

BROXTOWE BOROUGH COUNCIL

Part 2 Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies

Statement of Compliance with the Duty to Cooperate

July 2018

Quick guide to the Statement of Compliance with the Duty to Cooperate

This document provides evidence that the Broxtowe Part 2 Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate.

Contents

1.0	Introduction	4
2.0	Duty to Cooperate' as set out in the Localism Act 2011	4
3.0	The Plan Area and Relationship to the Greater Nottingham Housing Market Area.....	6
4.0	Cooperation with Greater Nottingham Councils.....	6
5.0	Summary of Cooperation with Prescribed Bodies and Outstanding Issues	7
6.0	APPENDIX 1.....	8

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1** This report sets out how Broxtowe Borough Council has complied with the duty to cooperate introduced under the Localism Act 2011 in the preparation of the Broxtowe Borough Council Part 2 Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies.
- 1.2** Part 1 of Broxtowe's Local Plan, the Broxtowe Borough Aligned Core Strategy, was adopted in 2014, and provides the planning framework for the strategic development of Greater Nottingham, including how the objectively assessed need for housing and employment will be met across the Housing Market Area (which comprises the full administrative areas of Broxtowe, Erewash, Gedling and Rushcliffe Borough Councils and Nottingham City Council). How the Duty to Cooperate was met for matters included in the Core Strategy was set out in a separate Compliance Statement (2013), and was tested at the Core Strategy Examination.
- 1.3** The Core Strategy dealt with many of the strategic matters with cross-boundary implications. Nonetheless, the Duty to Cooperate is an on-going continuous process of engagement that continues through to implementation, and this statement has been prepared to demonstrate how Broxtowe Borough Council has met the Duty in the preparation of its Part 2 Local Plan.
- 1.4** There is a long history of joint working and cooperation between the Councils making up Greater Nottingham, and other key stakeholders in the area. The preparation of Core Strategies in Greater Nottingham was part of this process, with on-going and constructive engagement between constituent and neighbouring authorities and relevant organisations since the preparation process began in 2008.
- 1.5** The Infrastructure Delivery Plan which underpinned the Greater Nottingham Core Strategies was prepared with the full positive engagement of the Environment Agency, English Heritage, Natural England, Homes and Communities Agency, Clinical Commissioning Groups (role formerly provided by Primary Care Trusts), Highways England and the three Highway Authorities. The relevant elements of this have been rolled forward and updated, and an Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been prepared to support the Part 2 Local Plan.
- 1.5** Broxtowe Borough Council has sought to positively engage with all the relevant duty to cooperate bodies throughout the preparation of the Part 2 Local Plan, and is confident that it has fully complied with the duty.

2.0 Duty to Cooperate' as set out in the Localism Act 2011

- 2.1** The duty to cooperate is set out in Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011 which requires an amendment to Part 2 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
- 2.2** The Act makes clear that the 'duty' applies to all those with planning responsibilities, including local planning authorities and other planning bodies, undertaking the

preparation of Local and other prescribed plans in so far as these plans relate to a 'strategic matter'. The duty:

- Relates to sustainable development or use of land that would have a significant impact on at least two local planning areas or on a planning matter that falls within the remit of a County Council;
- Requires that Councils set out planning policies to address such issues;
- Requires that Councils and public bodies 'engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis' to develop strategic policies; and
- Requires Councils to consider joint approaches to plan making.

2.3 Paragraphs 178 to 181 of the NPPF give guidance on planning 'strategically across local boundaries' and highlight the importance of joint working to meet development requirements that cannot be wholly met within a single local planning area, through either joint planning policies or informal strategies such as infrastructure and investment plans.

2.4 The NPPF states that: "The Government expects joint working on areas of common interest to be diligently undertaken for the mutual benefit of neighbouring authorities" (NPPF paragraph 178) and further that: "Local planning authorities should work collaboratively with other bodies to ensure that strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly coordinated and clearly reflected in individual Local Plans." (NPPF paragraph 179).

2.5 Part 2 of the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 which came into effect on the 6th April 2012, clarifies that the bodies prescribed for the purposes of section 33A (1) (c) of the Localism Act 2011 (in relation to the duty to cooperate) comprise the following:

- Local Planning Authorities, either neighbouring or making up the Housing Market Area
- Environment Agency
- Historic England
- Natural England
- Mayor of London
- Civil Aviation Authority
- Homes England (formerly Homes and Communities Agency)
- NHS Nottingham West (Primary Care Trust) now replaced by Clinical Commissioning Group
- Office of the Rail Regulator
- Highways England
- Transport for London
- Integrated Transport Authorities
- Highway Authorities

- Marine Management Organisation
- Local Enterprise Partnerships
- Local Nature Partnerships

2.6 There are two main separate aspects of the duty:

- i. The legal requirement to cooperate. PINs will need to see sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the duty to cooperate has been undertaken in accordance with the 2011 act appropriate to the plan being examined.
- ii. If PINS consider that the legal requirement to cooperate has been met through joint working but there is disagreement about the policy outcome (for example the proposed level of housing provision), then this will need to be resolved through the examination process based on the evidence.²

2.7 This document sets out how the legal duty has been met by Broxtowe Borough Council on an on-going basis, in the preparation of the Broxtowe Part 2 Local Plan and how any strategic issues have been resolved through the duty. Some of these duty to cooperate groups in relation to London and Marine Management are not relevant to Broxtowe.

3.0 The Plan Area and Relationship to the Greater Nottingham Housing Market Area

3.1 The Part 2 Local Plan covers the administrative area of Broxtowe, which is a Borough Council. However, much of the built up area of Greater Nottingham is located in the wider Housing Market Area (HMA), which consists of the council areas of Erewash Borough, Gedling Borough, Nottingham City and Rushcliffe Borough, together with the relevant parts of Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire County Councils. In addition, the Hucknall part of Ashfield, although located in the Nottingham Outer HMA, has a strong functional relationship with, and forms part of Greater Nottingham.

4.0 Cooperation with Greater Nottingham Councils and Prescribed Bodies

The preparation of the Greater Nottingham Core Strategies was overseen by the Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board (JPAB), which is made up of the Portfolio Holding Councillors for planning and transport of the constituent authorities. JPAB meets around four times a year, and although the Core Strategies are now adopted, it has turned its focus towards implementation of the Core Strategies, which includes the preparation of Part 2 Local Plans where relevant. Several of the prescribed bodies are observer members of JPAB, including the Environment Agency, Natural England, Highways England, Homes England and D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership.

² See para 182 of NPPF (2012)

		<p>“A policy relating to the natural environment (i.e. beyond just locally designated sites) [and so presumably potentially part of a new GI policy] is also required, which could incorporate policy E16, above.” In addition, the policy would need to : ensure that impacts on biodiversity are minimised; contribute to the establishment of coherent ecological networks; set criteria against which proposals affecting designated wildlife sites will be judged; plan positively for networks of biodiversity and GI; plan for biodiversity at a landscape scale across local authority boundaries; identify and map components of ecological networks; promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats; promote the recovery of populations of priority species; identify suitable monitoring indicators; prevent harm to geological conservation interests; and “make provision for an Nature Improvement Areas which may be identified in the plan area in the future”.</p>	<p>Local Plan and which can now be seen in Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets and Policy 31: Biodiversity Assets which in combination seek to protect important biodiversity assets whilst creating/enhancing GI routes.</p>
		<p>H5: Affordable housing “The County Council welcome the issue of whether a consistent Borough Wide approach is appropriate, this will help when considering viability issues/priorities relating to the delivery of new housing sites.”</p>	<p>Noted</p>
		<p>EM1 (?) New employment sites and/or RC2 and RC3 Community and education facilities “Paragraph 3.4.21 (p38) the County Council welcome the plans for “specific provision” for education which is also supported in Policy RC2 and RC3 (p55-56). Where ‘Reference to particular sites will need updating’ is included. The Capacity of schools sites to allow for further expansion</p>	<p>Noted</p>

		is an issue that is changing over the duration of the plan period.”	
		<p>RC5: Protection of open spaces The policy does “not provide an adequate framework, standards or criteria for an objective determination of the role and value of open spaces in new development...There needs to be a very clear relationship between the demographic projections of the local areas and the open spaces required – a PPG 17 type study which is only partly reported in the Council’s Green Spaces Strategy 2009-16.”</p> <p>RC6: Open space: requirements for new developments The policy does “not provide an adequate framework, standards or criteria for an objective determination of the role and value of open spaces in new development...There needs to be a very clear relationship between the demographic projections of the local areas and the open spaces required – a PPG 17 type study which is only partly reported in the Council’s Green Spaces Strategy 2009-16.”</p>	<p>Paragraph 3.4.21 of the Aligned Core Strategy, which is referred to on page 38 of our consultation document with regard to policy EM1, is about the ‘knowledge based economy’; unclear what “specific provision” is referring to; and unclear as to the perceived relationship between employment and education policies. Further discussions have been held with Nottinghamshire County Council.</p> <p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan and which can now be seen in Policy 27: Local Green Space and Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets. Including the justification text 16.13 which links the distance from households to different types of Green Space and states that;</p> <p><i>“16.13 The need for the provision and maintenance of playing pitches, and associated developer contributions, will be assessed on a case-by-case basis, using evidence from the Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS, adopted in January 2017) and the Green Infrastructure Strategy (GIS, adopted in January 2015).”</i></p>
November 2015	Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation	No representations made.	
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional	Bramcote: A coal Minerals Safeguarding Area/Minerals Consultation Area covers the entirety of the site. There it is	Ongoing dialogue with the County Council regarding their role as minerals planning authority and no further

