

Policy 30 – Landscape:

ID	Organisation
Duty to Co-operate / Interest Groups	
67	Brinsley Parish Council
6279	Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum
6944	Brinsley Vision (Representing 70 Residents of Brinsley)
Individual / Local Resident	
3630	Potter
6883	Walker

67 - 8

Broxtowe Borough C.
Planning & Community Deve.

2 NOV 2017

Broxtowe Local Plan



Broxtowe
Borough
COUNCIL

Agent

Please provide your client's name	BRINSLEY PARISH COUNCIL
-----------------------------------	-------------------------

Your Details

Title	[REDACTED]
Name	[REDACTED]
Organisation (If responding on behalf of the organisation)	BRINSLEY PARISH COUNCIL
Address	[REDACTED]
Postcode	[REDACTED]
Tel. Number	[REDACTED]
E-mail address	[REDACTED]

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

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

<p>If you would like to be contacted by the Planning Policy Team regarding future consultations.</p> <p>Please tick here <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Please help us save money and the environment by providing an e-mail address that correspondence can be sent to: _____</p>
--

For more information including an online response form please visit:

www.broxtowe.gov.uk/part2localplan

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

Please return completed forms to:

Planning Policy, Legal and Planning Services, Foster Avenue, Beeston, Nottingham NG9 1AB

For more information: Tel: 0115 917 3452, 3448, 3468 or 3015 E-mail: policy@broxtowe.gov.uk

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

Document	Policy number	Page number	Policy text/ Paragraph number
Part 2 Local Plan	Policy 1: Flood Risk		
	Policy 2: Site Allocations		
	Policy 3: Main Built up Area Site Allocations		
	Policy 4: Awsworth Site Allocation		
	Policy 5: Brinsley Site Allocation		
	Policy 6: Eastwood Site Allocation		
	Policy 7: Kimberley Site Allocations		
	Policy 8: Development in the Green Belt		
	Policy 9: Retention of good quality existing employment sites		
	Policy 10: Town Centre and District Centre Uses		
	Policy 11: The Square, Beeston		
	Policy 12: Edge-of-Centre A1 Retail in Eastwood		
	Policy 13: Proposals for main town centre uses in edge-of-centre and out-of-centre locations		
	Policy 14: Centre of Neighbourhood Importance (Chilwell Road / High Road)		
	Policy 15: Housing size, mix and choice		
	Policy 16: Gypsies and Travellers		
	Policy 17: Place-making, design and amenity		
	Policy 18: Shopfronts, signage and security measures		
	Policy 19: Pollution, Hazardous Substances and Ground Conditions		
	Policy 20: Air Quality		
	Policy 21: Unstable land		
	Policy 22: Minerals		
	Policy 23: Proposals affecting designated and non-designated heritage assets		
	Policy 24: The health impacts of development		
	Policy 25: Culture, Tourism and Sport		
	Policy 26: Travel Plans		
	Policy 27: Local Green Space		
	Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets		
	Policy 29: Cemetery Extensions		
	Policy 30: Landscape	165	16
	Policy 31: Biodiversity Assets		
	Policy 32: Developer Contributions		
Policies Map			
Sustainability Appraisal			
Other (e.g. omission, evidence document etc.)			

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

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

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

If you think this paragraph or policy of the Plan is not sound, is this because:	
It is not justified	<input type="checkbox"/>
It is not effective	<input type="checkbox"/>
It is not positively prepared	<input type="checkbox"/>
It is not consistent with national policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Your comments

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

We are very concerned that the landscape of Church Lane with its beautiful fields which roll back to Moorgreen and Greasley is not assessed as 'local landscape character area' along with the four other named features of the Nottinghamshire Coalfield. With the beautiful scenery, links to D. H. Lawrence and nature reserve, we feel this area's landscape is equal to any other in Broxtowe and warrants equal protection.

Question 4: Modifications sought

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

Question 4

Add to other Landscape Areas.

