

**Requested Map Amendments:**

Map 1	
6279	<a href="#">Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum</a>
5893	<a href="#">T Hartman</a>
Map 2	
6279	<a href="#">Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum</a>
Map 3	
48	<a href="#">Sport England</a>
Map 4	
6279	<a href="#">Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum</a>
5893	<a href="#">T Hartman</a>
2565	<a href="#">M Johnson</a>
6057	<a href="#">M Hill</a>
Map 8	
6279	<a href="#">Bramcote Neighbourhood Forum</a>
Map 16	
68	<a href="#">Awsorth Parish Council</a>
6537	<a href="#">Awsowth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group</a>
Map 17	
68	<a href="#">Awsorth Parish Council</a>
6537	<a href="#">Awswoth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group</a>
Map 18	
68	<a href="#">Awsorth Parish Council</a>
6537	<a href="#">Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group</a>
Map 24	
4200	<a href="#">Taylor &amp; Burrows Property (Represented by Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd)</a>
5908	<a href="#">Sustrans</a>
3586	<a href="#">Austin</a>

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.

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 03 November 2017 12:36  
**To:** Policy  
**Subject:** FW: Broxtowe Local Plan part II on-line response form

---

**From:** [REDACTED] Customerservices  
**Sent:** 03 November 2017 10:46  
**To:** pabc  
**Subject:** FW: Broxtowe Local Plan part II on-line response form

---

**From:** Tom and Jenny Hartman [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 03 November 2017 09:27  
**To:** Customerservices  
**Subject:** Broxtowe Local Plan part II on-line response form

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please could you forward this note to the appropriate authorities.

I would like to inform you that the local planning consultation placed by Broxtowe council is one of the hardest bits of online documentation that I have ever had to try and fill in (and I am used to university level administration). Wanting to add some comments to the proposals for development within the area (admittedly close to the time limit, I tried filling it out this Friday morning) I followed the links to the online form and it seems to me that I need to have a whole morning free to fill it in with needing to give policy numbers, page numbers, paragraph numbers, etc. on the very first page. It seems to me that this is the best way that a council can ensure that no one responds as the amount of effort level is so high. I do have comments to make about the plan part II, but without having a huge amount of time to devote to checking the precise paragraph number of the report that I wish to comment on. In essence, the plan seems to be flawed in several respects including

1. - No notice of the 100 or so dwellings to be built on the former golf course.
2. - The council has not released land within Beeston Town square for dwellings such as the car park and derelict land opposite Tesco's.
3. - The map of the build-up area includes all of the countryside right up to the side of the M1.
4. - There is no discussion of the status of Bramcote Moor which, I understand, the council has issued a statement that it should be protected.

And many more.

These are the issues that I wished to comment on in the on-line form but the form itself is much too hard to fill out. For those of us who are very busy, the notion that a public fronted form to accept comments should be so hard to fill out is really exasperating when the issues are complex and there are so many facets of the plans missing in the document.

Thank you for your kind attention

Yours sincerely

Tom Hartman

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.

# Details

Agent	
Please provide your client's name	
Your Details	
Title	
Name	
Organisation (If responding on behalf of an organisation)	Sport England
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.)

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	Yes
It is not effective	No
It is not positively prepared	No
It is not consistent with national policy	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.**

Consistency with National Policy

Thank you for consulting Sport England on Part 2 of the Local Plan. The Local Plan as proposed is consistent with National Policy due to having a robust and up to date evidence base in regard to its Playing Pitch Strategy and Built Facility Strategy. Please note that it is important to keep these strategies up to date so they can remain robust. However, this is questionable as this evidence base does not appear to be considered and implemented in line with NPPF paragraph 74.

Justification of the Plan - Policy Specific Considerations

In relation to the locations identified in policies 3.1- 3.3, 3.5 & 6.1 for potential major growth, when decisions are made about these locations when they were brought forwards and their potential dwelling capacity. As the plan stands it is currently lacking justification or relevant consideration to whether any of the sites contain existing sports facilities such as playing fields which justify protection under policies 25, 27 and 28 of the plan and paragraph 74 of the NPPF.

Policy 3.1 – Site Allocation of Chetwynd Barracks – There is no mention of playing fields on site within the description. This 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. This 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.

Policy 3.2 – Site Allocation of Toton Lane – The allocation includes a school site and playing pitches within the area. The development is marked for additional land for community facilities including education (the relocation of George Spencer Academy which is Mentioned in the playing pitch strategy as a football and cricket site) and the provision of a Leisure Centre. The proposals also include an allocation for 500homes.

Policy 3.3 - Site Allocation of Bramcote (East of Coventry Lane) – This site is referred to as being greenfield and as a former playing field associated with the adjacent school. The policy states that the site is currently unused. However, the most recent aerial view is from 2013 and shows marked pitches and is listed within the 2016 Playing Pitch Strategy. The site contains 7 x football pitches 3x mini football pitches and 3 cricket wickets. Playing Pitch Strategy states that site is needed and suggests proposals for cricket nets, Artificial Grass Pitch and a sports barn. Playing Pitch Strategy confirms that should the site be lost then equivalent or better provision is required as mitigation. The Site Allocation of Bramcote School and Leisure Centre is also included within this policy for redevelopment. The site includes 3 schools and borders existing playing fields the site contains a small sided Artificial Grass Pitch which is currently used by football, multiple courts and a sports hall which is also used by a local football club. Therefore, it will need to be insured that any development does not prejudice the use of these facilities.

Policy 3.5 - Site Allocation of Severn Trent – This site borders playing pitches therefore any development needs to ensure that there are no negative impacts to these pitches. The Playing Pitch Strategy also refers to the Nottingham casuals site which is stated as being overplayed and needing investment of £340,000 for changing room improvements and floodlighting.

Policy 6.1 – Walker street Eastwood – There is no mention of playing fields on site within the description. However, Google image from 2016 shows a cricket wicket and Google history shows site with 3 football pitches and a rounders pitch. This site does not appear to be covered by the Playing Pitch Strategy where there is a shown deficiency and no justification for pitches to be lost. The pitches should be protected from development.