	<p>Sites Consultation</p>	<p>important to avoid the needless sterilisation of economically important mineral reserves and to ensure that development would not pose a serious hindrance to future extraction. Where there is need for non-minerals development prior extraction should be sought where practicable.</p> <p>Note that site contains the Bramcote Quarry and Landfill – site restoration has been completed. County Council acknowledge the identified desire for further development and improvements to the site restoration as part of wider green infrastructure enhancements.</p> <p>Need to provide good access to health and social facilities – in Bramcote many of the health indicators are similar or no better than the England average.</p> <p>Area identified is larger than that which might be required, wider area includes several local wildlife sites and local nature reserves. Area hatched for residential development includes Bramcote Moor Grasslands Local Wildlife Site (LWS). This LWS appears to be last vestige of the Bramcote Moor (which once existed in the area) shown on historic maps. The LWS are of at least county-level importance and would need to be retained in its entirety. If this were not possible the County Council would object to the allocation of the site.</p> <p>Further information could be provided regarding the value of the LWS and how its interest would be protected (e.g. by incorporating into public open space and securing long term positive management).</p>	<p>policy amendments are needed for this Local Plan. Coal safeguarding areas are shown on the policies map.</p> <p>The allocation at Bramcote has been reached in full dialogue with NCC. See previous comments regarding review and mitigation for the LWS.</p>
--	----------------------------------	---	--

		<p>Should be designed to include good non-motorised permeability and where possible pass through public open space and green corridors with good natural surveillance.</p> <p>Heritage List should make reference to site of Bramcote Hall and the design landscape that is an un-designated heritage asset.</p> <p>Further detailed transport assessments required. County Council is likely to request developer contribution to provide bus service to serve the development adequately.</p>	
		<p>Chetwynd: A coal Minerals Safeguarding Area/Minerals Consultation Area covers the southern part of the site. There it is important to avoid the needless sterilisation of economically important mineral reserves and to ensure that development would not pose a serious hindrance to future extraction. Where there is need for non-minerals development prior extraction should be sought where practicable.</p> <p>Need to provide good access to health and social facilities – for Chetwynd Barracks many of the health indicators are similar or no better than the England average.</p> <p>Existing mature vegetation on site should be retained and incorporated into the development where possible. Hobgoblin Wood and adjacent Local Wildlife Site (LWS) are to be retained which is welcomed. Opportunities for</p>	<p>Site has been allocated in full dialogue with NCC who are supportive of the allocation</p>

		<p>significant Green Infrastructure improvement should be pursued.</p> <p>Should be designed to include good non-motorised permeability and where possible pass through public open space and green corridors with good natural surveillance. Bridleway network in Broxtowe is segmented and north-south bridleway through site would be an excellent addition to the network.</p> <p>Further detailed transport assessments required.</p> <p>County Council is likely to request developer contribution to provide bus service and a bus stop to serve the development adequately including penetrating into the site to ensure that all new residents have access to quality public transport and infrastructure.</p>	<p>Site not allocated for housing</p>
<p>Nuthall: Oppose Allocation - Need to provide good access to health and social facilities – in Nuthall many of the health indicators are worse than the England average with all-cause death aged under 65 and 75 both being statistically worse than the England average and therefore improvements are particularly important.</p> <p>Serious concerns regarding Sellers Wood SSSI would be abutted by new development (approx. 630m). Buffer indicated by no suggestion of how broad this would be. Development would have a serious urbanising effect on a site that is of regional importance for wildlife. Concern regarding increased public access pressure, potential for fly-tipping of garden waste, predation of wildlife by pets,</p>			

		<p>general disturbance by noise and artificial lighting, potential air quality impacts etc. Development also restricts opportunities for woodland expansion/linking and may compound the effects of HS2.</p> <p>County Council would object to the allocation of this site.</p> <p>List of heritage constraints should include the site of the Grade II listed Blenheim Farm (within the city of Nottingham). Allocation would also be in an area associated with early coal mining, for which there are a number of records close by showing on the Nottinghamshire Historic Environment Record.</p> <p>Further detailed transport assessments required.</p> <p>County Council is likely to request developer contribution to provide bus service and bus stop to serve the development adequately.</p>	
February 2017	Brinsley additional site consultation	<p>As raised at previous stages of consultation, the adopted (and emerging) Minerals and Waste Local Plans form part of the development plan for the area and as such need to be considered as part of the development of the Part 2 Local Plan. The County Council will not reiterate the points already made at previous stage, instead would highlight the following points relating specifically to the Option 2 site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site lies within a Minerals Safeguarding and Consultation Area for Coal (as per Policy DM13 of the emerging Minerals Local Plan). The reference to the presence of coal under 'other' in the consultation document is welcomed. The County Council would refer to the views of 	<p>Broxtowe note the strong objection from the County Council and as a result of the consultation response the site was not carried forward into the Part 2 Local Plan.</p>

		<p>The Coal Authority in terms of assessment the impact of the development against Policy DM13.</p> <p>- There are no existing waste facilities in the vicinity of the site which would raise an issues in terms of safeguarding in line with Policy WCS10 of the adopted Waste Core Strategy.</p> <p><u>Nature conservation</u> - Option 2 is not covered by any nature conservation designations. However, the Winter Close Grassland, New Brinsley LWS (5/2328) abuts part of the north-western boundary of the proposed allocation and would need to be protected during development. The site appears to be dominated by improved (or possibly semi-improved) grassland, bounded by hedgerows and has some potential to support protected species; as such, a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal of the site should support any planning application. The site layout should be designed to retain existing features such as trees and hedgerows.</p> <p><u>Right of Way</u> - There are no recorded public rights of way over Option 2.</p> <p>The County Council would take this opportunity to inform the District Council that Brinsley Footpath No 31 crosses Option 1. The route on the ground is understood to deviate from the route shown on the Definitive Map. Should this option be taken forward, this discrepancy should be noted and any future developer advised of such.</p> <p><u>Landscape and visual impact</u> (comments provided by Via East Midlands on behalf of the County Council) - As with</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Option 1, Option 2 lies within Policy Zone NC03 (Selston and Eastwood Urban Fringe Farmland) within the Nottinghamshire Coalfield Character Area. The overall landscape strategy is to enhance. Any development of this site should following the recommended Landscape Actions where possible. Winter Close BioSINC/LWS lies to the north of the site (neutral grassland). Ecological surveys should be carried out, including recommended mitigations measures. Visual impact on existing residents along Cordy Lane and Broad Lane should be considered.</p> <p>Option 2 provides a more integrated extension to the village than Option 1, which was to the east of the A608.</p> <p><u>Public Health</u> -Detailed comments on the links between planning and health were provided as part of the County Council's response to the previous Additional Sites Consultation. Further to these general comments, in terms of the Option 2 site, the relevant local health report can be found attached. This sets out the health profile of the local area and shows that many of the indicators for the area local to the site are 'not better than the England average'.</p> <p>As with all sites being considered for allocation, it is recommended that the relevant Local Estate Forum and Clinical Commissioning Group be consulted on the proposals in terms of the likely additional healthcare requirements that will be generated as a result of the development of the site(s). Further details on the impact of proposals at this site on public health will be provided when more details are</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>available at the planning application stage.</p> <p><u>Strategic Highways</u> - The County Council has no comments to make on the alternative site in relation to strategic transport planning.</p>	
September 2017	Publication	<p>Generally supportive but raise issues specific to dealing with the Chetwynd and Toton allocations in a coordinated manner (policies 3.1. And 3.2), the provision of infrastructure and concern regarding potential housing on the Local Wildlife Site at Bramcote</p>	<p>These issues are substantially resolved. Amendments to the Chetwynd and Toton allocations especially in relation to the provision of infrastructure have fully taken on board the comments of the County Council and the LWS at Bramcote has been reviewed with details in the SA. A small section on the south west of the site is of most ecological interest and this will form part of a green infrastructure corridor, and an additional Key Development Requirement in Policy 3.3 that any loss of the LSW land is mitigated/ compensated at equivalent quality within close proximity to its current location.</p>

Derbyshire County Council

When they were consulted	What they were consulted on	What they Said	What has happened subsequently / What we did in response
November 2013	Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation	No representations made.	
Autumn 2014	Green Belt Review Framework	No representations made.	
February 2015	Preferred Approach to site allocations: Green Belt Review Consultation	No representations made.	
February 2015	Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation	No representations made.	
November 2015	Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ACS has been through a rigorous examination process in front of a Local Plan inspector and the scale of housing and employment development has been deemed appropriate. • Broad area of housing proposed for allocation would form logical sustainable urban extension to the existing area of Toton. • If the housing allocation were increased significantly above 500 dwellings there could be potential adverse effects on future housing delivery in Erewash 	Agree with almost all of their comments. The one exception is the 18,000 square metres of employment provision which is considered can be enhanced without competing with city centres, or impeding the delivery of other sites such as Stanton. An increase in economic potential to include the DB Schenker site has significant potential to assist in the delivery of Stanton to encourage the relocation of the existing rail connected uses to Stanton. In addition any economic development at this location

