

Policy 22 – Minerals:

ID	Organisation
Duty to Co-operate / Interest Groups	
211	Nottinghamshire County Council
16	The Coal Authority
6882	Broxtowe Labour Group
Developer / Landowner	
3756	Gladman Developments Limited

Details

Agent	
Please provide your client's name	
Your Details	
Title	
Name	
Organisation (If responding on behalf of an organisation)	Nottinghamshire County Council
Address	
Telephone Number	
Email Address	
Would you like to be contacted regarding future planning policy consultations?	Yes
If you wish to comment on more than one issue you will need to submit a form for each representation.	

Policy relates to

Please specify what your comment relates to					
Policy number	Page number	Policy text/ Paragraph number	Policies Map	Sustainability Appraisal	Other (e.g. omission, evidence document etc.)
22: Minerals					

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

Question 2

Question 2: What is the issue with the Local Plan?	
Do you consider this paragraph or policy of the Local Plan to be:	
2.1 Legally compliant	Yes
2.2 Compliant with the duty to co-operate	Yes
2.3 Sound	Yes

Additional details

Please give details of why you consider this part of the Local Plan is not legally compliant, is unsound or does not comply with the duty to co-operate. Alternatively, if you wish to support any of these aspects please provide details.	Policy 22 is a welcomed, it adequately deals with potential mineral resource sterilisation and clearly defines the two mineral resources within the Borough in Map 41 (surface coal to the north and sand and gravel to the south). Though some housing and mixed use allocations do fall within these minerals safeguarding and consultation areas, they are positioned in areas that would be unlikely to be worked due to their proximity to existing residential development.
---	---

Question 4

Question 4: Modifications sought	
Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound.	None.

Question 5

Question 5: Public Examination Attendance	
If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the public examination?	Yes
If you wish to participate at the public examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary	To help contribute to the discussion and help clarify any points raised for the Planning Inspector.



The Coal Authority

Broxtowe Part 2 Local Plan - Publication Version

Consultation Deadline – 3 November 2017

Contact Details

[Redacted contact details]

[Redacted contact details]

Date

12 October 2017

Background on the Coal Authority

The Coal Authority is a Non-Departmental Public Body sponsored by the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy. The Coal Authority was established by Parliament in 1994 to: undertake specific statutory responsibilities associated with the licensing of coal mining operations in Britain; handle subsidence claims which are not the responsibility of licensed coalmine operators; deal with property and historic liability issues; and provide information on coal mining.

The main areas of planning interest to the Coal Authority in terms of policy making relate to:

- the safeguarding of coal in accordance with the advice contained in The National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance in England, Scottish Planning Policy in Scotland, and Minerals Planning Policy Wales and MTAN2 in Wales;
- the establishment of a suitable policy framework for energy minerals including hydrocarbons in accordance with the advice contained in The National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance in England, Scottish Planning Policy in Scotland, and Minerals Planning Policy Wales and MTAN2 in Wales; and
- ensuring that future development is undertaken safely and reduces the future liability on the tax payer for subsidence and other mining related hazards claims arising from the legacy of coal mining in accordance with the advice in The National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance in England, Scottish Planning Policy in Scotland, and Planning Policy Wales and MTAN2 in Wales.

Coal Issues in Broxtowe

Surface Coal Resources and Prior Extraction

As you will be aware, the Broxtowe Council area contains coal resources which are capable of extraction by surface mining operations. These resources cover an area amounting to approximately 48.88% of the Broxtowe area.

The Coal Authority is keen to ensure that coal resources are not unnecessarily sterilised by new development. Where this may be the case, The Coal Authority would be seeking prior extraction of the coal. Prior extraction of coal also has the benefit of removing any potential land instability problems in the process.

Coal Mining Legacy

As you will be aware, the Broxtowe Borough Council area has been subjected to coal mining which will have left a legacy. Whilst most past mining is generally benign in nature, potential public safety and stability problems can be triggered and uncovered by development activities.

Problems can include collapses of mine entries and shallow coal mine workings, emissions of mine gases, incidents of spontaneous combustion, and the discharge of water from abandoned coal mines. These surface hazards can be found in any coal mining area, particularly where coal exists near to the surface, including existing residential areas.

The Coal Authority has records of over 171,000 coal mine entries across the coalfields, although there are thought to be many more unrecorded. Shallow coal which is present near the surface can give rise to stability, gas and potential spontaneous combustion problems. Even in areas where coal mining was deep, in some geological conditions cracks or fissures can appear at the surface. It is estimated that as many as 2 million of the 7.7 million properties across the coalfields may lie in areas with the potential to be affected by these problems. In our view, the planning processes in coalfield areas need to take account of coal mining legacy issues.