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

Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum
Response to Broxtowe Borough Council Part 2 Plan

Submitted by [REDACTED]
behalf of the Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum

			LEGALLY COMPLIANT		Compliant with Duty to Cooperate		Sound						
POLICY	PAGE / PARA.	TEXT	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No		COMMENTS	MODIFICATIONS SOUGHT	PUBLIC EXAMINATION ATTENDANCE	WHY
Policy 1: Flood Risk			x		x		x					No	
Policy 2: Site Allocations	2.7			x				x	It is not justified	The statement that sites with commitments "of 10 or more dwellings these have been shown on the overview plans" is untrue and misleading - the land of the former Bramcote Hills Golf course was granted outline planning permission for 100 dwellings earlier in 2017 but is NOT shown on the overview plans	The consequences of commitments of more than 10 dwellings on housing land allocation should be considered in the evidence base	Yes	Part 2 is misleading in the way it represents the land committed for housing in Bramcote and therefore fails to provide sound support for land allocation adjacent to the former Bramcote Hills Golf Course
Policy 2: Site Allocations	2.8			x	x			x	It is not justified	The statement that the "the Council has maximised to the greatest possible extent the supply of sites in existing urban areas" is not true as, for example, it has failed to use the air space above the bus tram interchange in Beeston Town Square for residential and also failed to require residential development when granting planning permission for the redevelopment of Phase 1 of BeestonTown Square.		Yes	The Council should demonstrate why areas within the built up part of the Main built Up area are unsuitable for housing whereas an urban extension is
Policy 2: Site Allocations	2.8			x	x			x	It is not justified	The statement that "When sites currently in the Green Belt are selected, exceptional circumstances are demonstrated" is untrue for the land in Bramcote - 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	The permanence and openness of the green belt has been compromised by the proposals in Part 2 and no exceptional circumstances for the scale and extent of changes to the green belt have been provided.	Yes	The sacrifice of the green belt has not been justified
Policy 2: Site Allocations	"2.10			x	x			x	It is not justified	The statement "the urban and main built up area sites are assessed as being the most sustainable" has not been followed through by keeping land allocation within the main built up area and instead requiring release of the green belt		Yes	Part 2 is misleading as the text and Map 1 are not consistent and the extent of the Main Built Up area is grossly and wrongly over exaggerated
Policy 3: Main Built up Area Site Allocations	Map 2			x	x			x	It is not justified	The map mislabels open countryside adjacent to the M1 and stretching east to Bramcote as Main built Up area	The 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	Yes	Part 2 is misleading and the consequences of this mismatch between text, map and reality on the ground are enormous
Policy 3: Main Built up Area Site Allocations	3.2			x	x			x	It is not justified	The statement that "It is considered that there are exceptional circumstances required to amend the boundary of the Green Belt to allow residential development." is untrue for the land in Bramcote - 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		Yes	The sacrifice of the green belt has not been justified
Policy 3: Main Built up Area Site Allocations	Map 4			x	x			x	It is not justified	Map 4 omits the committed land on the former Bramcote Hills Golf course and thereby paints a very misleading picture of land allocation in Bramcote. Map 4, however, does illustrate the extent of open countryside east of the M1.		Yes	Part 2 is misleading and the consequences of this mismatch between text, map and reality on the ground are enormous
Policy 3: Main Built up Area Site Allocations	3.1		x		x			x	It is not positively prepared	The requirements fail to state the net housing density to be achieved	A minimum net housing density of 40 per hectare should be added and the effects of this on the total number of houses that can be delivered should be reflected in the list of requirements	No	
Policy 3: Main Built up Area Site Allocations	3.1		x		x			x	It is not positively prepared	The requirement for a small retail / service centre fails to recognise the nearby facilities and would jeopardise the viability of both existing and new businesses	Remove the requirement for a small retail/ service centre	No	
Policy 3: Main Built up Area Site Allocations	3.1		x		x			x	It is not justified	The extent of the public space to the south of the memorial is not shown and there is a potential use of land eminently suitable for housing to be lost in this way	The extent of the public space should be made clear and the reasons for not allocating that land for housing should be reported. There are plenty of green and open spaces within the Barracks.	Yes	It is essential that land allocation is optimised to prevent loss of green belt elsewhere and for the council to comply with National policy on the need to protect the green belt
Policy 3: Main Built up Area Site Allocations	3.3	3.7		x	x			x	It is not justified	The pen picture is inaccurate and fails to point out that part of the land is a county level protected area - the last remant of Bramcote Moor.		Yes	The true nature of the land ought to be understood before making decisions to take it out of the green belt and allocate it for housing
Policy 3: Main Built up Area Site Allocations	3.3	3.8	x		x			x	It is not justified	The figure of 300 houses is not justified and is at odds with both the objectively assessed housing need for Bramcote (ca 180 houses over the plan period) and the various statements by the leasors of this land of 350 or 450-500 homes.		Yes	It is essential that the use of this land is such as to deliver the maximum benefit for the local community and the county council who own the freehold

Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum

Response to Broxtowe Borough Council Part 2 Plan

Submitted by: [REDACTED]
behalf of the Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum

Policy 3: Main Built up Area Site Allocations		3.8	x		x			x	It is not effective	The requirements do not encourage lifts from west of the site to terminate on the land and for pedestrian access to the school.	Provision of a dropping off area and school walking buses should be within the area proposed for housing	Yes	It is essential that the residents of Moor Lane, Thorseby and Arundel Drive do not unnecessarily suffer increased traffic - with associated poor air quality and danger of road traffic accident by parents being unable to drop off their children within walking distance of the schools
Policy 3: Main Built up Area Site Allocations		3.8	x		x			x	It is not effective	The removal of any vegetation from the Moor Lane cutting should be done in such a way that the present stability of the cutting is not compromised now and into the future.			
Policy 3: Main Built up Area Site Allocations		3.8	x		x			x	It is not effective	The caveat "if required" disreagrds the oft and strongly stated desire of local residents for the leisure centre to remain in Bramcote	"if required" should be removed	Yes	Bramcote is being asked to pay a heavy price for no tangible benefit and to face the loss of the leisure centre as well as its green belt alongside increased traffic congestion and air pollution is not compatible with sustainable development
Policy 3: Main Built up Area Site Allocations		3.9		x	x			x	It is not consistent with national policy	The loss of green belt is not recognised in the summary of the sustainability appraisal. The loss of green belt and the loss of the last remnant of Bramcote Moor cannot be trivialised as a very minor disbenefit.	The sustainability appraisal should be revised to accurately reflect the scale of disbenefit loss of green belt and Bramcote Moor would have	Yes	The impact of this flawed assessment of the green disbenefits has knock on consequences to other parts of Part 2.
Policy 3: Main Built up Area Site Allocations		Map 8		x	x			x	It is not consistent with national policy	The map fails to show the status of the Bramcote Moor land and also suggests a housing density of only 19 houses per hectare.	A greater density accompanied by a requirement to pay for a replacement leisure centre should be included.	Yes	The benefits to the local community of a higher housing density generating more funds to pay for a replacement leisure centre should be at the centre of land use decisions in this locality and would better reflect local residents views as well as represent a more sustainable form of development in the area.
Table 4		Table 4	x		x			x	It is not effective	The table shows that Bramcote will house over 440 of the 2729 houses in the entire main built up area of Broxtow. It is ridiculous that such a small area should be taking more than 16% of the housing need while the council allows land to be developed at low densities or not at all elsewhere.		Yes	The negative social, economic and environmental impact of the unfair burden of new housing in Bramcote is a combined effect of a series of failings by the council in formulating its plan.
	82	3b.9		x	x			x	It is not justified	The reference to a leisure hub should not be seen as a replacement for the leisure hub at Bramcote.	The text should be amended to make it clear that any leisure hub at the western extremity of the borough ought to be in addition to the one at Bramcote.	No	
Policy 8: Development in the Green Belt	8.5			x	x			x	It is not effective	We welcome the reporting of "strong support for the protection of the Green Belt" and lament the fact the council has ignored this and considerably reduced the green belt in Bramcote.		Yes	The council has consistently ignored local views expressed formally and at workshops and through the ballot box and is not delivering tangible benefits to the local community in Bramcote while at the same time asking it to bear an enormous and unfair share of the burden of new housing allocation.
	8.3			x	x			x	It is not justified	The Preferred Approach to Site Allocations erroneously assumed that all green belt sites served the same or no purpose in encouraging urban regeneration and this has skewed the council's assessment of the need to take land out of the green belt.		Yes	The flawed assessment of the five functions of the green belt has skewed the allocation of land in the green belt for housing contrary to the strong protection due to the green belt from the NPPF and the manifesto promises at the 2015 & 2017 general elections - both post dating the ACS
Policy 11: The Square, Beeston	11.2		x		x		x			We strongly support the mixed development in the Square, Beeston.	We would encourage the proposed cinema to be of flexible use by including moveable partitions and a stage.	No	
Policy 19: Pollution, Hazardous Substances and Ground Conditions	2			x	x		x			The required site investigation should be carried out by a competent person as required by the NPPF	The text should be amended to reflect the need for a competent person to carry out the site investigation	No	
Policy 20: Air Quality	119		x		x		x			We welcome the three measures to protect air quality.		No	
Policy 24: The health impacts of development	146		x		x		x			We welcome the requirement for a health impact assessment		No	
Policy 26: Travel Plans	153		x		x		x			We welcome the requirement for travel plans to be submitted		No	
Policy 27: Local Green Space	154		x		x		x			We support the designations as Local Green Space in Bramcote and ask the Council to consider the additional areas being designated as Local Green Space in the Bramcote Neighbourhood Plan	We are disappointed that none of the former Bramcote Hills Golf course is to be designated as local green space	No	
Policy 27: Local Green Space	27.2			x	x			x		The statement that the "The land at Bramcote and Stapleford (item 3 in the policy) comprises a former area of Green Belt between Moor Farm Inn Lane, Moor Lane, Derby Road, Ilkeston Road and Coventry Lane" is untrue. Such land would only be taken out of the green belt by the adoption of this part 2.	The text should be amended to accurately reflect the present and new status of the land and the role of Part 2 in any change	No	
Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets	157		x		x		x			We welcome the policies on green infrastructure.			
Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets	Map 62		x		x			x	It is not justified	The map erroneously shows (2.11) a continuous corridor through the former Bramcote Hills Golf - part of which is committed having been granted planning permission earlier in the year		Yes	This map is one several misleading maps which seek to underrepresent the enormous damage to the local environment Part 2 will have on Bramcote
Policy 30: Landscape	165		x		x		x			We note that this policy would be contradicted by housing development in land currently within the green belt and ask the council makes provision for suitable compensation to be provided in such cases			
Appendix 4	187		x		x			x	It is not justified	The Moor Lane cutting is omitted from the list.	The Moor Lane cutting should be added to the list	Yes	The considerable scientific and cultural significance of this cutting and its educational value should be recognised and included in Part 2.