		<p>(particularly Long Eaton, Sandiacre and possibly Stanton Ironworks).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The level of employment land (18,000sqm) appears to be pitched at around the right level; any substantial increase could have potential consequences on the attraction of employment land to investors in Erewash (particularly Long Eaton and Stanton Ironworks).• Much of the area included in the allocation is Green Belt and it is important that any masterplanning incorporates significant areas of landscaping and open space to form separation between Toton, Stapleford, Long Eaton and Chilwell.• An increase in employment and housing development is likely to have an impact on the amount of open space and landscaping.• Connectivity proposals do not conflict with Derbyshire County Council plans and are broadly supported.• Concerned that there should be connectivity through the site and not just to the station.• Bus operators have indicated that they would wish to serve the station as part of a through service rather than at the end of a spur.• Mention of NET extending through the site but suggest that we would want to safeguard high-standard routes through the site for buses, walking and cycling and local connections from adjacent housing and employment areas.	<p>should be complementary and not compete with that offered at other locations including Long Eaton, Stanton and the city centres.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Much of our literature relates to S106 agreements but we might want to use the term 'developer contributions' to provide flexibility in the future should we wish to adopt CIL.• Support approach to allow the school to expand if required.• Concern that there could be an impact on Derbyshire schools due to proximity of the site to the boundary and would wish for assessment of impact to be undertaken, in addition to potential pupils of Derbyshire wishing to attend new primary school/ extended secondary.• Greater consideration should be given to the impact on waste management facilities. There is no mention of current provision and whether that needs to be improved.• Any development should take into account the potential impact on Erewash especially; Erewash Canal, Nutbrook Trail, local residents and the Sandiacre Lock Conservation Area. This part of Erewash is also part of the Erewash Green Belt.• Any development should take into account the effect on landscape character.• Opportunities are supported; to expand green infrastructure network around the site, to link the west with the Erewash Valley and Canal, and where development would be designed to have full regard to maintaining the landscape and character of the	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Riverside Meadows and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EBC plan showing east-west access from existing cycle routes should be extended to strategic location, links with Sandiacre and Nutbrook Trail with the consideration of east to west infrastructure connectivity. 	
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation	<p>Chetwynd: Support Allocation – Located in very sustainable location within the urban area between Toton and Chilwell in a well-established large surrounding residential area.</p> <p>Well located to take advantage of the recently opened NET extension and proposed HS2 station both of which area a short distance away.</p> <p>Development of the site is unlikely to have any significant implications for housing delivery in nearby Erewash Borough Council and Long Eaton particularly.</p> <p>Erewash Borough Council has no housing allocations in Long Eaton and has only one allocation in Stanton.</p> <p>Distance between Chetwynd and Stanton is unlikely to raise any significant delivery or viability concerns for Stanton.</p>	Broxtowe Borough Council welcomes the support from Derbyshire County Council for the allocation of Chetwynd Barracks and has carried this through as a housing allocation in the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 3.1.
February 2017	Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation	No representations made.	
September 2017	Publication	No objections but strong reference to the need to plan transport infrastructure in a comprehensive and coordinated way regarding the Chetwynd and Toton allocation (3.1. and	These issues are addressed in the proposed changes to the policies.

		3.2) with reference to the East Midlands Gateway model	
--	--	--	--

The Environment Agency:

When they were consulted	What they were consulted on	What they Said	What has happened subsequently / What we did in response
<p>November 2013</p>	<p>Site Allocations Issues and Options</p>	<p>35 - Land off Main Street Awsworth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Former landfill site underlain by principal aquifer with potential for development to cause pollution. • Environmental assessment required 	<p>Site benefits from extant planning permission (implemented by access road). The site has been carried forward as a commitment in the Part 2 Local Plan and contributes towards the Aligned Core Strategy housing requirement for Awsworth.</p>
		<p>36 - The Ponderosa Awsworth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent to former landfill site and underlain by principal aquifer site which has potential for development to cause pollution. • Environmental assessment required. 	<p>Development of the site is complete and contributes towards the Aligned Core Strategy housing requirement for Awsworth.</p>
		<p>190 – North of Barlows Cottages Awsworth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low flood risk area • Ordinary watercourse within site. • Watercourse must remain open and site specific flood risk assessment and flood mitigation measures required. 	<p>Green Belt site which was considered further through the Green Belt Review.</p>
		<p>192 - West of Awsworth Lane South of Newtons Lane Cossall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Former Common Farm landfill site underlain by principal aquifer with potential for development to cause pollution. • Environmental assessment required. • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. • Site specific flood risk assessment regarding 	<p>Site no allocated for housing.</p>

		infiltration of surface water need to be considered.	
		117 - Land at Newtons Lane Awsworth 394 – Rear of 13-27 The Glebe Cossall 138 - Walker Street Eastwood 146 – Chewton Street Newthorpe <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No constraints. • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. 	As comments for Nottinghamshire County Council starting on page 58 of this statement.
		564 - Land at Gin Close Way Awsworth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historical flooding in vicinity • Surface water strategy required to reduce flooding to others. • Development would have potential to pollute groundwater • Environmental assessment required. 	Site benefits from extant planning permission. The site has been carried forward as a commitment in the Part 2 Local Plan and contributes towards the Aligned Core Strategy housing requirement for Awsworth.
		197 – North of Cordy Lane Brinsley <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management and analysis of watercourse through site required. 	Green Belt site which was considered further through the Green Belt Review.
		200 - West of High Street Brinsley <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific constraints • Surface water flooding to north of site requires investigation 	
		376 - Land opposite 28 Church Lane Brinsley <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific constraints • Surface water flooding through middle of site requires investigation 	Green Belt site which was considered further through the Green Belt Review.
		3 – Wade Printers (and adjacent land) Baker Road	Site not allocated for housing.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. • Drain adjacent to East of site that will need site specific flood risk assessment. • Historic use of site potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer environmental assessment required. 	
		<p>34 - Land off Acorn Avenue Giltbrook</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historical flooding in vicinity • Surface water strategy required to reduce flooding to others. • Development has potential to pollute groundwater • Environmental assessment required. 	Part commitment and part to be protected for open space and flood mitigation on land to rear of Thorn Drive.
		<p>130 - Church Street Eastwood (Raleigh)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. • Historic use underlain by secondary aquifer with potential for development to cause pollution. • Environmental assessment required. 	Same general response as in relation to comments in response to NCC for all remaining sites. Comments to be addressed through the development management process.
		<p>143 - South of Smithurst Road Giltbrook</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. • Flood mitigation assessment required for drain on Western boundary of site. 	Planning Permission granted and issues fully addresses.
		<p>203 – Nether Green East of Mansfield Road Eastwood</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South West and Western boundary within flood zone 3. • Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if 	Site not allocated for housing

		<p>sequentially preferable) required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flood risk management and biodiversity protection required for Brinsley Brook on Western part of site. 	
		<p>204 – North of 4 Mill Road Beauvale 206 – East of Baker Road/North of Nottingham Road Giltbrook 208 – West of Moorgreen 514 – Hall Farm Cockerhouse Road Eastwood</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. 	Sites not allocated for housing
		<p>413 – Mansfield Road Nether Green</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ordinary watercourse to North and South of boundaries. Southern boundary within flood zone 3 suitable easement for flood risk management and biodiversity protection should be used. Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. Historic use as landfill site has potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer, environmental assessment required. Site underlain by Made Ground and deterioration of water quality of adjacent brook suggests site causing pollution. 	Site not allocated for housing
		<p>496 – Greasley Beauvale D H Lawrence Primary School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific constraints Nearby watercourse (that EA have no knowledge of) requires investigation. 	Noted

		<p>519 - Land off Thorn Drive & West of the Pastures Newthorpe 522 - Castle College Chewton Street Eastwood 105 - Land west of New Farm Lane Nuthall 113 - Land north of Alma Hill Kimberley 116 - Land north of Alma Hill Kimberley 131 - Church Hill Kimberley 234 - Land at New Farm Nuthall 271 - Gilt Hill Farm Kimberley 285 - Land north of Alma Hill west of Millfield Road Kimberley 586 – Kimberley Brewery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific constraints. • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. 	Noted
		<p>521 - Beamlight Automotive Newmanleys Road Eastwood</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. • Historic use and adjacent landfill site potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer. • Environmental assessment required. 	Issues addressed through the development management process.
		<p>140 - Builders Yard Eastwood Road Kimberley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific constraints. • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. Impacts on former landfill adjacent to Southern boundary should be investigated. 	Noted
		<p>144 - South of Eastwood Road Kimberley 215 - Land adjacent to Kimberley Depot Eastwood Road Kimberley</p>	Noted

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific constraints. • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. • Impacts on former landfill adjacent to Southern boundary should be investigated. 	
		<p>411 - 2 High Street Kimberley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific constraints. • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. • Small watercourse to South West boundary needs to be included in the flood risk assessment. 	Noted
		<p>473 – Home Farm Nuthall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to principal aquifer • Environmental assessment required. 	Noted
		<p>136 - East of Main Street Awsworth 128 – Robin Hood Inn, 17 Hall Lane Brinsley 125 - Land at Church Street Eastwood 129 - Telford Drive Eastwood 134 – Springbank Primary School Devonshire Drive Eastwood 147 - East of Pinfold Road Newthorpe 163 - Chewton Street Eastwood 201 – Rear of the Island Eastwood 313 - Brookhill Leys Farm Eastwood 349 - 66 Dovecote Road Eastwood 508 – Hilltop House Nottingham Road Eastwood 103 – Land east of New Farm Lane Nuthall 144 - South of Eastwood Road Kimberley</p>	Noted

		<p>210 – South-east of 32 - 40 Maws Lane Kimberley 218 - South of Kimberley Road Nuthall 219 - West of the Paddocks Nuthall 228 – North-west of Chestnut Drive Nuthall 428 – Rear of Chilton Drive Watnall 518 – Rear of 127 Kimberley Road Nuthall 1 - 92-106 Broadgate Beeston 28 - Hofton & Sons Regent Street Beeston 261 - Brethren Meeting Hall Hillside Road Beeston 265 – Beeston Police Station 419 - Wadsworth Road Stapleford 458 - Wyndham Court Field Lane Chilwell 460 - Peatfield Court Peatfield Road Stapleford 520 - Garages off Hall Drive Chilwell 543 - Inham Nook Methodist Church Pearson Avenue Chilwell 551 - Feathers Inn 5 Church Street Stapleford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific constraints. 	
		<p>6 - N K Motors 205a Bye Pass Road Chilwell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in flood zone 3 • Adjacent to unnamed watercourse. • Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. • Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer, • environmental assessment required. 	<p>Development management issues to be addressed in line with Policy 1 of this Local Plan as site not allocated in this Local Plan.</p>
		<p>12 - Moults Yard 68-70 Nottingham Road Stapleford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to principal aquifer 	<p>As above</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental assessment required. 	
	<p>20 - Chetwynd Barracks Chetwynd Road Chilwell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. • Historic use of site potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer • Environmental assessment required. 	Matters addressed through the site allocation.
	<p>51 - Pinfold Trading Estate Nottingham Road Stapleford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. • Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to principal aquifer, • Environmental assessment required. 	Development management issues. Aldi have planning permission to build a new foodstore.
	<p>95 - Allotments Hassocks Lane Beeston 107 - Land at Woodhouse Way Nuthall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments on planning application remain valid. 	Noted
	<p>108 - Field Farm north of Ilkeston Road Stapleford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority of site within flood zone 1 • Watercourse (Boundary Brook) dissects site meaning some within flood zone 3. • Sequential approach confirmed, site specific flood risk assessment required. 	Core Strategy allocation
	<p>111 – Land off Moss Drive Bramcote</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management and flood risk from Boundary Brook required. 	Site not allocated for housing
	<p>135 - Field Lane Chilwell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific constraints. 	Noted