Map 3 - this map includes the site allocation of Trent Vale sports club within the mixed-use commitments however the plan gives no further information on this 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.

Where these sites contain pitches and the evidence base highlights a deficiency in provision there is a conflict within the policies. Therefore, the extent of development in these locations should account for the need to maintain such facilities and site policies



	<p>should require the facilities to be protected or replaced. The loss of the playing fields without an agreed compensatory project being implemented would not accord with Sport England's playing fields policy or paragraph 74 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Policies 17 &amp; 24 - Sport England 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 through sport and physical activity (through use of Sport England's and Public Health England's established Active Design guidance (<a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/active-design/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/active-design/</a>))</p> <p>Policy 25 – Sport England seeks to ensure that a planned approach to the provision of facilities and opportunities for sport and recreation is taken by planning authorities. We 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.</p> <p>Policy 27 - Sport England is encouraged that the emerging local plan looks to include policies to protect existing sport/leisure facilities where there is a need to do so to meet existing/future community needs which accord with paragraph 74 of the NPPF - policies that support the principle of enhancing existing sports/leisure facilities to meet community needs. However, it is thought that the plan should 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</p> <p>Policy 28 – Sport England 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.</p> <p>If you would like any further information or advice please contact me.</p>
--	--

## 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.	.

## 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?	No
If you wish to participate at the public examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary	

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 03 November 2017 12:36  
**To:** Policy  
**Subject:** FW: Broxtowe Local Plan part II on-line response form

---

**From:** [REDACTED] Customerservices  
**Sent:** 03 November 2017 10:46  
**To:** pabc  
**Subject:** FW: Broxtowe Local Plan part II on-line response form

---

**From:** Tom and Jenny Hartman [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 03 November 2017 09:27  
**To:** Customerservices  
**Subject:** Broxtowe Local Plan part II on-line response form

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please could you forward this note to the appropriate authorities.

I would like to inform you that the local planning consultation placed by Broxtowe council is one of the hardest bits of online documentation that I have ever had to try and fill in (and I am used to university level administration). Wanting to add some comments to the proposals for development within the area (admittedly close to the time limit, I tried filling it out this Friday morning) I followed the links to the online form and it seems to me that I need to have a whole morning free to fill it in with needing to give policy numbers, page numbers, paragraph numbers, etc. on the very first page. It seems to me that this is the best way that a council can ensure that no one responds as the amount of effort level is so high. I do have comments to make about the plan part II, but without having a huge amount of time to devote to checking the precise paragraph number of the report that I wish to comment on. In essence, the plan seems to be flawed in several respects including

1. - No notice of the 100 or so dwellings to be built on the former golf course.
2. - The council has not released land within Beeston Town square for dwellings such as the car park and derelict land opposite Tesco's.
3. - The map of the build-up area includes all of the countryside right up to the side of the M1.
4. - There is no discussion of the status of Bramcote Moor which, I understand, the council has issued a statement that it should be protected.

And many more.

These are the issues that I wished to comment on in the on-line form but the form itself is much too hard to fill out. For those of us who are very busy, the notion that a public fronted form to accept comments should be so hard to fill out is really exasperating when the issues are complex and there are so many facets of the plans missing in the document.

Thank you for your kind attention

Yours sincerely

Tom Hartman

## Details

<b>Agent</b>	
Please provide your client's name	
<b>Your Details</b>	
Title	Mr
Name	Michael P Johnson
Organisation (If responding on behalf of an organisation)	
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.)
8: Development in the Green Belt	Page 27		Map		A Green Infrastructure Corridor through the Site East of Coventry Lane is not indicated

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	Yes
It is not effective	Yes
It is not positively prepared	Yes
It is not consistent with national policy	Yes

## 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>The map on Page 27 does not include the Old Peoples Complex that has been granted Planning Permission. Have the Dwellings on that site been taken into account when preparing this document?</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>I am not legally qualified to comment further.</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>	

Steffan Saunders  
Broxtowe Borough Council  
Foster Avenue  
Beeston



3 November 2017

Dear Steffan

**Broxtowe Core Strategy – Part 2**

I am writing this as I have attempted to respond to your Consultation on line but found that if I wished to make more than one comment I was stymied.

I also echo the comments at the end of the forward by the Chair and Vice Chair of the Jobs and Economy Committee “we would like the Borough to continue to be an excellent place to live, work and spend leisure time”

**My 1<sup>st</sup> Comment** is about the map on Page 17 of the Bramcote & Stapleford Open Design East Midlands Document. The Green Infrastructure Links are illustrated. In my opinion the link along Moor Lane is not wide enough. The Land that is East of Coventry Lane and formerly used as Playing Fields is, at the moment, in Green Belt and is open grass land. Part of the area is scrub land annotated as Bramcote Moor Grassland LWS.

The proposed building of houses on Field Farm and to the west of Coventry Lane will effectively block the Green Corridor known as The Bramcote Ridge.

I suggest that a strip of land 50 metres wide should be set aside as a Green Infrastructure Corridor. This Green Corridor, immediately adjacent to Moor Lane, should stretch from the Bramcote Ridge in the South to the Trees by the Old Nottingham Canal in the North.

Trees could be planted on this strip to assist in cleaning the air. The Trees will help take water from the area as the playing fields have been in the past boggy in places.

**My 2<sup>nd</sup> Comment.** - I refer to the 100 Dwellings that are to be built on the Bramcote Ridge or former Golf Course site. They do not appear within the list on page 24 and on the Map on page 27 Housing and Mixed Use Allocations and Commitments in Bramcote and Stapleford.

The information is not entirely accurate as presented at the beginning of a consultation.

I understand this information is only updated on an annual basis. It would seem to me that before a public consultation the information given to the public should be as up to date as possible. I acknowledge it would be impracticable to include every small site where housing is to be added or subtracted but the addition of 100 dwellings in my view is a substantial number.

I wonder whether these 100 dwellings are included in the information on page 75.