Within the Broxtowe Borough Council area there are approximately 1566 recorded mine entries and around 9 coal mining related hazards have been reported to The Coal Authority. Mine entries may be located in built up areas, often under buildings where the owners and occupiers have no knowledge of their presence unless they have received a mining report during the property transaction. Mine entries can also be present in open space and areas of green infrastructure, potentially just under the surface of grassed areas. Mine entries and mining legacy matters should be considered by Planning Authorities to ensure that site allocations and other policies and programmes will not lead to future public safety hazards.

Although mining legacy occurs as a result of mineral workings, it is important that new development recognises the problems and how they can be positively addressed. However, it is important to note that land instability and mining legacy is not a complete constraint on new development; rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new development is safe, stable and sustainable.

As The Coal Authority owns the coal and coal mine entries on behalf of the state, if a development is to intersect the ground then specific written permission of The Coal Authority may be required.

Specific Comments on the Broxtowe Part 2 Local Plan - Publication Version

The comments and/or changes which The Coal Authority would like to make or see in relation to the above document are:

Representation No.1

Policy 21: Unstable Land

Test of Soundness

Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistency to NPPF	Legal & Procedural Requirements Inc. Duty to Cooperate
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Support – The Coal Authority supports the inclusion of Policy 21 which identifies that within the defined Development High Risk Area planning application, for non-householder development, will need to demonstrate that the site is or can be made safe and stable.

Representation No.2

Paragraph 21.1 – Justification

Support – The Coal Authority supports justification for Policy 21 and the recognition that there is extensive coal mining legacy in Broxtowe.

Representation No.3

Policy 22: Minerals

Test of Soundness

Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistency to NPPF	Legal & Procedural Requirements Inc. Duty to Cooperate
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Support – The Coal Authority supports this policy which states that development will not be permitted which needlessly sterilises mineral resources.

Representation No.4

Paragraph 22.1 – Justification

Support – The Coal Authority supports this justification which identifies that Nottinghamshire County Council as the Mineral Planning Authority sets out the mineral safeguarding and consultation areas based on resources identified by the BGS. It is also noted that this document notes that the mineral safeguarding and mineral consultation areas are the same. We are also pleased to see that shallow coalfield deposits are identified as one of the principal minerals in Broxtowe.

Representation 5

All Allocations

Unfortunately, even after several attempts I have been unable to download and review the Site Section Background Document which it is assumed sets out consideration of the site assessment criteria. However, on the basis of our previous comments to the Issues and Options consultation, dated 19 March 2015, it is assumed that all site allocations have been considered against relevant Development Risk and Surface Coal Resource plans, which we provide to the LPA in downloadable format. On this basis we would expect all relevant constraints and considerations in respect of coal mining legacy and surface coal resource issues to have been identified at the initial

stage when the sites were being considered for allocation in order to ensure that potential risks have been identified.

Conclusion

The Coal Authority welcomes the opportunity to make these comments. The Coal Authority also wishes to continue to be consulted both informally if required and formally on future stages.

Regards

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Planning Liaison Manager



6882



3rd November 2017

Broxtowe Labour Group response to the Local Plan Part 2

Dear Steffan

I am writing in my capacity as Deputy Leader of the Labour Group in order to respond to the Local Plan Part 2 on behalf of the Labour Group of Councillors on Broxtowe Borough Council.

The Labour Group recognise the time, commitment and level of consultation that has gone into developing the current draft of the local plan, and we commend the officers involved on their efforts in relation to this important work.

The Local Plan Part 2 sets out the vision for Broxtowe for the next ten years, and during that time Broxtowe is likely to face significant changes, with demographic change, population growth and a fundamental shift in infrastructure with for example the advent of HS2. Broxtowe's residents are also likely to change the ways in which we live our lives, with the advent of new technologies and green energy. We believe that our Council must take a progressive and forward thinking approach to meeting those changes and challenges head on.

Broxtowe's Local Plan Part 2 must not only to be environmentally responsible, but also be environmentally progressive. Our commitment in Broxtowe is for 6150 homes by 2028 and when taken collectively, those homes have the ability to make a significant impact on the environment. We would therefore like to see additional commitments built into the plan in respect of new developments that ensure environmentally friendly housing development, which proactively encourages energy efficiency through the use of technologies such as solar panels, and ground source or air source heat pumps.

