional commitments” should be built into the Plan to ensure “environmentally friendly housing developments”, regarding issues such as solar panels and ground source or air source heat pumps.	Not specified.	Disagree. No change is considered to be appropriate
		Considers that the Plan should enable Broxtowe to become a “proactively green borough”, regarding issues such as electric charging points, cycle paths, and the allocation of land for green energy, such as solar or wind energy.	Not specified.	Disagree. Electric charging points are covered by policy 20.3; cycling is referred to in Core Strategy policy 14.3; and allocations for solar or wind energy are not considered to be appropriate.
2548	Broxtowe Borough Council Environment Department	Proposes various corrections to the justification texts, maps and appendices.	See previous column.	Factual corrections will be made where necessary. None.
4200	Taylor Burrows (represented by Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd)	Plan will only be in effect for 9 years (and not the minimum of 10).	Not specified.	Disagree. This is Part 2 of a two-part plan; Part 1 runs until 2028 and it would be illogical for Part 2 to have a different timescale.

Other officer recommended changes to the Plan

Policy	Broxtowe Proposals	SA Implications
8, Development in the Green Belt	The policy wording should be amended to clarify that “disproportionate additions” should be considered on a cumulative basis.	No significant implications.
10, Town Centre and District Centre Uses	<p>The policy should be made more flexible by: amending the 10% figure in part 1.b)i to 20% for Use Classes A2 and A3; and amending the 50% figure in part 1.b)ii to 60%.</p> <p>The wording should also be amended so as to make clear the relationship between the various parts of the policy.</p> <p>Kimberley Town Centre boundary has been amended to reflect the work of the Town Council on the emerging Kimberley Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	No significant implications.
14, Centre of Neighbourhood Importance	For clarity, “...and only providing such a use does not...” should be replaced with “...provided that such a use does not...”.	No significant implications.
15, Housing Size, Mix and Choice	For clarity, in part 3 the word “allocated” should be replaced by “other”.	No significant implications.
17, Place-making, Design and Amenity	A reference should be added at part 1.i) to “safe and convenient access”; the wording at part 4.e) should be amended so as to cover all developments that might affect visibility; and additions relating to annexes should be made to part 4.	No significant implications.
27, Local Green Space	The “Protected Open Area” designation should be deleted and the two golf courses which are currently designated as “Protected Open Areas” should instead be protected as “Green Infrastructure Assets” in policy 28.	No significant implications.

Requested Map Amendments:

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
6279 - Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum 5893	Map 1: Map shows the Main Built up Area extending into open countryside.	Map should be amended to reflect the built up area.	Agree. Map has been amended to show the extent of the urban area (following the allocations proposed in the plan) i.e. excluding the extent of the Green Belt.	None.
6279 - Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum	Map 2: Map mislabels the open countryside adjacent to the M1 stretching east to Bramcote as 'Main Built up Area'.	Map should be amended to reflect the built up area and ensure land allocation is retained within that built up area without urban extension and loss of Green Belt.		
48 - Sport England	Map 3: includes the site allocation of Trent Vale sports club within the mixed-use commitments however there is no further information on the allocation.	Details of the allocation should be provided to ensure the facilities are retained as playing fields and upgraded to sufficient standards as detailed within the Playing Pitch Strategy.	Noted. The Trent Vale Sports club is not shown as part of a mixed-use allocation on Map 3. The sports club is the land to the south of the commitment (Beeston Business Park). No map amendments required, however the commitment has been amended to show the distinction between the residential and employment land.	No significant implications.
6279 - Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum 5893 2565 6057	Map 4: Omits the commitment to building houses on the former Bramcote Hills Golf Course.	Include Bramcote Golf Course commitment on overview.	Agree. The plans have been updated to show the commitments from the 17/18 SHLAA of 10 or more dwellings.	None.
6279 -	Map 8: Fails to show the Local	A greater density should be	Agree.	See site