**My 3<sup>rd</sup> Comment.** – Within the Local Plan Part 2 document on Page 94 is a list of Key Development Requirements in Beeston Town Centre. I would like the provision of a Community Centre for use by clubs and societies. Beeston U3A has 750 members and over 60 Interest Groups and some of the groups are having difficulty finding suitable places to meet. The Pearson Centre has only partially filled the need.

**My 4<sup>th</sup> Comment.** – Policy 20 Air Quality. More can be done than indicated in your plan on page 119. With the growth of houses in the Borough we will see a rise in the use of Cars. Road junctions could be improved so that the number of stationary vehicles queuing at them is reduced. We should plant more Trees to help clean the air.

**My 5<sup>th</sup> Comment.** – Policy 27 Local Green Space – Bramcote Ridge is included twice on Page 154. I trust the land that is part of the Bramcote Ridge and is the former Golf Course Land is also included in this category. Special attention should be given to the development of the 100 dwellings on this land so that the planning inspectors stipulated restrictions are not exceeded.

**My 6<sup>th</sup> Comment.** - The Green Infrastructure Corridors Map 62 on page 160 is confusing as it indicates that Bramcote Ridge is linked into this structure. However, when the developments take place on Field Farm and East and West of Coventry Lane then the Bramcote Ridge will not be linked to this structure without the suggestion of the 50 Metre Strip of Land through the Playing Fields to the East of Coventry Lane.

**My 7<sup>th</sup> Comment.** - I would like to see the replacement for the Bramcote Leisure Centre built within Bramcote before the present Leisure Centre is demolished.

Yours sincerely

Mike Johnson

[Redacted Signature]

To: Planning Policy Team,  
Broxtowe Borough Council.



2 November, 2017

**Consultation on Broxtowe Local Plan Part 2 - Bramcote Area.**

Dear Sirs,

I am choosing to use a letter to inform you of my opinions regarding the Broxtowe Local Plan Part 2 proposals for the Bramcote area as I find the online and PDF methods both incomprehensible and difficult to use. I do however recognise that I wish to take the opportunity given to be able to comment on the plan during the consultation period and I hope that you find the following comments helpful in formulating the final approved version.

I understand that there is a commitment to provide more housing within the Bramcote area and that there are proposals as outlined within the document for housing development off Coventry Lane associated with building a new school adjacent to the Moor Lane educational facilities currently existing. I personally would not be opposed to this provided other amenities were preserved. For example, I consider it essential that a new Leisure Centre very close to where the present building is at the Bramcote Hills site is provided before it ceases functioning.

I have examined the maps provided but find them not up to date and insufficiently detailed. For example, I cannot find any mention of the possible development of the Bramcote Hills Golf Course site between Thoresby Road and Moor Lane. This is still indicating a green space even though, I understand, there are plans to provide old persons accommodations which are much further forward than the proposed sites either side of Coventry Lane. Further not all areas are adequately identified. For instance, at a recent meeting mention was made of various plots of land such as "2a" and "2b" which are not identified as far as I am aware on any of the consultation maps and those who attended that meeting were left in confusion. I consider, therefore, that I have been given insufficient information upon which to form judgements from the consultation documents.

A further point is that I do not find the Local Plan Proposal positively prepared in that there is insufficient detail as to how the general infrastructure will be affected and, most important, as to how these problems are to be solved.

Broxtowe Borough Council Planning & Community Development				
- 3 NOV 2017				

As but one example, the road system will be drastically overloaded. It is already known that the junction of Coventry Lane with Ilkeston Road is totally inadequate and the Sherwin Arms junction is nearing that stage also but I do not see anything stated as to how this can be overcome. I suspect that sometime in the future with the advent of Field Farm development together with housing developments either side of Coventry Lane that high density traffic streams will be generated which will overwhelm the road network in the area from Hickings Lane, Stapleford, through to the Sherwin Arms roundabout and beyond to the extent that there will be complete gridlock not only at busy times but throughout the day. Further, the developments either side of Coventry Lane will increase the traffic flow to the five ways junction to the north and again this is apparently ignored. Though outside the area that I am principally concerned about I can also foresee greatly increased traffic volumes down Hickings Lane through the centre of Stapleford as residents attempt to access the A52 for the tram terminus and M1 routes.

Nothing in the document is stated about these influences or a solution offered. They have been apparently glossed over. Feasible solutions surely must be fundamental to any plan otherwise it is simply not viable. I am now retired from industry but was involved in project management where a significant and necessary part of the project brochure was the identification of problems and their solution. If this was not contained within the document then it was immediately returned with the instruction to include! Failure to offer solutions is not "consistent with achieving sustainable development". Should not the plan identify and contain statements on this this before considering the viability of any development? Any plan without these statements is incomplete.

I would appreciate a reply to the points raised in this letter. If you wish you may use e.mail for this purpose for which my address is [REDACTED]

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]  
Maurice Hill



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.

## Details

Agent	
Please provide your client's name	
Your Details	
Title	
Name	
Organisation (If responding on behalf of an organisation)	Awsworth Parish 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.)
4: Awsworth Site Allocation	48		16 - The Settlement of Awsworth		

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	Yes
It is not effective	Yes
It is not positively prepared	No
It is not consistent with national policy	No

## Additional details

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>Page 48 - Map 16 – The Settlement of Awsworth – It is noted that the settlement boundary has been amended to include all of the area previously proposed to be taken out of the Green Belt west of Awsworth and inside the bypass.</p>
---	---

## Question 4

Question 4: Modifications sought	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>It would be clearer if the map refers to The Key Settlement of Awsworth – the defined area used by the Local Plan to allocate land for new homes - to acknowledge that parts of the Key Settlement are not in Awsworth but located in adjoining parishes (Kimberley and Cossall). Especially as part of the proposed allocation Policy 4.1 is located outside both Awsworth village and Parish.</p>

## Question 5

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

## Details

Agent	
Please provide your client's name	
Your Details	
Title	
Name	
Organisation (If responding on behalf of an organisation)	Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
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.)
	48		Map 16 – The Settlement of Awsworth		

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	Yes
It is not effective	Yes
It is not positively prepared	No
It is not consistent with national policy	No