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. 	
		<p>150 – Beeston Maltings Dovecote Lane</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer • Environmental assessment required. 	Noted and development management issues to be assessed in line with Policy 1 of this Local Plan.
		<p>104 – Land off Coventry Lane Bramcote 178 - Land north of Nottingham Road Trowell Moor 356 - East of Field Farm Sidings Lane Bramcote 410 - South of Baulk Lane Stapleford 412 – Chilwell Lane Bramcote (south of Common Lane) 415 - Ashlands Bilborough Road Trowell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. 	Noted
		<p>195 - Land adjacent to 428 Queens Road West Chilwell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in flood zone 3. • Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. • Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer • Environmental assessment required. 	Issues addressed through a planning application.
		<p>220 - Land east of Low Wood Road Nuthall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority of site within flood zone 1 • Watercourse dissects site meaning some within flood zone 3. • Sequential approach and specific flood risk assessment required. 	Site not to be allocated for housing.
		230 - Lower Regent Street Beeston	Sites not allocated in this Local Plan. Urban sites and

		<p>239 - Works Bailey Street Stapleford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in flood zone 3. • Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. 	<p>Development management issues to be assessed in line with Policy 1 of this Local Plan</p>
		<p>231 - Wollaton Road Beeston</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to principal aquifer • Environmental assessment required. 	<p>Noted</p>
		<p>232 - Sandiacre Road Stapleford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in flood zone 3. • Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. • Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to principal aquifer • Environmental assessment required. 	<p>Site not to be allocated for housing.</p>
		<p>237 – The Boots Company Beeston Site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in flood zone 3. • Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. • Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer • Environmental assessment required. 	<p>Matters fully addressed through Core Strategy and the planning application on this site.</p>
		<p>258 – Land at Lilac Grove Beeston</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in flood zone 3. • Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. • Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer 	<p>Matters fully addressed through the Core Strategy re Sequential Test and other matters to be addressed as part of the development management process to be assessed in line with Policy 1 of this Local Plan.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental assessment required. 	
	<p>298 – Spring Farm Nottingham Road Trowell Moor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within flood zone 1 • Site dissected by watercourse. • Site specific flood risk assessment and potentially mitigation proposals required. 	Site not to be allocated for housing.
	<p>301 - 7a Middleton Crescent Beeston</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in flood zone 3 and includes Tottle Brook. • Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. • Water Resource Act 1991 & Midlands Land Drainage Byelaws mean prior written consent from EA required which is not guaranteed. 	Urban site and development management issues process to be assessed in line with Policy 1 of this Local Plan.
	<p>310 - Neville Sadler Court Beeston 389 - Neville Sadler Court Beeston</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in flood zone 3. • Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. 	Urban sites and development management issues to be assessed in line with Policy 1 of this Local Plan.
	<p>343 – St Johns College Peache Way Bramcote</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific constraints. • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. 	Planning Permission granted and development underway.
	<p>360 - Chetwynd Barracks Chetwynd Road Chilwell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. • Historic use of site potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer environmental assessment required. 	Comments have been fully taken on board with the site allocation.

		<p>398 - Manor Garage 365 Nottingham Road Toton</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent to River Erewash part of site is close to or is functional floodplain (flood zone 3b) and should not be developed. • Prior written consent from EA required which is not guaranteed. 	<p>Following this response the site was moved out of the land supply and was deemed to be 'not deliverable or developable' in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.</p>
		<p>407 – Land between A52 Stapleford and Chilwell Lane Bramcote</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management including analysis of ordinary watercourse required. 	<p>Site not proposed to be allocated for housing.</p>
		<p>408 - Myford Machine Tools Wilmot Lane Beeston</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments on planning application remain valid. 	<p>Noted</p>
		<p>420 - Land north of Stapleford Road Trowell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. • Historic use of site potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer environmental assessment required. 	<p>Noted and development management issues</p>
		<p>449 – Beeston Cement Depot Station Road Beeston 499 - Beeston Business Park Technology Drive Beeston</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in flood zone 3. • Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. • Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer, • Environmental assessment required. 	<p>No sequentially preferable sites for either and no objections to the published version of the Local Plan. Beeston Business Park has planning permission.</p>
		<p>509 - Trowell Freight Depot Stapleford Road Trowell</p>	<p>Noted</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. • Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to secondary aquifer • Environmental assessment required. 	
		<p>548 - Beeston Van Hire 2 Barton Way Chilwell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located in flood zone 2. • Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. 	Noted
		<p>588 – Land to west of Bilborough Road Strelley 189 - Land at Smithfield Avenue Trowell 513 - Land belonging to Stubbing Wood Farm Watnall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. 	Sites not allocated
		<p>Toton - (133, 254, 259, 403, 132, 407 & 358)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site specific flood risk assessment focusing on sustainable surface water management required. <p>Site 358 - (Toton Sidings)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located within flood zones 1, 2 & 3. • Sequential test and flood risk assessment (if sequentially preferable) required. • Historic use of site could have potential for development to cause pollution to principal aquifer. • Environmental assessment required. <p>Site 133</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within flood zone 1 • Unmapped ordinary watercourse boarders site. • Planning proposals acceptable subject to flood 	Toton Strategic Location for growth, allocated for development with the full support of the EA. The site was originally confirmed as a Strategic Location for Growth through the Core Strategy process with all flood risk and other issues addressed in principle at that time.

		mitigation proposals.	
		<p>Climate Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus is almost entirely on renewable technology and not enough consideration given to reducing flood risk. • Sequential and exception tests not included in the DPD docs despite the CS saying this would be done. 	Policy 1 of the Local Plan addresses these points.
		<p>Enhancing the Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration of good quality green space is encouraged • GI is encouraged • Recreation opportunities should be managed to avoid areas of high biodiversity. 	Noted
		<p>SA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 3 Qu. 1-3 should promote opportunities for Green Infrastructure • Consider the better management of water resources and waste. Recommend indicators for: increasing biodiversity levels “Will it provide a net biodiversity gain?” • Recommend indicators for: managing flood risk “Will it avoid flood risk?” • Recommend indicators for: minimising water usage “Will it minimise water usage?” • Recommend indicators for: waste “will it reduce the number of fly-tipping incidents?” 	Noted
Autumn 2014	Green Belt Review Framework	No representations made.	
February 2015	Preferred Approach to site allocations:	No representations made.	

	Green Belt Review Consultation		
February 2015	Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation	<p>E27: Protection of groundwater The EA “would wish for it to be retained rather than merged into other policies. This approach is important for Broxtowe as the district is situated on principal and secondary aquifers”.</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request to retain the 2004 LP policy E27 however; it has been incorporated into a merged policy in the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 19: Pollution, Hazardous Substances and Ground Conditions.</p> <p><i>“1. Permission will not be granted for development which would result in:...</i> <i>c) Development which would be liable to result in the infiltration of contaminants into groundwater resources, having regard to any cumulative effects of other developments and the degree of vulnerability of the resource, unless measures would be carried out as part of the development to prevent such contamination taking place”.</i></p>
		<p>E29: Contaminated land The EA “do not agree that there is no need for this policy. Former contaminative uses for example petrol stations or cemeteries pose a risk to groundwater and drinking water supply, but are not covered by environmental permitting regulations”. They “point out that issues around contaminated land is an environmental consideration and is not exclusive to human health matters”.</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request to retain the 2004 LP policy E29 and has incorporated it into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 19: Pollution, Hazardous Substances and Ground Conditions which states that;</p> <p><i>“2. Development of land potentially affected by contamination will not be permitted unless and until:</i> <i>a) A site investigation has been carried out to assess the nature and degree of contamination, using a method of investigation agreed in writing with the Council; and</i> <i>b) Details of effective and sustainable remedial</i></p>

			<p><i>measures required to deal with any contamination have been agreed in writing with the Council, taking into account actual or intended uses; and</i></p> <p><i>c) There will be no significant risk to the health and safety of the occupants of the development; and</i></p> <p><i>d) There will be no contamination of any surface water, water body, groundwater or adjacent land”.</i></p>
		<p>Possible new policy: Flood risk – sequential and exception tests</p> <p>The EA “have some serious concerns about the wording of the current draft and would not be able to support the draft policy in its current form”.</p> <p>“There is a need for clarification within the policy wording on which types of development would be subject to the principles of the Sequential and Exception Test elements of the policy.”</p> <p>Clarity should be added on the Exception test “to state that only the first part of the requirement for ‘wider sustainability benefits’ will be waived and the need to undertake a Flood Risk Assessment that demonstrates development will be safe and does not increase flood risk elsewhere, will continue to be complied with”.</p> <p>The EA “challenge the proposal to consider the term ‘minor development’ as less than 10 dwellings within the defended area”, as this is contrary to the PPG, and “small scale” [in the explanatory paragraph] needs to be defined.</p>	<p>Following this response Broxtowe Borough Council consulted with the Environment Agency to address the concerns that they had.</p>

		<p>The EA notes that “the tenor of the explanatory paragraph text is not replicated in the proposed policy wording”.</p> <p>The policy has “a number of phrases which are poorly defined and would be hard to understand and apply by all parties in the planning process”, including ‘where a risk of flooding or problems of surface water disposal exist’, ‘existing developed’, ‘adequately protected’, ‘suitable’ and ‘no adverse effects on the management of flood risk’.</p> <p>It is “important” that the “message is clear in the final policy wording” that the policy “relates only to a particular area that is defended to an appropriate standard”.</p> <p>Bullet A) “is simply application of the NPPF without any references to your justification of the variations proposed in the explanatory paragraph text and makes the flood risk policy aspirations unclear”.</p> <p>In bullet B), “further clarification is needed in regard to the term ‘compensation’ in the draft policy or whether the council’s intended requirement is for mitigation measures”. “Where an area benefits from an appropriate standard of flood protection (such as the river Trent defences) the Environment Agency does not normally seek flood compensation.”</p> <p>The “requirement for flood mitigation is and must be</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>applicable to all sites (defended or not) and the requirement for flood 'compensation' is and must be for all sites that are not defended or have a sub standard level of flood defence".</p> <p>If the draft policy "is intended to suggest that no mitigation...works are necessary for developments of less than 10 dwellings, it will be strongly opposed by the EA"; and "any policy where flood compensation is not an absolute requirement in non defended or sub standard defended areas is not acceptable to the EA and will be resisted".</p> <p>In bullet C), the reference to 'adverse effects' "will need to be clearly defined".</p> <p>In bullet D), the EA "would suggest that additional wording is included for 'flood risk management assets' to ensure that access is maintained at all times".</p> <p>In bullet E), the EA "recommend that the policy needs to be more proactive in that it leads to an actual reduction in surface water run-off, rather than a simple no worsening principal". The EA also "question how the policy will be made to apply to 'off site measures'".</p> <p>The EA "request that this draft policy is revised, and we would be happy to have further discussion around the detail of the proposed changes."</p>	
		Possible new policy: Flood risk – Sustainable Drainage Systems	Policy 1 addresses this point.