Over the next ten years, we have the opportunity to bring about significant change in Broxtowe in terms of becoming a proactively green borough. We believe that there are a number of adjustments to the local plan that may provide for this, including the introduction of electric charging points across the borough, a commitment to introduce a significant shift in the uptake of cycling by increasing the cycle paths available in the borough, and the allocation of land specifically for the creation of green energy - such as solar or wind energy. In addition, we recognise that fracking

2
has the potential to impact on significant swathes of Broxtowe over the next ten years. Whilst we note the key role that the County Council has to play in relation to fracking decisions, we believe that Broxtowe Borough should assert a commitment to a frack free Broxtowe in respect of the minerals policy in the Local Plan.

3.2
Green transport is also going to offer significant change in Broxtowe over the next ten years as we move towards preparing for the arrival of HS2 in Toton. We welcome HS2 and the opportunities that it will bring for jobs creation and local growth. A significant infrastructure project the size of HS2 offers an opportunity to put Broxtowe on the map, building an economic hub around the Toton Sidings station and the surrounding area. We are therefore strongly in favour of the provision for economic development and transport provision, including a Stapleford Gateway that promotes business growth in the corridor between Toton Sidings and Stapleford.

4
Further, outside of the immediate HS2 area, we are strongly supportive of the development of a freight terminal at Bennerley Washings in order to support jobs and growth in the North of the Borough as well as the South.

In addition to provision of green transport in respect of HS2, we have a clear commitment to the introduction of environmentally sound methods of transport in Broxtowe and the introduction of additional capacity to transport infrastructure in order to cope with population growth and changing demographics. We therefore advocate for a corridor of land reflecting the proposed tram route in Kimberley to be earmarked for the introduction of a new tram route in the North of the borough, joining Eastwood, Kimberley, Nuthall and Nottingham. We would also be supportive of additional bus infrastructure that joins the North and the South of the borough.

28
We believe that there should be put into place a green infrastructure corridor that extends from the HS2 site to Bramcote Woods, with a view towards creating a single extended green infrastructure corridor between the North and the South of the Borough. Such a corridor would be particularly valuable for nature preservation in terms of uninhibited movement of species. It would also provide a protected area for residents to enjoy and explore, thereby supporting our commitments to healthy lifestyles and green space preservation. Our green infrastructure sites should be enforceable in planning terms in order to secure their maximum impact.

15
In housing terms, we support a housing strategy which matches the demographic growth of Broxtowe and meets already existing shortfall in addition to those commitments required for future provision. The commitments to housing mix must be backed up by evidence drawn from housing waiting lists and population growth demographics. Faced with an aging population who are experiencing increasingly complex conditions, we would like to see strengthened commitments to the provision of dementia friendly housing and also supported living. In addition, we believe that there is a role for an increased development of Council owned social housing and we would like to see a specific commitment in the housing mix policy to this.

In terms of site allocations, whilst we broadly welcome the site allocations set out in the plan, we have some concerns that the density of development in the South of the borough will lead to significant pressures on both community and transport infrastructure and we believe this needs examining in some detail. In particular, we are concerned that there will be significant transport pressure placed on the A6005 that runs through Toton, Attenborough, Chilwell and Beeston and that capacity here will need to be considered. Likewise, we have some similar concerns surrounding the transport infrastructure capacity to support the proposed development in Awsworth in the North of the borough, and the access routes to the Chetwynd development in Chilwell in the South.

3.5
7 We strongly believe that housing should not be developed in isolation and we recognise a clear need for the provision of a wide variety of community infrastructure to support the proposed housing site allocations. This is particularly the case in the proposed developments in both Beeston Rylands, and the Chetwynd Barracks site in Chilwell, where planned developments are of a significant enough size to change the shape, dynamic and operation of the communities there. In these cases, we believe that there is a real need for the type of infrastructure that supports a community of significant size, such as shops, doctor's surgeries, green space, and places for the community to meet. In line with these principles, we also request that the 'Horse Field' in Beeston Rylands to the back of Cornwall Avenue not be included in the plan, and that Kettlebrook Lodge in Kimberley continues to be excluded from the plan in any revisions that may arise following this consultation. In addition, we would also stipulate that where community facilities do need to be moved in order to make way for proposed development, they are provided with a guaranteed site allocation and an enhanced facility to compensate the community for any loss.

3.4
3.1 We also believe that green spaces and green infrastructure have a clear role to play in any site allocation and therefore in particular reference to the site close to Bramcote Crematorium, consideration must be given to the preservation of a green corridor that runs between the North and the South of the borough. In addition, we recommend that provision be made for a network of footpaths running across the Chetwynd Barracks development.