## Additional details

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>Page 48 - Map 16 – The Settlement of Awsworth – It is noted that the settlement boundary has been amended to include all of the area previously proposed to be taken out of the Green Belt west of Awsworth and inside the bypass.</p>
---	---

## Question 4

Question 4: Modifications sought	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>It would be clearer if the map refers to The Key Settlement of Awsworth – the defined area used by the Local Plan to allocate land for new homes - to acknowledge that parts of the Key Settlement are not in Awsworth but located in adjoining parishes (Kimberley and Cossall). Especially as part of the proposed allocation Policy 4.1 is located outside both Awsworth village and Parish.</p>

## Question 5

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

## Details

Agent	
Please provide your client's name	
Your Details	
Title	
Name	
Organisation (If responding on behalf of an organisation)	Awsworth Parish 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.)
4: Awsworth Site Allocation	49		17 - Housing Allocations and Commitments in Awsworth		

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	Yes
It is not effective	Yes
It is not positively prepared	No

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>Page 49 - Map 17 – Housing Allocations and Commitments in Awwsworth – Shows a commitment at Old School Lane (east of Main Street) – this development of 20 dwellings is now completed so requires updating. Neither the map nor the accompanying text make clear how many dwellings are provided (20 dwellings completed at Old School Lane, 71 dwellings with planning permission at Gin Close Way). We understand from the landowner / developer that the necessary ground remediation works at the latter site are due to commence October 2017.</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>Clarify situation as regards completion at Old School Lane by updating map. Make clear how many dwellings are provided collectively and on individual sites either on map / key or in accompanying text. Provide update as regards Land off Gin Close Way (Langridge Homes site).</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>	No
<p>If you wish to participate at the public examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary</p>	



## Details

Agent	
Please provide your client's name	
Your Details	
Title	
Name	
Organisation (If responding on behalf of an organisation)	Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
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.)
	49		Map 17 – Housing Allocations and Commitments in Awsworth		

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	Yes
It is not effective	Yes
It is not positively prepared	No
It is not consistent with national policy	No

## Additional details

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>Page 49 - Map 17 – Housing Allocations and Commitments in Awwsworth – Shows a commitment at Old School Lane (east of Main Street) – this development of 20 dwellings is now completed so requires updating. Neither the map nor the accompanying text make clear how many dwellings are provided (20 dwellings completed at Old School Lane, 71 dwellings with planning permission at Gin Close Way). We understand from the landowner / developer that the necessary ground remediation works at the latter site are due to commence October 2017.</p>
---	--

## Question 4

Question 4: Modifications sought	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>Clarify situation as regards completion at Old School Lane by updating map. Make clear how many dwellings are provided collectively and on individual sites either on map / key or in accompanying text. Provide update as regards Land off Gin Close Way (Langridge Homes site).</p>

## Question 5

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

## Details

Agent	
Please provide your client's name	
Your Details	
Title	
Name	
Organisation (If responding on behalf of an organisation)	Awsworth Parish 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.)
	51		18 - 'Land West of Awsworth (inside the bypass): 250 homes'		

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	Yes
It is not effective	Yes
It is not positively prepared	No
It is not consistent with national policy	No

## Additional details

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>Page 51 - Map 18 – ‘Land West of Awsworth (inside the bypass): 250 homes’ – Note this site was previously referred to as ‘Land off Newtons Lane, Awsworth’ – map refers to site being 12.0 hectares – the site has been drawn widely to include adjacent highway land along Shilo Way to the west and Newtons Lane to the south – whereas, the promoters have indicated that their site is 10.1 hectares comprising 8.2 hectares in Awsworth Parish and 1.9 hectares in Cossall Parish. This is at least partly accounted for by excluding adjacent highway land. The map also incorrectly includes ‘The View’, which we understand will be retained and is excluded from the development site.</p>
---	--

## Question 4

Question 4: Modifications sought	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>To be effective the Local Plan map and accompanying text should be clarified as regards actual extent of the developable area of the site.</p>

## Question 5

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

## Details

Agent	
Please provide your client's name	
Your Details	
Title	
Name	
Organisation (If responding on behalf of an organisation)	Awsworth Parish 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.)
	51		18 - 'Land West of Awsworth (inside the bypass):250 homes'		

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	Yes
It is not effective	Yes
It is not positively prepared	No
It is not consistent with national policy	No

## Additional details

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>Page 51 - Map 18 – ‘Land West of Awsworth (inside the bypass): 250 homes’ – The figure does not make clear the split between Awsworth and Cossall parishes – the promoters have indicated some 250 homes on 10.1 hectares including 40 homes on that part of the site in Cossall (about 1.9 hectares). On the basis of commitments providing some 107 dwellings this would leave a residual requirement of 243 homes for the Key Settlement – assuming an 80/20 split based on 8.2 hectares in Awsworth Parish and 1.9 hectares in Cossall Parish this suggests about 194 in Awsworth Parish and 49 in Cossall Parish. Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan is likely to include a figure of around 200 homes.</p>
---	--

## Question 4

Question 4: Modifications sought	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>Helpfully make clear the split between Awsworth and Cossall parishes.</p>

## Question 5

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

## Details

Agent	
Please provide your client's name	
Your Details	
Title	
Name	
Organisation (If responding on behalf of an organisation)	Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
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.)
	51		Map 18 – 'Land West of Awsworth (inside the bypass): 250 homes'		

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	Yes
It is not effective	Yes
It is not positively prepared	No
It is not consistent with national policy	No

## Additional details



<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>Page 51 - Map 18 – ‘Land West of Awsworth (inside the bypass): 250 homes’ – Note this site was previously referred to as ‘Land off Newtons Lane, Awsworth’ – map refers to site being 12.0 hectares – the site has been drawn widely to include adjacent highway land along Shilo Way to the west and Newtons Lane to the south – whereas, the promoters have indicated that their site is 10.1 hectares comprising 8.2 hectares in Awsworth Parish and 1.9 hectares in Cossall Parish. This is at least partly accounted for by excluding adjacent highway land. The map also incorrectly includes ‘The View’, which we understand will be retained and is excluded from the development site.</p>
---	--