		<p>The EA “support the inclusion of the principle of the policy with details to follow once the necessary system is known and approved”.</p>	
		<p>Possible new policy: Green Infrastructure The policy should make specific reference to “blue infrastructure i.e. watercourse networks (including rivers, streams, canals, ditches and drains)” throughout the borough.</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets. Whilst ‘blue infrastructure’ isn’t specifically referenced using those terms the Justification text 28.1 for this policy says that;</p> <p><i>Green Infrastructure is defined for the purposes of the Green Infrastructure Strategy (GIS) and the Part 2 Local Plan as “a network of living multi-functional natural features, green spaces, rivers, canals and lakes that link and connect villages, towns and cities”</i></p>
		<p>SA scoping report Three specified documents are recommended to be added to the schedule of relevant plans, policies and programmes.</p> <p>The SFRA “could be considered to be out of date” and the EA “recommend that the document is reviewed and updated”.</p>	
November 2015	Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation	No representations made.	
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation	No representations made.	
February 2017	Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation	No preference on which site is developed – no difference in terms of environmental constraints.	Noted

		As set out in the SA secondary aquifer is present below the entire settlement and mitigation measures may be required. Environment Agency comfortable that any potential issues can be addressed by way of future discussions.	
September 2017	Publication	No fundamental objections. Some commentary on suggested policy wording changes to Policy 1	Suggestions have been incorporated into proposed changes at submission.

Historic England (formerly English Heritage)

When they were consulted	What they were consulted on	What they Said	What has happened subsequently / What we did in response
<p>November 2013</p>	<p>Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation</p>	<p>128 – Robin Hood Inn, 17 Hall Lane Brinsley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site adjacent to conservation area – character and significance of this need to be considered. 	<p>Site not to be allocated</p>
		<p>198 – East of Church Lane Brinsley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of development on setting of Grade II Listed church needs to be considered – not referenced in site assessments 	<p>Addressed in allocation with no objection for Historic England</p>
		<p>3 – Wade Printers (and adjacent land) Baker Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on wider setting of Greasley Castle Scheduled Monument needs to be considered. 	<p>Site not to be allocated</p>
		<p>134 – Springbank Primary School Devonshire Drive Eastwood</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on the conservation area and adjacent Grade II Listed Building need to be considered. • Note conversion of existing school building. 	<p>Matters considered through the development management process.</p>
		<p>204 – North of 4 Mill Road Beauvale</p> <p>Impact on setting of Grade II Listed D H Lawrence primary school (site 496) needs to be considered.</p>	<p>Site not to be allocated</p>
		<p>206 – East of Baker Road/North of Nottingham Road Giltbrook</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on wider setting of Greasley Castle Scheduled Monument needs to be considered. 	<p>Site not to be allocated</p>
		<p>413 – Mansfield Road Nether Green</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setting of Grade II Listed Eastwood Hall will need 	<p>Site not to be allocated</p>

		to be considered.	
		<p>496 – Greasley Beauvale D H Lawrence Primary School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to ensure that residential use is most suitable and viable use for this Grade II Listed Building and is sympathetic to designation reasons • Have we explored alternatives including employment use? • Lower residential density might be more appropriate given significance of asset. 	Matters considered through the development management process
		<p>508 – Hilltop House Nottingham Road Eastwood</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider impact of development on adjacent Grade II Listed memorial. 	Development management issues
		<p>514 – Hall Farm Cockerhouse Road Eastwood</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site includes Grade II Listed Hall Farm buildings • 98 dwellings is likely to impact upon the setting of these buildings • Further consideration of these issues is required. 	Site not to be allocated
		<p>144 - South of Eastwood Road Kimberley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of site falls within a Conservation Area and therefore impact upon this will need to be considered. 	Matters to be addressed through the development management process
		<p>473 – Home Farm Nuthall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is within Conservation Area • Includes 3 Grade II Listed Buildings (plus curtilage buildings), impact on these need to be considered. 	Site not allocated and matters will be addressed through the development management process.
		<p>586 – Kimberley Brewery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade II Listed Buildings (LB) on site. • Buildings form substantial and distinctive part of 	Issues addressed through the development management process.

		<p>Kimberley Conservation Area (CA) (considered to be 'at risk' on the 2013 register).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern over the number of dwellings proposed and impact upon the significance of heritage assets and the woodland within the site which contributes to the character of the CA. • TPO, SSSI & SINIC have not been picked up in site constraints. • Number for allocation more than for hybrid scheme EH were consulted on and they felt that even the lower figure would constitute substantial harm to the LB's and CA. • Recognise need for development to regenerate buildings. • Have alternate uses for buildings been explored (i.e. employment uses)? • Concern over the level of development and the potential loss of important features of the existing buildings and CA. 	
		<p>104 – Land off Coventry Lane Bramcote</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on setting of Grade II Listed Trowell Hall and bridges along Nottingham Canal needs to be considered. • Large scale development may have wider impacts on heritage assets (e.g. at Strelley and Wollaton). 	Site not allocated
		<p>150 – Beeston Maltings Dovecote Lane</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buildings on site include non-designated heritage assets and therefore consideration should be 	The Maltings buildings were demolished several years ago. Conservation issues will be addressed through the development management process and there is no

		given to retain and convert them.	objection from HE to the allocation in the Local Plan for 56 homes.
		237 – The Boots Company Beeston Site <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Setting of Grade I Listed Buildings needs to be considered. 	An outline planning application (14/00515/OUT) has been received and is currently pending albeit this is only in relation to S106 issues which are expected to be resolved by 31 August 2018. Historic England have been consulted throughout and support the principle of the redevelopment of the site.
		258 – Land at Lilac Grove Beeston <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Setting of Grade I Listed Buildings needs to be considered. 	Noted.
		265 – Beeston Police Station <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site includes Grade II Listed Buildings and is within the Conservation Area, impact on these needs to be considered. 	It has been through the development management process and development is nearing completion.
		298 – Spring Farm Nottingham Road Trowell Moor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on setting heritage assets in Strelley needs to be considered. 	Site not to be allocated
		343 – St Johns College Peache Way Bramcote <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site is within Conservation Area and includes 3 Grade II Listed Buildings, impact on setting and significance needs to be considered. 	Development nearing completion on site and issues were fully considered through the development management process.
		407 – Land between A52 Stapleford and Chilwell Lane Bramcote <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Setting and significance of Bramcote Conservation Area needs to be considered. Not recognised in constraints. 	Site not to be allocated
		412 – Chilwell Lane Bramcote (south of Common Lane)	Site not to be allocated

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Setting of adjacent Conservation Area needs to be considered. 	
	<p>449 – Beeston Cement Depot Station Road Beeston</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on setting of Listed railway buildings needs be considered. 	Noted
	<p>588 – Land to west of Bilborough Road Strelley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on setting of Broad Oak Farm scheduled monument and Conservation Area needs to be considered. Not recognised in constraints. 	Site not to be allocated
	<p>Green Belt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comment on Green Belt issues other than those for specific sites. 	Noted
	<p>Economic Issues/Job Creation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comment other than those for specific sites. 	Noted
	<p>Climate Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check EH’s policy through various guidance documents. There is a need to differentiate between technical potential and deployable potential. 	Noted
	<p>Town Centres</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See EH’s guidance on retailing in settlements 	Policy has no objection from Historic England and various policies in the plan secure the appropriate protection and enhancement of the historic environment.
	<p>Community Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No detailed comment to make at this time 	Noted
	<p>Enhancing the Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus is mainly on natural environment. Positive strategy for conservation and 	Comments have been incorporated in the submission version of the Local Plan.

		<p>enhancement needs to be set out including heritage at risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape and historical landscape character assessments need to be carried out for large-scale expansion options. • Recognition of non-designated heritage assets is important through the development of a local list. • Up-to-date evidence base should be used. Inc. annual update of heritage counts survey. • Concerns regarding documents relating to historic environment considerations are not referenced. • No historic environment objectives have been identified. • Implications of development on the historic environment has not been analysed and assessed. • Historic environment should have its own dedicated heading. • Nottinghamshire Historic Environments Record (HER) should be used to gain info. Regarding underground historic environment assets. 	
		<p>Healthy Living</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition that the protection of cultural facilities may also benefit heritage assets including wildlife corridors etc. 	Noted
		<p>Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No detailed comments at this time. 	Noted
		<p>SA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reference to historic environment 	All comments have been fully taken on board and rectified.