11 Strategic development sites in the borough also offer the opportunity to bring about jobs and growth, and we welcome the commitment in the Local Plan Part 2 to develop Beeston town centre through the Phase 2 site. As part of this, we believe that there must be the clear provision of cultural and community space, including a clear expanse of public realm inclusive of a water feature similar in style to Nottingham market square. We believe that this space should extend between the current site and the church, including provision for the demolition of the current Argos block. Whilst we recognise that this development should be mixed use, we also believe that the formula for attracting homes in this critical development should

not be based on a short term gain of capital receipts. Instead, the strategy for redeveloping Beeston square should maximise economic rental revenue for the Council in future years.

10 In order to support jobs and growth in Broxtowe we believe there is a role for regeneration of all four of our town centres across the borough. We are supportive of the developments in Beeston town centre but we believe there is a role for growth in our towns also in Stapleford, Eastwood and Kimberley. We are therefore concerned at the assertion in the current version of the Local Plan Part 2 that our town centre boundaries will be constricted in order to potentially make way for new housing development at the edges of those town centres: we would advocate to keep the boundaries in their current state.

Our belief, as referenced in earlier in this response, is that housing should not be developed in isolation but in partnership with the community infrastructure already in existence, and reducing our town centre boundaries seems to go against this principle. Likewise, we believe that the current Broxtowe college site should not be sacrificed for more housing. Instead, it should be retained as a site for high quality education and training provision, or for employment provision if this is not possible. Likewise, we are aware of current plans to explore options for Beeston town hall: we believe that this community heritage asset offers more opportunity than the provision of housing, and has the potential to be used in creative ways to provide direct support for the members of community, looking towards examples of good practice such as Derby City Council's health and housing hub.

Ultimately, we believe that our Local Plan should offer the opportunity to become a forward thinking, progressive borough that is not only a centre for jobs and growth but also harnesses the opportunities of the future in terms of technological change, green energy and green transport. We believe that the policies in the Local Plan Part 2 and the respective allocation sites in Broxtowe should reflect this ambition, and should also reflect a core desire to develop not just housing, but also the communities that will live, work and thrive in those developments.

Yours sincerely,

Dawn Elliott
Deputy Leader of the Labour Group
On behalf of the Broxtowe Labour Group

Broxtowe Borough Council
Lawrence Avenue
Eastwood
NG16 3LD

By email to: policy@broxtowe.gov.uk

Dear Sir or Madam,

Re: Broxtowe Local Plan Part 2

Gladman Developments Ltd. (hereafter referred to as "Gladman") has considerable experience in the development industry across a number of sectors including residential and employment land. This letter provides the response of Gladman to the current consultation held by Broxtowe Borough Council (BBC) on the Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2).

The LPP2 will help to deliver housing required in Broxtowe over the plan period. To ensure this is achieved, the Plan should distribute housing to a range of sites that will distribute housing to a range of sites that will **support the Plan's strategy**, provide sustainable locations for development and ensure housing is delivered. To address situations where housing does not come forward as expected, the LPP2 should ensure that it allows for flexibility in order to ensure a five year supply of deliverable housing sites can be maintained over the course of the plan period.

Local Plan Part 1

The Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1) specifies the overall spatial strategy for growth and allocates strategic sites. As well as the spatial strategy it sets the housing requirement for the borough. Whereas the emerging LPP2 is intended to deal with non-strategic allocations and more detailed development management policies.

Local Plan Part 2

Site Allocations

In allocating sites the Council should be mindful that to maximize housing supply the widest possible range of sites, by size and market location are required so that house builders of all types and sizes have access to suitable land in order to offer the widest possible range of products. The key to increased housing supply is the number of sales outlets. Whilst some SUEs may have multiple outlets, in general increasing the number of sales outlets available means increasing the number of housing sites. So for any given time period, all else been equal, overall sales and build out rates are faster from 20 sites of 50 units than 10 sites of 100 units or 1 site of 1,000 units. The maximum delivery is achieved not just because there are more sales outlets but because the widest possible range of products and locations are available to meet the widest possible range

of demand. In summary a wider variety of sites in the widest possible range of locations ensures all types of house builder have access to suitable land which in turn increases housing delivery.

Five year housing land supply

The Council must ensure that it is able to demonstrate a rolling five year housing land supply over the plan **period in order to be compliant with the Framework and meet fully the needs of the Borough's communities** and support the economic prospects of the wider area. It is important that the Council uses realistic delivery rates in its housing land supply. On average, annual delivery rates should be in the region of around 30 dwellings per annum per developer acting on site.