## Question 4

Question 4: Modifications sought	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>To be effective the Local Plan map and accompanying text should be clarified as regards actual extent of the developable area of the site.</p>

## Question 5

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



## Details

Agent	
Please provide your client's name	
Your Details	
Title	
Name	
Organisation (If responding on behalf of an organisation)	Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
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.)
	51		Map 18 – 'Land West of Awsworth (inside the bypass): 250 homes'		

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	Yes
It is not effective	Yes
It is not positively prepared	No
It is not consistent with national policy	No

## Additional details

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>Page 51 - Map 18 – ‘Land West of Awsworth (inside the bypass): 250 homes’ – The figure does not make clear the split between Awsworth and Cossall parishes – the promoters have indicated some 250 homes on 10.1 hectares including 40 homes on that part of the site in Cossall (about 1.9 hectares). On the basis of commitments providing some 107 dwellings this would leave a residual requirement of 243 homes for the Key Settlement – assuming an 80/20 split based on 8.2 hectares in Awsworth Parish and 1.9 hectares in Cossall Parish this suggests about 194 in Awsworth Parish and 49 in Cossall Parish. Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan is likely to include a figure of around 200 homes.</p>
---	--

## Question 4

Question 4: Modifications sought	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>Helpfully make clear the split between Awsworth and Cossall parishes.</p>

## Question 5

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

**Broxtowe  
Borough  
COUNCIL**

Please provide your client's name

TAYLOR &amp; BURROWS PROPERTY

Title	<div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> </div>
Name	
Organisation <small>(if responding on behalf of the organisation)</small>	Phoenix Planning (UK) Limited
Address	<div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> </div>
Postcode	
Tel. Number	
E-mail address	

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

**Please tick here** ✓

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

**[www.broxtowe.gov.uk/part2localplan](http://www.broxtowe.gov.uk/part2localplan)**

**Please return completed forms to:**

**For more information:** Tel: 0115 917 3452, 3448, 3468 or 3015 E-mail: [policy@broxtowe.gov.uk](mailto:policy@broxtowe.gov.uk)

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

Document	Policy number	Page number	Policy text/ Paragraph number
<b>Part 2 Local Plan</b>	<b>Policy 1:</b> Flood Risk		
	<b>Policy 2:</b> Site Allocations		
	<b>Policy 3:</b> Main Built up Area Site Allocations		
	<b>Policy 4:</b> Awsworth Site Allocation		
	<b>Policy 5:</b> Brinsley Site Allocation		
	<b>Policy 6:</b> Eastwood Site Allocation	Page 59-64	Policy 6 as a whole
	<b>Policy 7:</b> Kimberley Site Allocations		
	<b>Policy 8:</b> Development in the Green Belt		
	<b>Policy 9:</b> Retention of good quality existing employment sites		
	<b>Policy 10:</b> Town Centre and District Centre Uses		
	<b>Policy 11:</b> The Square, Beeston		
	<b>Policy 12:</b> Edge-of-Centre A1 Retail in Eastwood		
	<b>Policy 13:</b> Proposals for main town centre uses in edge-of-centre and out-of-centre locations		
	<b>Policy 14:</b> Centre of Neighbourhood Importance (Chilwell Road / High Road)		
	<b>Policy 15:</b> Housing size, mix and choice		
	<b>Policy 16:</b> Gypsies and Travellers		
	<b>Policy 17:</b> Place-making, design and amenity		
	<b>Policy 18:</b> Shopfronts, signage and security measures		
	<b>Policy 19:</b> Pollution, Hazardous Substances and Ground Conditions		
	<b>Policy 20:</b> Air Quality		
	<b>Policy 21:</b> Unstable land		
	<b>Policy 22:</b> Minerals		
	<b>Policy 23:</b> Proposals affecting designated and non-designated heritage assets		
	<b>Policy 24:</b> The health impacts of development		
	<b>Policy 25:</b> Culture, Tourism and Sport		
	<b>Policy 26:</b> Travel Plans		
	<b>Policy 27:</b> Local Green Space		
	<b>Policy 28:</b> Green Infrastructure Assets		
	<b>Policy 29:</b> Cemetery Extensions		
	<b>Policy 30:</b> Landscape		
	<b>Policy 31:</b> Biodiversity Assets		
	<b>Policy 32:</b> Developer Contributions		
<b>Policies Map</b>			
<b>Sustainability Appraisal</b>			
<b>Other (e.g. omission, evidence document etc.)</b>			

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

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

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

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

## Your comments

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

The Adopted Core Strategy 2014 identified a requirement of up to 1250 dwellings to be provided within Eastwood. The Housing Trajectory at Page 75 of the Local Plan identifies 795 dwellings within the SHLAA plus the proposed allocation of 200 dwellings. The Local Plan Part 2 therefore provides 455 less dwellings than was identified within the Core Strategy. This is a substantial variation, providing for around only 63% of that envisaged within the Core Strategy.

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

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

### **Walker Street Allocation**

The Part 2 Local Plan only identifies 1 housing allocation for Eastwood which is identified as the Walker Street site which proposes 200 homes and 30 extra care units. Map 24 in Local Plan is flawed as there is no key identifying the development zonings within the site. It is assumed however that the red annotation relates to housing land.

Concern is raised with regards to the deliverability of this site within the plan period. Part of the site includes the existing Lynncroft Primary School. Although development has commenced on the replacement school, it is understood that this development will need to be completed prior to the release of the site for housing. The site does not presently have a residential consent and therefore an application will also need to be submitted and approved. The Housing Trajectory expects this site to complete all 200 dwellings within the 1<sup>st</sup> 5 years. The Trajectory identifies that the site will expect a completion rate of 50 dwellings per annum over a 4 year period. It is considered that, firstly it is very unlikely that the development of housing on the site will start so quickly and secondly that such a rate of completion is overly ambitious within this location and does not reflect market signals.

Furthermore, it is considered that the site will bring forward limited S106 contribution by the residential development due to viability considerations. The Site Selection Document identifies that the site has infrastructure delivery issues and is unlikely to be able to viably provide any affordable housing. It is considered that there are alternative sites within Eastwood that could provide for a full suite of S106 provisions and bring forward more substantial benefits to the wider area.