		<p>considerations therefore no objectives identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No analysis or assessment of historic environment policies or programs. • 'Landscapes' have not been properly considered. • No further information or discussion of historic environment attributes. • Appears unfinished, unclear of indicator measurements. • Info regarding non-designated heritage assets not included. Further baseline data required inc. Grade II LB's on the 'at risk' register. • No detailed comments regarding historic environment attributes. This needs to inc. character of the area and setting, for both designated and non-designated heritage assets. • County, national and regional scale comparison information not filled in. • Scoping report appears unfinished. Unclear what measurements are. • SA objective 3 & 7 need to relate to 'social' theme 	
<p>Autumn 2014</p>	<p>Green Belt Review Framework</p>	<p>Assessment criteria in figure 1 should be amended to include "both designated and non-designated heritage assets" and to also include "Scheduled Monuments" in the list that follows.</p> <p>The significance of assets should also be considered as more than just a measure of distance from an asset and should relate to broad considerations and not simply</p>	<p>Broxtowe (and the other Councils) incorporated the request into the text of the framework and this methodology was then used when carrying out the Green Belt Review.</p>

		visual impacts. Local conservation and archaeological expertise should be sought when undertaking assessments.	
February 2015	Preferred Approach to site allocations: Green Belt Review Consultation	<p>Concerned at scale and location of proposed removal of the Green Belt at Brinsley.</p> <p>Green Belt protects setting of heritage assets including the Conservation Area, Grade II listed Church (which currently enjoys an open landscape setting to the west and east) and non-designated heritage assets relating to the colliery site (including links to D.H.Lawrence) and the footpath which forms the former railway line.</p> <p>Historically development has occurred to the west of the Church Lane - development to the East may be unsustainable.</p> <p>As the development need for the settlement is comparatively small – why have the particular boundaries been chosen?</p> <p>2003 Local Plan Inspector recognised value of the agricultural land and importance area fulfils in the Green Belt. Inspector considered more sustainable locations that could meet housing requirements.</p>	<p>Following these comments Broxtowe commissioned an independent expert in Historic Environment to assess the impact of development on the designated and non-designated heritage assets through an Open Design Review. The in-house Conservation Officer also assessed the proposals against their significance.</p>
		Agree with the results of the assessment for zone 6	
		<p>Bramcote/Stapleford:</p> <p>Assessment fails to take into consideration impacts upon</p>	<p>Following these comments Broxtowe commissioned an independent expert in Historic Environment to assess the impact of development on the designated and non-</p>

		<p>designated heritage assets such as Bramcote Conservation Area.</p> <p>Topography of area with the two hills – Stapleford Hill and Bramcote Hill, are significant landscape features.</p> <p>Sites have some historic landscape interest with woodland planting.</p> <p>Consider wider impacts relating to views from Wollaton Hall.</p> <p>Scoring is incorrect for historic settlements and countryside encroachment (particularly from up the hills which has remained unaffected by development).</p>	<p>designated heritage assets through an Open Design Review. The in-house Conservation Officer also assessed the proposals against their significance</p>
February 2015	Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation	<p><u>E24: Trees, hedgerows and Tree Preservation Orders</u> EH “consider that it would be helpful and NPPF compliant to retain a policy with regard to trees and hedgerows where they are important – for example where they play a positive contribution to the local character”. There is “scope for updating” to accord with the NPPF.</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 31: Biodiversity Assets which states that;</p> <p><i>“Development proposals which are likely to lead to the increased use of any of the Biodiversity Assets listed below, as shown on the Policies Map, will be required to take reasonable opportunities to enhance the Asset(s). These Biodiversity Asset(s) are;...</i></p> <p><i>c) Trees which are the subject of Tree Preservation Orders; or</i></p> <p><i>d) Aged or veteran trees; or</i></p> <p><i>e) Ancient Woodland; or</i></p> <p><i>f) Hedgerows which are important according to the criteria of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997; or</i></p>

		<p><u>S8: Shopfront design</u> EH consider that “continuing policy reference to shopfront design, security and signage is important for the new Local Plan, as it will form part of your positive strategy for the historic environment”; “these three policies could easily be amalgamated”.</p> <p><u>S9: Security measures</u> EH consider that “continuing policy reference to shopfront design, security and signage is important for the new Local Plan, as it will form part of your positive strategy for the historic environment”; “these three policies could easily be amalgamated”.</p> <p><u>S10: Shopfront signage</u> EH consider that “continuing policy reference to shopfront design, security and signage is important for the new Local Plan, as it will form part of your positive strategy for the historic environment”; “these three policies could easily be amalgamated”.</p> <p>With regard to signage, “amenity is a very important consideration, particular[ly] in those historic areas (such as conservation areas) and as such a policy reference is needed, and should not simply be deferred to the NPPF”. The PPG “states that in relation to amenity, this includes the local characteristics of the neighbourhood, citing that if the locality where the advertisement is to be displayed has important scenic, historic, architectural or cultural</p>	<p><i>g) Other trees and hedgerows which are important to the local environment”.</i></p> <p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 18: shopfronts, signage and security measures which states that;</p> <p><i>“1. Proposals for shopfronts, signage and security measures will be granted permission/consent provided:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) That they relate well to the design of the building concerned;</i> <i>b) Are in keeping with the frontage as a whole; and</i> <i>c) Respect the character of the area.</i> <p><i>2. Security shutters should ensure that at least two thirds of their area comprises an open grille or large slots, in order to give a reasonable degree of visibility. Shutter boxes should be located discreetly within the frontage.”</i></p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>features consideration of whether it is in keeping with these features is required. A local plan policy on this would make this explicit for Broxtowe”.</p>	
		<p><u>RC5: Protection of open spaces</u> “Open spaces can often form part of heritage assets – for example, non-designated historic parkland, cemeteries, important open spaces within Conservation Areas etc. Policy recognition should therefore include these matters and support the enhancement of such assets where relevant.”</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 23: Proposals affecting designated and non-designated heritage assets which recognises setting as an important factor when considering development proposals including non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p><i>“1. Proposals will be supported where heritage assets and their settings are conserved or enhanced in line with their significance.</i></p> <p><i>2. Proposals that affect heritage assets will be required to demonstrate an understanding of the significance of the assets and their settings, identify the impact of the development upon them and provide a clear justification for the development in order that a decision can be made as to whether the merits of the proposals for the site bring public benefits which decisively outweigh the harm arising from the proposals.</i></p> <p><i>3. Proposals affecting a heritage asset and/or its setting will be considered against the following criteria, where relevant:</i></p> <p><i>a) The significance of the asset...</i></p> <p><i>d) Whether the proposals would respect the asset’s relationship with the historic street pattern, topography, urban spaces, landscape, views and landmarks”.</i></p>

		<p><u>Possible new policy: Design</u> EH “consider that there is a need for a locally distinctive design policy”. “This could set out design criteria in more detail and should make reference to local character and distinctiveness.” There should also be reference to “local materials”.</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 17: Design and Enhancing Local Identity which states that;</p> <p><i>“1. For all new development, permission will be granted for development which, where relevant:...</i> <i>d) Creates a place with a locally-inspired or otherwise distinctive character; “</i></p> <p>Policy 23: Proposals affecting designated and non-designated heritage assets also states;</p> <p><i>“3. Proposals affecting a heritage asset and/or its setting will be considered against the following criteria, where relevant;...</i> <i>c) Whether the proposals would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the heritage asset by virtue of siting, scale, building form, massing, height, materials and quality of detail”.</i></p>
		<p><u>Possible new policy: Heritage assets / conservation</u> EH “consider that further detailed development management policies are essential”. “We consider that a lack of detailed development management policies relating to heritage would render the plan unsound.” They cite the ACS and NPPF in support of this view.</p> <p>The PPS guide [to which we referred in the consultation document] “is to be replaced”, however the forthcoming new documents “are not a replacement for detailed Local</p>	<p>Policy 23 addresses these points.</p>

		<p>Plan Policies and should not be used as such”.</p> <p>Broxtowe “may wish to set out further and more detailed local information requirements for applications involving heritage assets”.</p> <p>A “local list, or a methodology relating to the identification of non-designated heritage assets could be developed”. A link to EH guidance on local listing is provided.</p> <p>Some fairly general comments are made about possible topics and format for policies.</p> <p>Historic environment considerations “should not be limited to a stand-alone chapter”.</p> <p>EH “are happy to comment on draft policies as they develop and provide further advice on any of the above”.</p>	
		<p><u>Possible new policy: Archaeology</u></p> <p>EH “consider that reference is required within the Local Plan to this – this could be combined with a heritage asset policy, as above, or separated”.</p> <p>They “consider that there should be alignment with the City Council’s approach to archaeology”.</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 23: Proposals affecting designated and non-designated heritage assets states that;</p> <p><i>“3. Proposals affecting a heritage asset and/or its setting will be considered against the following criteria, where relevant:...</i></p> <p><i>g) Whether the proposals would appropriately provide for ‘in-situ’ preservation, or investigation and recording, of archaeology”.</i></p>

			This is in line with Nottingham City Council approach (Policy He1:3g).
		<p><u>Possible new policy: Boots / Severn Trent</u> EH “consider that it is essential a policy to guide development for the strategic employment site at Boots is included within the Plan. A joint approach between your Authority and the City Council should also be pursued. As part of this, it is critical that reference is made within this to the protection of designated and non-designated assets to ensure the policy is sound”.</p>	This may not be necessary as planning permission is ready to be granted subject to s106 issues with no objection from Historic England.
		<p><u>Possible new policy: Culture, tourism and sport</u> It is “important” to have a policy on this issue, as “part of your positive strategy for the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment...further detail should relate to literary heritage etc.”</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 25: Culture, Tourism and Sport which states that;</p> <p><i>"Development proposals will be encouraged that;</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Make specific provision for sports pitches that are suitable for a wide age range of users, in particular children’s sport.</i> <i>2. Enhance the tourism offer in association with DH Lawrence or the industrial/pharmaceutical heritage of the Borough”.</i>
		<p><u>Possible new policy: Cromford Canal</u> EH “would support the inclusion of such a policy”.</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan justification text 28.4 and 28.5 for Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets.</p> <p><i>“A potential continuation of the Nottingham Canal towpath north of Eastwood approximately follows the line of the former Cromford Canal. The Council will work with</i></p>