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

Document	Policy number	Page number	Policy text/ Paragraph number
Part 2 Local Plan	Policy 1: Flood Risk		
	Policy 2: Site Allocations		
	Policy 3: Main Built up Area Site Allocations		
	Policy 4: Awsworth Site Allocation		
	Policy 5: Brinsley Site Allocation		
	Policy 6: Eastwood Site Allocation		
	Policy 7: Kimberley Site Allocations		
	Policy 8: Development in the Green Belt		
	Policy 9: Retention of good quality existing employment sites		
	Policy 10: Town Centre and District Centre Uses		
	Policy 11: The Square, Beeston		
	Policy 12: Edge-of-Centre A1 Retail in Eastwood		
	Policy 13: Proposals for main town centre uses in edge-of-centre and out-of-centre locations		
	Policy 14: Centre of Neighbourhood Importance (Chilwell Road / High Road)		
	Policy 15: Housing size, mix and choice		
	Policy 16: Gypsies and Travellers		
	Policy 17: Place-making, design and amenity		
	Policy 18: Shopfronts, signage and security measures		
	Policy 19: Pollution, Hazardous Substances and Ground Conditions		
	Policy 20: Air Quality		
	Policy 21: Unstable land		
	Policy 22: Minerals		
	Policy 23: Proposals affecting designated and non-designated heritage assets		
	Policy 24: The health impacts of development		
	Policy 25: Culture, Tourism and Sport		
	Policy 26: Travel Plans		
	Policy 27: Local Green Space		
	Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets		
	Policy 29: Cemetery Extensions		
	Policy 30: Landscape	167	30.2
	Policy 31: Biodiversity Assets	168	text
	Policy 32: Developer Contributions		
Policies Map			
Sustainability Appraisal			
Other (e.g. omission, evidence document etc.)			