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum	Wildlife Site and also suggests a housing density of 19 dwellings/ha.	allocated accompanied with a requirement to pay for a replacement leisure centre.	The housing number for the site has been increased (see site allocation response).	allocation response.
68 - Awsworth Parish Council	Map 16: The settlement boundary has been amended to include all of the area that was previously to be taken out of the Green Belt.	The map should refer to 'the key settlement of Awsworth' to make it clear that the Settlement includes areas that are in other Parish's.	Agree. Amend title of Map to reference the 'Key' settlement of Awsworth. The map has also been amended to show the settlement as existing + allocation.	None.
6537 - Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group				
68 - Awsworth Parish Council	Map 17: The commitment on Old School Lane shown on the map has now been built and so should be removed. It is also not clear from the plan or map how many dwellings are included in the commitments.	Update maps to show current position re: commitments (remove complete sites). Make clear what is being provided on the committed sites and provide an update on delivery.	Agree. See response (above) re: updated commitments, the OS base map has yet to be updated and so the houses built on the site are not yet shown. See the SHLAA 17/18 for housing numbers.	None.
6537 - Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group				
68 - Awsworth Parish Council	Map 18: Parish boundary is not shown clearly and a housing number should be allocated to each part of the site based on Parish boundaries.	Amend map to show the Parish boundaries and allocate a housing number to each respective part of the site / Parish.	Noted. Map 16 shows the Parish boundaries but this has been updated to also show the site allocation. It is not appropriate to designate housing numbers (or indeed any other on-site provision) on a pro-rate basis as it is necessary that the site is comprehensively planned as a whole.	None.
6537 - Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	Map 18: The figure does not make clear the split between Awsworth and Cossall Parish Councils. On the basis of the indicative plan from the developer it is roughly an 80/20 split and therefore Awsworth would provide 194 homes and Cossall would provide 49.	Amend the map to show the respective housing figures for each of the Parishes.		

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
68 - Awsworth Parish Council 6537 - Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	Map 18: Site name has changes from 'land off Newton's Lane' to 'Land West of Awsworth (inside the bypass)' the site area is shown as 12ha but includes adjacent highways land along Shiloh's Way and Newton's Lane to the South. The site promoters have stated that there land ownership extends to 10.1ha.	Amend the map to show only the developable area.	Noted. The boundary shown in Map 18 is the extent of the land to be released from the Green Belt and included in the allocation (and does not relate to private land ownership).	
68 - Awsworth Parish Council	Map 18: Includes 'The View' within the allocation which is to be retained and is excluded from the development site.	Amend the map to exclude 'The View'.	Noted. See above.	None.
4200 - Taylor & Burrows Property (Represented by Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd)	Map 24: No key identifying the development zones within the site.	Add Key	Agree.	None.
5908 - Sustrans	Amend Policies map and Recreational Routes Map to show amended route for the Great Northern Path.		Plans have not been provided to show what the amendments should be made to the route.	
3586	Map 61: No rationale for removing land from the Green Belt and designating it as Local Green Space. Defensible boundary can be achieved by Deddington Lane, Moor Lane and Coventry Lane and this would not affect school plans or possible		'Very special circumstances' would need to be proven at application stage if the area is to remain in the Green Belt.	

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
	café on the park as these can be justified by exceptional circumstances.			

Appendix Amendments:

ID - Organisation	Summary of Representation	Requested Changes	Broxtowe Response	SA Implications
6279 - Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum	Appendix 4: Moor Lane Cutting is omitted from the list	Add the cutting to the list.	<p>Agree.</p> <p>After Reviewing the data there were three other Local Geological Sites that had been omitted from the appendix. These have now been included.</p> <p>Omitted sites were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moor Lane Road Cutting, Bramcote • Beauvale Brook, Greasley • Babbington Colliery Roadside Exposure, Kimberley • Wildman's Wood Quarry, Kimberley 	The assessments demonstrate that these were considered as part of the evidence for the SA.