### **Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment**

The latest Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment identifies the sites within Eastwood that are considered to be deliverable and developable. It is noted that the SHLAA identifies sites that can provide up to 760 dwellings within Eastwood. Concerns are raised with regards to the deliverability of a number of the identified sites and our comments on the individual sites are provided below.

<b><i>SITE</i></b>	<b><i>NUMBER OF DWELLING</i></b>	<b><i>ISSUES</i></b>
Hilltop House Nottingham Road Eastwood	10	It is understood that the site is presently being considered for uses other than residential. No planning application has been submitted to redevelop this site. It is understood that the site has been for on the market for a number of years. The asking price for the property may preclude the viable redevelopment of this site for housing. There is insufficient progress to conclude that this site will be delivered for housing.
Dovecote Bar and Grill 29 Beauvale Newthorpe	6	The anticipated land value may preclude this site from being viably redeveloped for housing. This site does not have planning consent and therefore there has been insufficient progress to conclude that this will be delivered for housing
Beamlight Newmanleys Road Eastwood	150	Although this site has an approval, this site is likely to be affected by possible gassing from the nearby tip. Issues in this regard remain outstanding. This will affect the deliverability of the site and question is therefore raised as to whether the site can accommodate 150 dwellings.

95 South Street Eastwood	1	Consent lapsed in 2013 and has not been renewed. This site therefore should be excluded with SHLAA.
--------------------------	---	---

In terms of discounting the sites where planning consent has expired, the National Planning Practice Guidance regarding Assessment of land availability clearly sets out what types of sites and sources of data should be used. This identifies that those sites where planning applications have been withdrawn or refused can be taken into consideration. Whilst it may be reasonable to consider sites where permissions have lapsed, this should be on the basis of some sort of evidence as to why it lapsed and why it is felt that it may now be deliverable. This is not clear from the council's evidence base. Also, where applications are for single plots, it is considered that these are essentially windfall and there is therefore a degree of double counting if the Council also want to claim a windfall allowance for such sites.

It is clear that there are issues with a number of the sites within Eastwood and other areas within Broxtowe that may affect the deliverability of the housing requirement within the plan period. In this regards, it is considered necessary to release additional land within Eastwood in order to ensure that the housing requirement is met in full. The soundness and deliverability of the plan is therefore called into question.

Because of the above concerns, it is considered that in this regard the Plan fails the tests of soundness in that ;

- 1. Positively Prepared:** To meet the test the plan must be able to show it is based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, in a manner consistent with achieving sustainable development. This councils approach to Eastwood raises concerns over its sustainability and deliverability in a manner which fails this test.
- 2. Justified:** As highlighted above, the approach that has been taken is not only not justified, but is at odds with the Core strategy on which the plan is supposed to be based.
- 3. Effective:** Because of the issues raised above, it is not considered that the Plans approach will make an effective contribution to delivering sustainable development for the district and deliver the growth required.
- 4. Consistent with national policy:** The approach taken here is not considered to be sustainable and therefore the proposals are contrary to the golden thread running through the NPPF. The significant concerns over the sustainability of the approach being taken to this area undermines the Plans credentials in this respect.

## 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.

My client considers that additional sites should be released within the Eastwood in order to ensure an appropriate and continual supply of housing for both Eastwood and Broxtowe as a whole.

**Alternative Housing Allocation - Land off Baker Road, Giltbrook**

Wade Printers are a successful local employer who operate their printing business from the Wade Printers site identified as SHLAA site no 3. The site, although presently partially occupied for employment use, consists of existing industrial buildings that are in a poor state of repair and do not meet the needs of a modern-day business. The occupiers need to relocate to new premises, within a more suitable location and with modern facilities to enable them to operate their business more effectively and retain local employment.

The site is currently an eyesore within a pleasant residential area and the site consists of a non-conforming uses within an existing residential area, incorporating several daily HGV movements along Baker Road. Therefore, the redevelopment of this site for housing purposes would bring forward substantial benefits to the wider area. It is important to note however that the owners of the Wade Printer site have undertaken viability work in order to assess whether developing the existing employment site in isolation for housing purposes would provide sufficient funding for their relocation to more suitable premises. However, unfortunately it is considered that insufficient value is generated by the redevelopment of employment site in isolation to make it a viable for new businesses premises to be found. On this basis, it is imperative for a larger housing development to be brought forward which incorporates the adjacent landholdings in order to create a viable housing option that will enable Wade Printers to relocate to more suitable premises, ensuring the business remains profitable and local employment is retained.

Without the release of additional land for housing purposes, the site will remain within its current use and remain an eyesore within the locality. Wades Printers have over the last few years considered how the existing brownfield site along with elements of the less sensitive greenbelt land can be bought forward for residential development whilst retaining the important gap between Giltbrook and Kimberley.

It should be noted that although part of the site is located within the greenbelt, a further priority is to enable the reclamation of the former tip site and improve the ecological value and management of the SINC site which can be facilitated by the redevelopment of the wider area. To the east of the employment site is the reclamation site extending to 6ha site identified as the Former Tip Baker Road under policy E30 of the Adopted Local Plan. Policy E30 of the Adopted Local Plan identifies that the Council will encourage the reclamation of derelict land. It is understood that areas of the site were previously tipped in the 1830's with colliery shale and lied adjacent to the former Newthorpe Colliery. This section of the site is presently utilised as a corporate event activity centre including off road vehicle events, archery/cross bow target shooting. The use of the site for off road biking and associated activities has over the years lead to the degradation of this site. The redevelopment of the site therefore will bring forward environmental and visual benefits.

It should be noted that detailed proposals has been submitted to the Planning Department in relation to the potential of this site including Masterplans, Transport Assessments, Landscape Appraisals, Drainage Appraisals and a detailed Planning Statement, that highlights the material planning considerations of this development site. There are two masterplans outlining the basics of our proposal and providing two potential development options that have been presented to Broxtowe Borough Council for consideration.