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

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

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

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

Your comments

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

We fully support these policies

[REDACTED]

From: Potter Mr.J [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 November 2017 17:40
To: Policy
Subject: Broxtowe Borough Council Publication Version Part 2 Local Plan, Response Comments

To, Planning Policy
Foster Avenue
Beeston
Nottinghamshire NG9 1AB

November 2nd, 2017

If you are to consider the River Trent landscape, from for example Clifton Bridge due south-west through to where the Midland Main Line crosses the river - or even out to the M1 - then - in tandem with Nottm.-City and Erewash l.p.a. councils - yourselves ought to be policy, environmentally and planning endeavouring towards that Green Belt stretch of river being 'countryside'esque; that's possible, and this notion pegged back to the [Attenborough] railway line (or to some degree, where possible, the A6005); and that should now planning &/or policy include: not unduly urbanizing within the aforementioned built footprint, fringe there; and controlling with sensitivity any lighting.

Mr J Potter

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: Potter Mr.J
Sent: 07 January 2014 PM
To: planningpolicy@broxtowe.gov.uk
Subject: Issues & Options, B.B.C.
< I&O_B.B.C..doc >

Details

Agent	
Please provide your client's name	
Your Details	
Title	Miss
Name	Rosemary Walker
Organisation (If responding on behalf of an organisation)	
Address	<div></div> <div></div> <div></div>
Telephone Number	
Email Address	<div></div>
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.)
7: Kimberley Site Allocations					

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	No

Question 3

Question 3: Why is the Local Plan unsound? Please only answer this question if you answered 'No' to 2.3 above	
If you think this paragraph or policy of the Plan is not sound, is this because:	
It is not justified	No
It is not effective	Yes
It is not positively prepared	Yes
It is not consistent with national policy	No

Additional details

<p>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.</p>	<p>I have concerns regarding the Kimberley allocations on two fronts - traffic and landscape.</p> <p>Firstly, the site allocations for 167 houses all fall on the western side of Kimberley, adjoining the already busy Eastwood Road, and in the vicinity of the brewery site which is currently under development. I would like to see how cumulative traffic and parking issues have been taken into account during the site allocation process as there are already considerable issues on the road (particularly during rush hour) and it takes little more than a set of roadworks to bring the area to a standstill. I do not object to the principle of housing in the area, but am concerned that the volume proposed will significantly contribute to what already is an issue locally.</p> <p>Secondly, I am concerned about the loss of the designated Mature Landscape Area on the Swingate upland. I understand that the shift in policy is moving away from designating local landscapes, however I am concerned that the loss of the designation means that there is now little protection from any other policy with regards to trees and hedgerows. Particularly concerning is the sentiment within the justification for the Kimberley Depot site that the MLA is no longer designated so the site may as well be built on - I don't think that removal of the MLA should automatically mean that the landscape is suitable for development, and this implied policy may lead to other valued landscapes being threatened in this manner.</p>
---	--

Question 4

Question 4: Modifications sought	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Consider the cumulative impacts of traffic and parking on the west side of Kimberley as a result of the planned allocations and review the numbers of houses proposed. This will ensure that large volumes of traffic generated by the allocations are not introduced on already congested roads.</p> <p>Add into the plan provision for the protection of trees and hedgerows and remove the inferral that removal of the MLA means that the landscape has little value and there is a green light to develop. This will ensure that other sites can be defended on the grounds of landscape value.</p>

Question 5

Question 5: Public Examination Attendance	
<p>If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the public examination?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>If you wish to participate at the public examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary</p>	