Gladman are of the view that the housing land supply calculation for Broxtowe Borough should include a 20% buffer to take into account the previous persistent under-delivery of housing within the borough. The Council should also plan to ensure that any shortfall is made good within the first 5 years of the plan in line with the PPG¹. Based on the Council's latest 5 year housing land supply assessment (5YHLS) the Council is only able to demonstrate 3.6 years. However, the approach advocated by the Council is inappropriate, the buffer should be applied to the annual requirement after the undersupply since the start of the plan period has been added. As such, this would further reduce the Council's **housing** land supply position.

In light of the above it is evident that additional housing land is required to ensure that upon adoption of the Plan the Council is able to demonstrate a robust 5YHLS position.

Policies

Policy 15: Housing Size, Mix and Choice

The above policy seeks to impose the optional technical standards for new homes as set out in the 2015 Written Ministerial Statement. The Council should ensure that it is able to demonstrate robust evidence on viability and whether this is actually achievable across the entire plan period and its consideration on viability of the Plan as a whole in terms of delivering the above policy and what effects it may have on other elements of the policy 15 i.e. the provision of affordable housing.

Further, it is noted that the above policy also seeks to secure at least 5% of housing above 20 dwellings to be in the form of serviced plots for self-build development. In this regard, whilst the government is committed to increasing home ownership through a variety of means such as the provision of starter homes, it is important that the Council is able to demonstrate robust evidence of need which is notably lacking from the Council's **SHMA**.

Notwithstanding the above, Gladman take this opportunity to point out that the provision of starter homes should nonetheless be considered equivalent to the provision of affordable housing and not in addition to. This is quite clearly the Government's intention and is intended to be reflected through amendments to the definition of affordable housing contained in the Framework.

Policy 17: Place-making, Design and Amenity

Whilst noting the importance of design, Gladman do not consider that it is appropriate to place a mandatory **requirement on all sites of 10 or more dwellings to be required to score 9 or more 'greens' in the Building for Life 12 or equivalent**. The reason for this is that some developments may not be able to meet certain criteria simply due to their location or site characteristics. As such, this policy could have the negative consequence of stifling future development opportunities.

Policy 22: Minerals

¹ PPG Reference ID: 3-035-20140306

The above policy appears to be overly onerous and seeks to prevent development from sterilizing mineral resources to meet longer term need. Paragraph 143 of the Framework states that in preparing local plans, local planning authorities should set out policies to encourage the prior extraction of minerals, where practicable and feasible, if it necessary for non-mineral development to take place. Gladman acknowledge the importance of mineral assets, but is of the view that the local policy framework that relates to this must clearly set out that this will be suitably balance against competing development needs rather than a blanket approach that would seek to prevent the delivery of sustainable growth opportunities.

Policy 23: Proposals affecting designated and non-designated heritage assets

This policy relates to all heritage assets according to their significance. This policy should go further so that it recognises that there are two separate balancing exercises which need to be undertaken for designated and non-designated heritage assets. Paragraph 132 – 134 of the Framework relate specifically to designated heritage assets and highlight that the more important the asset the greater the weight that should be attached. Paragraph 135 of the Framework relates specifically to non-designated heritage assets and the policy test that should be applied in these instances is that a balanced judgment should be reached having regard to the scale of any harm and the significance of the heritage asset.

Policy 27: Local Green Space

Paragraph 77 of the Framework sets out the following in terms of when it is appropriate or not to designated land as Local Green Space (LGS). It states that:

“The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:

- Where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;
- Where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquility or richness of its wildlife; and
- Where the green area concerned is a local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.” (emphasis added)

The PPG provides further guidance on the designation of LGS and states:

“There are no hard and fast rules about how big a Local Green Space can be because places are different and a degree of judgment will inevitably be needed. However, paragraph 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that Local Green Space Designation should only be used where the green area concerned is not an extensive tract of land. Consequently, blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to settlements will not be appropriate. In particular, designation should not be proposed as a ‘back door’ way to try to achieve what would amount to a new area of Green Belt by another name.” (emphasis added)

In light of the above, Gladman question the justification of introducing the LGS as defined on map 61 which appears to be an extensive tract of land and therefore does not meet the tests required by the Framework.

Conclusions

Gladman have highlighted a number of concerns through these representations. This includes the lack of non-strategic allocations and the inconsistent approach with regards to several policies with the requirements of the Framework. Gladman believe that further allocations are required to ensure the borough’s housing needs are met in full and that an appropriate trigger mechanism is required to ensure that remedial action will be taken should monitoring indicate that the Plan is not enabling the level of development that is required to meet the needs of the area.

Gladman also take this opportunity to request that we are afforded the opportunity to participate at the public hearing sessions at the Examination in Public to discuss the issues raised.

Yours faithfully,