			<p><i>partners to look for ways to achieve this route. Protection of this route would help to retain a possible route for the restoration of the Cromford Canal, should proposals for this emerge in the future”.</i></p>
		<p><u>SA scoping report:</u> With regard to the inclusion of relevant plans, policies and programmes, “it does now cover the main documents”. The objectives of these documents, and their implications for the plan, “have been adequately identified”. The identification of key sustainability issues is now “adequate”, as are the SA objectives.</p> <p>Overall: “Although some further amendment is still required, we consider if this is made, the document does fulfil the legislative requirements”.</p> <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The baseline data still requires data inputting in relation to statistics for heritage assets within England.” • “We are still very concerned that there is no discussion of the baseline data in chapter 4...there is no further discussion of the attributes for the area.” • “We are still unclear as to what the proposed indicators are actually measuring as they just list types of heritage asset.” <p>“There is no formal framework for assessment of site</p>	<p>Matters have been addressed.</p>

		allocations...further detail is needed to ensure a robust process...for example, for site allocations, a more detailed framework is needed to understand how these will be assessed and how these will be ranked (colour coding? +/- ?). For heritage assets, this will need an assessment of the significance of the heritage assets. Distance should not be used as a proxy to harm”.	
November 2015	Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation	No representations made.	
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation	Bramcote, Chetwynd and Nuthall: Not clear how heritage assets and their setting have been considered as part of the assessment of the sites and recommend that a site selection methodology in relation to historic assets is used to make the process sound.	The two sites to be allocated have followed full dialogue with historic England with no outstanding objections to their allocation.
February 2017	Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation	It is recommended that the Historic Environment Record be consulted to inform your consideration of the site. Advice from your Conservation Officer and Archeological experts should be sought in respect of the site, and the findings of the Historic Landscape Character Assessment be taken into account.	Broxtowe commissioned an independent expert in Historic Environment to assess the impact of development on the designated and non-designated heritage assets through an Open Design Review. The in-house Conservation Officer also assessed the proposals against their significance.
September 2017	Publication	No fundamental objections but request minor changes to policies 4.1, 5.1, 23 and 32.	All agreed and included in proposed changes to the submission version of the plan.

Natural England

When they were consulted	What they were consulted on	What they Said	What has happened subsequently / What we did in response
November 2013	Site Allocations	Housing / General Development	Noted

	Issues and Options Consultation	<p>Welcomes reference to Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment, the 6Cs Growth Point Green Infrastructure Study and the Green Spaces Strategy 2009-2019.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest referencing emerging Broxtowe Green Infrastructure Study. • Soils and agricultural land should also be referenced. 	
		<p>237 – The Boots Company Beeston 258 – Land at Lilac Grove Beeston</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protected species identified on site - appropriate surveys required. • Close proximity of number of wildlife sites including SSSI at Attenborough would need to be protected from adverse development impacts. • Proposed green infrastructure should protect and enhance these sites. 	<p>Aecom undertook an extended Phase I Habitat Survey which is summarised in the Ecology chapter (13) of the Environmental Report that was submitted to the Council with their planning application 14/00515/OUT for the Boots site (237). Aecom summarised that the implementation of the mitigation measures would avoid or minimise the potential effects to the majority of the ecological receptors, therefore the overall residual effect assessment is assessed as slight adverse. However they do recognise that cumulative effects of development with the adjacent Severn Trent land are likely and that further assessment of impact would be required once details of the development are known.</p>
		<p>Toton - (133, 254, 259, 403, 132, 407 & 358)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two local wildlife sites immediately adjacent to the railway line and two to the North West of the proposed site which should be protected and enhanced and linked by green infrastructure. 	<p>Substantial Green Infrastructure is expected to be delivered on the Strategic Location for Growth at Toton linking to existing surrounding Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>Part of the site west of Toton/Stapleford Lane</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should not impact on SSSIs at Attenborough and Holme Pit to the South of the site. 	benefits from extant planning permission (12/00585/OUT) on which Natural England were consulted and raised no objection.
		<p>Green Belt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities should be taken to link Green Belt into green infrastructure and ecological networks. 	Policy 28 does this.
		<p>Economic Issues/Job Creation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference emerging Broxtowe Green Infrastructure Strategy to relay importance of Green Infrastructure in economic terms to the Borough. 	Noted
		<p>Climate Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated landscapes and nature conservation area sites should be fully protected. • Reference emerging Broxtowe Green Infrastructure Strategy to relay value of GI to help mitigate climate change. 	Noted
		<p>Community Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision should be made of accessible semi-natural green space in and around urban area. • Recommend the use of Natural England's Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards. • Reference emerging Broxtowe Green Infrastructure Strategy as this includes protection and enhancement of open 	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets which states that;</p> <p><i>“Development proposals which are likely to lead to increased use of any of the Green Infrastructure Assets listed below, as shown on the Policies Map, will be required to take reasonable opportunities to enhance the Green Infrastructure</i></p>

		<p>space, Public Rights of Way and access issues.</p>	<p><i>Asset(s). These Green Infrastructure Assets are:...</i> <i>c) Informal Open Spaces i.e. ‘natural and semi-natural green space’ and ‘amenity green space’....[and]</i> <i>e) Recreational Routes”.</i></p> <p>Natural England’s Accessible Natural Green Space Standard has been used to develop a local standard (Broxtowe Green Space Standard) which itself has been incorporated into the justification text 28.6 states that :</p> <p><i>“The need for contributions for other types of green space will be assessed in accordance with the Broxtowe Green Space Standard ... which was developed taking account of Natural England’s Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards”.</i></p>
		<p>Enhancing the Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference emerging Broxtowe Green Infrastructure Strategy to emphasise its provision of fundamental evidence to the plan. • Specific sites should be protected and enhanced: SSSIs (Attenborough Gravel Pits, Sellers Wood Meadows Nuthall, Kimberley Railway Cutting, Sledder Wood Meadows Greasley, Robinettes Cossall). • Local Nature Reserves and Local Wildlife Sites need to be protected. 	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request to reference the Green Infrastructure Strategy into the Part 2 Local Plan justification text 28.2 states that;</p> <p>All Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and Local Wildlife Sites are protected with an ambition to enhance them in the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 31: Biodiversity Assets which states that;</p> <p><i>“Development proposals which are likely to lead to the increased use of any of the Biodiversity Assets listed below, as shown on the Policies Map, will be</i></p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greenwood Community Forest should be included. 	<p><i>required to take reasonable opportunities to enhance the Asset(s). These Biodiversity Asset(s) are;...</i></p> <p><i>a) Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Local Wildlife Sites or Local Geological Sites”</i></p> <p>All Nature Reserves (irrespective of management/designation) are protected in the Part 2 Local Plan through Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets which states that;</p> <p><i>“Development proposals which are likely to lead to increased use of any of the Green Infrastructure Assets listed below, as shown on the Policies Map, will be required to take reasonable opportunities to enhance the Green Infrastructure Asset(s). These Green Infrastructure Assets are:...</i></p> <p><i>f) Nature Reserves”.</i></p> <p>The Greenwood Community Forest has not been carried forward as a specific policy into the Part 2 Local Plan. However, the partnership undertook a study the ‘Greenwood Community Forest Green Infrastructure and Public Benefit Mapping’ which formed part of the evidence base for the Broxtowe Green Infrastructure Study which in turn is a fundamental part of evidence for delivering Green Infrastructure benefits throughout the Part 2 Local Plan.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>Healthy Living</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference emerging Broxtowe Green Infrastructure Strategy to emphasise value of GI to promote healthy living and improve well-being. • GI needs to be considered at the outset to ensure it's fully integrated with existing green spaces. 	Noted
		<p>HRA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfied that Site Allocations will have no significant effect on European Site (alone or in combination) • No further assessment required at this stage. 	Noted. However in line with the recent legal judgment further work on this issue is being undertaken and will be complete by September 2018.
		<p>SA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SA scoping carried out comprehensively and follows acceptable methodologies. • National Character Areas should be included i.e. Sherwood, Southern Magnesian Limestone and Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire & Yorkshire Coalfield. • Reference should be made to 6Cs Infrastructure Study. • Reference Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment, soils and agricultural land. • Accessibility to open spaces to health and 	Noted

		well-being inc. social and community issues.	
Autumn 2014	Green Belt Review Framework	<p>Approach taken is appropriate to the aims and follows a logical methodology.</p> <p>Assessment should consider opportunities to link into GI & ecological networks. Landscape character could be considered when assessing value of the GB and reference should be made to the NCAs.</p>	The issues relating to GI, ecology and landscape are not Green Belt matters and therefore did not form part of the Green Belt Review however they were all taken into account in the Broxtowe's Part 2 Local Plan as part of the SA/ Green Infrastructure Strategy / Landscape and Visual Analysis Assessment.
February 2015	Preferred Approach to site allocations: Green Belt Review Consultation	<p>Zone 44: Contains two Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) – Bulwell Wood SSSI and Sellers Wood SSSI.</p> <p>Development should avoid any activity that would damage or destroy the interest features of these SSSIs, including trampling or erosion damage as a result of increased visitor pressure.</p>	Zone 44: Attenborough Wetlands SSSI whilst assessed through the Green Belt Review this site was not under consideration for development and has not been carried forwards in the Part 2 Local Plan.
February 2015	Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation	E16: Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation NE "generally agree with the analysis for this policy", "particularly support the idea of including advice regarding the natural environment at the landscape scale, biodiversity networks and species protection" and "agree that it is important to link this policy with policy on green infrastructure".	Noted
		E24 Trees, hedgerows and Tree Preservation Orders NE "would wish to see a policy to protect ancient woodland and aged or veteran trees to comply with paragraph 118 of the NPPF".	Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 31: Biodiversity Assets which states that; <i>"Development proposals which are likely to lead to</i>