**Option 1** incorporates the redevelopment of the Wade Printers industrial site along with land to the north and south for housing purposes. This masterplan proposes the provision of a significant area of public open space which could provide a defensible boundary within the green belt and provide much need open space for the locality. Also attached is a more detailed constraints and opportunities plan for this option which provides more detail.

**Option 2** excludes land to the south of the existing employment and concentrates development to the north and away from the settlement of Kimberley. This would remove completely any issue with regards to coalescence between Giltbrook and Kimberley although a reduced area of public open space could be provided.

The SA assessment provides an unjustified rejection of our proposals and does not fully consider the scheme that has been put forward and the benefits that it could bring. The full details of the suitability, deliverability and sustainability of our client's site are provided in our detailed submission paper attached as an appendix to this objection. However, in brief the main opportunities the site offers:



1. It provides for a mix of brownfield and greenfield land
2. Encourage the reclamation of derelict land
3. It allows for the relocation and growth of a local business which will allow for the retention and possible growth in local employment
4. It would allow for the removal of HGV's related to the business from a residential area and bring an end to the motor cycling on adjacent land that can generate nuisance
5. It would provide the Borough and/or the Parish Council, a significant, long term and controllable area of natural open space, forming a strong Green Belt boundary to the south of the town, and adding much needed publicly accessible open space to the settlement.
6. Whilst the site is partially part of the Green Belt, these proposals seek only to round the town off without further extending it to the south eastwards towards Kimberley, or north eastwards towards Greasley.
7. This option will not decrease the gap between Eastwood and Kimberly and will provide a strong defensible boundary that could be transferred to the Council and therefore provide public control over the land to ensure that it is defensible in perpetuity.

We realise that developing land within the Green Belt does rightly raise concerns, but we recognise that the Council has limited options. It is considered that our proposal provides a more sustainable and environmentally sensitive option for fulfilling the housing needs for Eastwood as identified by the Core Strategy, than any other reasonable alternative site within Eastwood and those allocated within Bramcote and Stapleford.

Our proposal does not impact on the role of the Green Belt and provides significant economic, social and environmental benefits to the area. The area of Green Belt taken is marginal and appears more as part of the natural shape of the town than as 'open countryside'.

It is considered that our proposal provides a sustainable and environmentally sensitive option for fulfilling the housing needs for Eastwood as identified by the Core Strategy.

Our clients very much want to work with the Council in terms of realising the potential of this site and bringing forward the housing Eastwood needs. Our concern is that the current approach the Council is taking, is not considering the broader picture and the important role our site could play as a sustainable extension to Eastwood.

We strongly believe in the positive benefits our site can bring and will seek to bring it forward.

It is considered that the Local Plan should be amended and the Wade Printers site be allocated for housing purposes.

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

### Question 5: Public Examination Attendance

**If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the public examination?**

Yes, I wish to participate at the public examination

√

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

**If you wish to participate at the public examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary**

The issues raised within this objection, the variation from the Aligned Core strategy and the approach taken to the development of Eastwood are considered to be crucial elements that must be fully considered if a sound local plan is to be achieved. Considering the merits of other sites is also necessary if the Council are to be encouraged into taking a new proactive approach to planning to meet their needs.

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



# Details

Agent	
Please provide your client's name	
Your Details	
Title	█
Name	██████
Organisation (If responding on behalf of an organisation)	Sustrans
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.)
7: Kimberley Site Allocations	68	Policy: 7.1 Land south of Kimberley including Kimberley Depot/7.5			

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

**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.**

Our comments relate to improving the network of routes within the borough for walking and cycling. The route we are particularly interested in seeing improved is that of the former Great Northern Railway which runs through the borough from the edge of Nottingham (at Hemphill Vale) through Kimberley and Awsworth and across Bennerley Viaduct. The borough's current 2004 Local Plan's policies RC14, RC15 and RC16 support the development and improvement of this Great Northern Path corridor as follows:

RC14 The Council will protect, maintain and where appropriate seek to extend the network of footpaths, bridleways and cycle routes in the borough.

RC15: The Council will safeguard from development and seek to complete the following long distance trails as shown on the proposals map:

- a) Nottingham Canal towpath;
- b) Nuthall-Awsworth and Bennerley Viaduct (the Great Northern Path).

RC16: Important links between built-up areas and the countryside are designated by the Plan as greenways and identified on the Proposals Map. Opportunity will be taken to enhance public access along these routes, and to enhance their environmental character and appearance, including through new development. Planning permission will not be granted for development which would harm their function, or their environmental, ecological or recreational value.

We consider Policy 7.1 of the 2017 Local Plan is unsound for the following reasons:

- The policy does not adequately incorporate the opportunity presented by this development to enhance the Great Northern Path (and connections) to enable the aspiration for it to be a good quality multipurpose route
- The policy does not incorporate the requirement to create a new good quality section of the Great Northern Path through the site or other good quality walking and cycling routes within the site

Whilst a usable route is possible along much of the Great Northern Path corridor, there are several sections where a good quality, multipurpose, safe and largely traffic-free trail is still required and where obstacles and gaps need to be overcome.

To help fund improvements along the Great Northern Path corridor we recommend developer contributions are sought from development proposals and allocations including Policy 7.1. Improvements all along the trail will benefit residents of this new housing site, for example enabling children to access Kimberley Secondary School from it safely and healthily.

The section of the route which relates most closely to Policy 7.1 is the section through Kimberley to Awsworth including through the site itself. We have carried out an initial assessment of this section and have some preliminary recommendations on where improvements are required, however, a thorough detailed feasibility study of the whole route is necessary and any improvements should be dependent on this feasibility study.

Our comments below refer to some of these obstacles and gaps in the route. Comments are written following the route from East to West and start where the path joins Newdigate Street in Kimberley. Please note these are preliminary recommendations which need to be qualified by a thorough feasibility study carried out for the whole route through the borough.