			<p><i>the increased use of any of the Biodiversity Assets listed below, as shown on the Policies Map, will be required to take reasonable opportunities to enhance the Asset(s). These Biodiversity Asset(s) are;...</i></p> <p><i>d) Aged or veteran trees; or</i></p> <p><i>e) Ancient Woodland;”.</i></p>
		<p>E33: Light pollution NE “support” a policy on light pollution. Reference should be made to “negative impact on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation (especially bats and invertebrates)” and to the use of “appropriate design” to address such impacts.</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 19: Pollution, Hazardous Substances and Ground Conditions which states that;</p> <p><i>“1. Permission will not be granted for development which would result in:...</i></p> <p><i>b) Lighting schemes unless they are designed to use the minimum amount of lighting necessary to achieve their purposes and to minimise any adverse effects beyond the site, including effects on the amenity of local residents, the darkness of the local area and</i></p> <p><i>nature conservation (especially bats and invertebrates)”.</i></p>
		<p>Possible new policy: Reducing CO2 emissions NE “suggest that a policy regarding renewable energy schemes should particularly include the avoidance of potential impacts on nature conservation and local landscapes” and “suggest that an assessment of landscape sensitivity is carried out before locations of schemes are</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 30: Landscape which states that;</p> <p><i>“All developments within, or affecting the setting of, the local landscape character areas listed below should make a positive contribution to the quality</i></p>

		<p>agreed”.</p>	<p><i>and local distinctiveness of the landscape. They should therefore be consistent with the ‘landscape actions’ for the area concerned, as set out in the Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment and in Appendix 7 of this Plan”.</i></p>
		<p>Possible new policy: Design Policy should “include provision to encourage “Biodiversity by Design”” (a link to a relevant part of the TCPA’s website is provided). This should encourage “incorporating ecologically sensitive design and feature early on within a development scheme”; measures “can include green roofs, planting and landscaping using native species, setting up bird and bat boxes and sustainable urban drainage systems”.</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 17: Place-making, design and amenity which states that;</p> <p><i>“1. For all new development, permission will be granted for development which, where relevant:...</i> <i>n) Incorporates ecologically sensitive design, with a high standard of planting and features for biodiversity; and</i> <i>o) Uses native species of trees, shrubs and wild-flower seeds in landscaping proposals; and</i> <i>p) Integrates bat and/or bird boxes into the fabric of new buildings”.</i></p>
		<p>Possible new policy: Landscape NE “supports the idea of a policy on landscape which uses information set out in the [Greater] Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment”. It also suggests that “reference should be made to the National Character Areas”, which are “a good decision making framework for the natural environment”.</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 30: Landscape which states that;</p> <p><i>“All developments within, or affecting the setting of, the local landscape character areas listed below should make a positive contribution to the quality and local distinctiveness of the landscape. They should therefore be consistent with the ‘landscape actions’ for the area concerned, as set out in the Greater</i></p>

		<p>Possible new policy: Green Infrastructure NE “agrees that any new policy will need to complement the Council’s emerging Green Infrastructure Strategy. It should integrate with other policies such as biodiversity, green space, flood risk and climate change adaptation”.</p>	<p><i>Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment”.</i> Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan justification text 28.2 states that; <i>“There is a need for these [Green Infrastructure] corridors to be enhanced in terms of quality, size, multi-functionality and connectivity, in order to maximise benefits and address needs identified in the GIS. The greatest opportunities for enhancing the corridors will come through development, and the Council intends to work with developers to create and maintain new spaces and to improve connectivity”.</i></p>
		<p>RC8: New informal open space NE “recommend the use of the Natural England’s Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards (ANGSt)”, which “provides a powerful tool in assessing current levels of accessible natural greenspace and planning for better provision”.</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets which states that; <i>“Development proposals which are likely to lead to increased use of any of the Green Infrastructure Assets listed below, as shown on the Policies Map, will be required to take reasonable opportunities to enhance the Green Infrastructure Asset(s). These Green Infrastructure Assets are:...</i> <i>c) Informal Open Spaces i.e. ‘natural and semi-natural green space’ and ‘amenity green space’”.</i> Natural England’s Accessible Natural Green Space Standard has been used to develop a local standard (Broxtowe Green Space Standard) which itself has</p>

			<p>been incorporated into the justification text 28.6 states that :</p> <p><i>“The need for contributions for other types of green space will be assessed in accordance with the Broxtowe Green Space Standard ... which was developed taking account of Natural England’s Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards” .</i></p>
		<p>RC15: Long distance trails NE “agrees... that reference to the Council’s emerging Green Infrastructure Strategy should be made”.</p>	<p>Broxtowe has incorporated the request into the Part 2 Local Plan Policy 28: Green Infrastructure Assets which states that;</p> <p><i>“Development proposals which are likely to lead to increased use of any of the Green Infrastructure Assets listed below, as shown on the Policies Map, will be required to take reasonable opportunities to enhance the Green Infrastructure Asset(s). These Green Infrastructure Assets are;...</i></p> <p><i>e) Recreational Routes “</i></p> <p>The justification text 28.1 states that Green Infrastructure assets are defined and identified in the Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p>
		<p>SA Scoping Report NE “generally supports the scoping report but would like to have seen reference to the National Character Areas”.</p>	<p>The National Character Areas have been referenced in the Sustainability Appraisal ‘plans and programs’ sections.</p> <p>The National Character Areas were used as</p>

			background evidence for a Broxtowe specific Landscape and Visual Analysis Assessment which was undertaken by Aecom. The results of the assessment then fed back into the Sustainability Appraisal individual site allocation assessments.
November 2015	Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation	No representations made.	
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation	Bramcote: Allocation unlikely to affect the notified features of any SSSI sites nearby. Welcome the opportunities identified for Green Infrastructure and wildlife corridors throughout the site.	Noted.
		Chetwynd Barracks: Sites lies within the Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) buffer for Attenborough Gravel Pits (SSSI) and would trigger consultation with Natural England in respect of any residential proposals in excess of 100 dwellings because of potential impact on the SSSI. Welcome significant opportunities for Green Infrastructure (GI) that the site offers and the ability to provide good links through the area up to the existing GI and local wildlife sites and provide local alternatives to Attenborough which is a honeypot site. Attenborough is notified for birds which are affected by water quality and water levels, any potential increase in visitor numbers would need to be given consideration.	Noted

		<p>Nuthall: Adjacent to Sellers Wood SSSI and within its Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) buffer. Site also lies within the IRZ buffer for Bulwell Wood. Both sites are notified for their woodland habitat. This sites allocation would directly affect Sellers Wood which is already used by the public and dog-walkers. The site is narrow and further dwellings adjacent to it would be a concern. The development site has capacity for development and Green Infrastructure (GI) and we would welcome moving the GI so that it is closest to the SSSI and positioning dwellings furthest away. We would welcome opportunities for more woodland as part of the green space opportunities to link between Sellers Wood and Bulwell Wood which would reduce woodland fragmentation and provide links between existing woodland habitats.</p>	<p>Broxtowe noted the concern regarding development adjacent to the woodland and incorporated a 'buffer' into the discussion points for the site specific workshop which was held on the 11th November 2016 (Natural England were invited but were unable to attend) .</p> <p>As a result it was considered that there were significant difficulties to deliver an acceptable, viable residential allocation which would be sensitive to the SSSI whilst achieving an acceptable access and the aspirations of the local community. It was therefore not carried forward as an allocation in the Part 2 Local Plan.</p>
February 2017	Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation	<p>Since Natural England duties relate to the protection and enhancement of the natural environment, Natural England's concerns relate primarily to safeguarding protected sites, species and landscapes and ensuring adequate green infrastructure provision. It follows that we have no particular comment to make except to advise that development sites should be located so as to avoid any adverse impacts on nationally and internationally designated nature conservation sites.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Broxtowe have considered all of the listed environmental designations (and more) through the Sustainability Appraisal which has fed into the site selection process.</p>

		<p>Natural England considers that there are a number of environmental designations and issues which may affect the size, scale, form and delivery of development sites and should be taken into account.</p> <p>Although the list below is not exhaustive, key environmental considerations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International and national nature conservation sites, including Special Protection Areas (SPA), Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), Ramsar sites, SSSIs, National Nature Reserves; • Locally and regionally designated sites for geodiversity and biodiversity; • UK BAP habitats and significant proportions of BAP or protected species; • Ancient woodland; • Landscape character. 	
September 2017	Publication	No outstanding issues	

Highways England (formerly Highways Agency)

When they were consulted	What they were consulted on	What they Said	What has happened subsequently / What we did in response
November 2013	Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation	No representations made.	
Autumn 2014	Green Belt Review Framework	Welcomes overall approach which will ensure a robust assessment of GB. Agency welcomes that the assessment will seek to check unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas which aligns with the Agency's preference for development to be concentrated in existing built-up areas with good access to public transport.	Noted
February 2015	Preferred Approach to site allocations: Green Belt Review Consultation	No representations made.	
February 2015	Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation	No representations made.	
November 2015	Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation	No representations made.	
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation	No representations made.	
February 2017	Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation	Given the relatively small scale of development being proposed, and the distance of the site from M1 junctions in the area, that there will be no significant impacts on the operations of the Strategic Road Network.	Noted
September 2017	Publication	No representations made.	

Homes and Community Agency

When they were consulted	What they were consulted on	What they Said	What has happened subsequently / What we did in response
November 2013	Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation	No representations made.	
Autumn 2014	Green Belt Review Framework	Welcomes joint approach as ensures consistency & have no specific comments to make.	Noted
February 2015	Preferred Approach to site allocations: Green Belt Review Consultation	No representations made.	
February 2015	Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation	No representations made.	
November 2015	Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation	No representations made.	
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation	No representations made.	
February 2017	Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation	No representations made.	
September 2017	Publication	No representations made.	

Clinical Commissioning Groups

When they were consulted	What they were consulted on	What they Said	What has happened subsequently / What we did in response
November 2013	Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation	No representations made.	
Autumn 2014	Green Belt Review Framework	No representations made.	
February 2015	Preferred Approach to site allocations: Green Belt Review Consultation	No representations made.	
February 2015	Development Management Policies Issues and Options Consultation	No representations made.	
November 2015	Strategic Location for Growth at Toton Consultation	No representations made.	
August 2016	Site Allocations Potential Additional Sites Consultation	No representations made.	
February 2017	Brinsley Alternative Site Consultation	No representations made.	
September 2017	Publication	Representations made regarding request for either a new medical Centre of financial contributions to improve or extend existing facilities.	Financial contributions for health care provision was already included in the plan (policy 32), further detail will be determined at planning application stage. The requirement for new medical centers on specific sites has been built into the relevant site allocations.

No comments were received from other prescribed bodies and all were consulted at each stage of plan preparation.