#### Newdigate Street to Station Road

Our recommendation is for the route to follow the line of the former railway through Station Road Dismantled Railway open space as shown on the current 2004 Local Plan Proposals Map (as Greenway and Long distance trail) and as shown on the Proposed 2017 Local Plan Map as Recreational Route. Improvements required include:

- Appropriate crossing of Newdigate Street, dropped kerbs etc
- Re-engineering of large level difference within site to create a multi-use path suitable

	<p>for all abilities including those with impaired mobility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widening of existing paths to multi-use standards</li> </ul> <p>Station Road to Kimberley Depot</p> <p>Both the 2004 Local Plan Map and the draft 2017 Local Plan Map omit to show a route for the Great Northern Path through the centre of Kimberley and this is one of the main obstacles on the route. Navigating a safe and reasonably level route from one side of Kimberley town centre to the other will be a key factor in the success of the path.</p> <p>We recommend the path take the following route:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Through Station Road Carpark, then north-west along Station Road to Nine Corners</li> <li>• Turn left along Nine Corners to junction with Eastwood Road/Main Street</li> <li>• That the route then follow the footways on the side of the road along Eastwood Road as far as the access to Kimberley Depot – for it to then go through this proposed development site</li> </ul> <p>Routes through Kimberley Depot and crossing the A610</p> <p>The proposed development site allocation Policy 7.1 presents a good opportunity to create a key missing link in the Great Northern Path.</p> <p>Both the 2004 Local Plan Map and the draft 2017 Local Plan Map show the route, after the gap in the centre of Kimberley, running south along the former railway embankment south from Church Hill. This route, however is unlikely to be suitable for a multi-user path as Church Hill is very steep and would therefore discourage use. Taking this route would also necessitate the path to follow an on-street route across the centre of Kimberley between Church Hill and Station Road which would be longer, steeper and encounter more road traffic than our recommended route proposed above. Therefore, we recommend that a new good quality route be created through the proposed development site allocation 7.1 from the Eastwood Road access so as to connect to Goodwin Drive and from there to the Awsworth Lane subway under the A610.</p> <p>We also recommend that a route be created through the proposed development site allocation 7.1 from the Eastwood Road access to connect to the former railway embankment on the southern edge of this site to the route of the Great Northern Path as shown on both the 2004 Local Plan Map and the draft 2017 Local Plan Map. Both maps show the path crossing the A610 in a straight line and following the former railway embankment on the other side of the dual carriageway. This route would require a new foot/cycle bridge crossing of the A610. The feasibility of this option would need to be investigated and therefore we recommend that this be covered as part of a detailed feasibility study of the whole route.</p> <p>Whether this crossing of the A610 via a new foot/cycle bridge is found to be feasible or not, we strongly recommend that the route through Kimberley Depot to Goodwin Drive and the Awsworth Lane subway is created in any event. From the development site Policy 7.1, works are required to enable multi-use access to Goodwin Drive. Access improvements are also required in the immediate vicinity of the subway.</p> <p>From the A610 to Awsworth</p> <p>The A610 creates a major obstacle in the path of the Great Northern Route/Greenway. Construction of a new foot/cycle bridge across the dual carriageway would appear to be the preferred route for a multipurpose traffic free trail as it utilises the former railway embankments, is direct, is entirely off road all the way to Awsworth and would form a pleasant stretch of greenway – as aspired to in policies RC15 &amp; 16 of the 2004 Local Plan. At the Awsworth end of the embankment there is a large level difference requiring a re-engineering of the embankment to enable access down to Awsworth Lane.</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>To make the policy sound it needs to incorporate required improvements and developments to the Great Northern Path (and connections) through Kimberley, through the site and through to Awsworth to enable the aspiration for it to be a good quality, multipurpose trail. Crucially it needs to incorporate requirements for creating a key missing section of the Great Northern Path through the site itself. We recommend the following changes to the existing text as follows:</p>

	<p>Key Development Requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhance and make improvements to the Great Northern path and its Green Infrastructure corridor both through Kimberley and west to Awsworth</li> <li>• Create a key 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</li> </ul> <p>We recommend that the policy include reference to a detailed feasibility study of the Great Northern Path corridor which will inform the improvements required through this policy.</p>
--	--

## 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	There may be issues that we might want to raise in relation to our comments and any of the other representations that are made.

**From:** Stephen Austin [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 03 November 2017 12:04  
**To:** Policy  
**Subject:** Part 2 Local Plan Consultation

Dear Sir

It is extremely difficult to respond online to this consultation so I am sending my comments by email:

### **Policy: 3.3 Bramcote (East of Coventry Lane)**

#### **Key Development Requirements**

1. I fully support the provision of replacement school which is badly needed.
2. The delivery of the school development clause looks too onerous (Consider Aldi at Stapleford) and should be modified to

*School redevelopment is to be delivered in conjunction with housing development (within the outline shown on page 34) and no houses are to be occupied until the school is substantially complete.*

3. A key development aspiration is replacement leisure centre (if required). A replacement leisure centre should be obligatory as local residents are supportive of the leisure centre remaining in Bramcote. This should be funded by increasing the number of homes built on Coventry Lane playing fields from 300 to the Councils target of 40 per hectare.
4. A key development aspiration is to mitigate highways impact on the wider road network to ensure that congestion is not made worse than currently exists. This should be made obligatory with improvements to the Coventry Lane/Ilkeston Road/Hickings Lane junction. This should include land/property sacrifice if necessary.
5. I am opposed to the removal of vegetation from the sandstone cutting off Moor Lane. This is unnecessary and destroys the attractive character of the cutting. Some removal may be required for safety reasons but should be as limited as possible.

#### **Sustainability Appraisal**

1. This says there is only minor green objective disbenefit because of inevitable greenspace loss to built development. This is not correct as the disbenefit is large. It is important therefore that a substantial wildlife corridor is maintained.

### **Map 61: The Local Green Space at land east of Coventry Lane Bramcote**

There is no rationale for the removal of this land from Green Belt and designating it Local Green Space. Any argument re defensible boundaries does not hold water. Deddington Lane from Moor Lane to Coventry Lane provides a clear boundary. Residents are clear this should be the case and it does not affect school plans or a possible Café on the Park which can be justified by exceptional circumstances.

Yours faithfully



Stephen Austin

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]