

## **Questions Arising from the Representations**

**Q1. Historic England, in its Regulation 16 consultation response, recommended further liaison with a number of bodies to provide details on designated heritage assets and locally-important buildings, as well as archaeological remains and landscapes in the Parish. Designated and non-designated assets are mapped on Page 9 of the Neighbourhood Plan. Please would the Parish advise what is the basis for defining the “Local Interest Buildings”; also, do they feature on records held by Broxtowe Borough Council or Nottinghamshire County Council?**

*A1. The ‘local interest buildings’ data has come from Broxtowe Borough Council who in turn receive heritage updates from Nottinghamshire County Council who publish the data on the Heritage Gateway.*

**Q2. Natural England drew attention to the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) at Sellar’s Wood, and offered advice on Green Infrastructure. Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust also sought amendments to Policy 4 to make it more ambitious in respect of a Green Infrastructure Network, and achieving gains for wildlife. Should the Neighbourhood Plan be amended, having regard for these comments?**

*A2. We agree to a change to the Neighbourhood Plan to include designated wildlife sites (including Sites of Special Scientific Interest and Local Wildlife Sites) will be depicted on map 9 on page number 23 and on the legend.*

*In addition to this, we agree to incorporate the suggestions out forward as follows.*

*The title of Policy 4 could be amended to ‘New & Enhanced Green Infrastructure Network’.*

*New criteria v. to add to follow in the list-*

*‘The creation of new wetlands, ponds, hedges, wildflower meadows green lanes and field margins and the enhancements of existing ones’*

*New criteria vi. to follow in the list-*

*‘The provision of features to provide net gains for wildlife such as bat/bird boxes, urban drainage ponds and swales and native species planting.’*

**Q3. Highways England suggested that Policy 1 should include a requirement that development proposals be subject to an appropriate Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Having regard for the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), section 4. Promoting sustainable transport, and the adopted Aligned Core Strategy, Managing Travel Demand, would the Parish Council support this proposed amendment?**

*A3. There is no objection to the principle of this but it is considered that transport issues are adequately covered in the NPPF (2012 and 2018) the Aligned Core Strategy and the Broxtowe Part 2 Local Plan.*

**Q4. Highways England also commented that phase 2b of HS2 is expected to have a significant impact on the Neighbourhood Plan area. Pages 14 onwards of the submitted Neighbourhood Plan provide additional information about the likely impact of HS2 development. This includes an expectation that 2 working farms would be severely affected, and a number of houses demolished. What is the source of this data? A**

reference to sources to understand how far planning for the new train line has reached, might be helpful in the Plan.

A4. HS2 information including their route alignment and safeguarding maps (sheets 1 & 2 <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hs2-phase-2b-maps-from-trowell-to-tibshelf> ), for clarity the route has also been depicted on map 7 on page 17.

**Q5. In addition, should the Plan acknowledge, as consultees have suggested that (i) development of HS2 may encourage new development and necessitate a review of Green Belt policy in the future, and/or (ii) employment land needs may change over the Plan period with the development of HS2?**

A5. No. This is a strategic matter which is a fundamental component of the Council's emerging Statement of Common Ground with support being provided to Broxtowe and other HMA councils by Derek Stebbing. The Broxtowe LDS includes a review of the Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategies by 2021 and the issue of cross boundary housing need, the implications of HS2, various employment issues, further Green Belt Review and all other relevant strategic matters will be reviewed as part of this process. The HS2 Growth Strategy was published in October 2017 and includes ambitions for an innovation campus around the station at Toton (expanding on Policy 2 of the ACS) which identified the main built up area of Nottingham as the first location for new growth in the Greater Nottingham settlement hierarchy and the area around the HS2 station as a Strategic Location for Growth. Broxtowe have now submitted a Part 2 Local Plan which details development ambitions in this area including those that go beyond 2028.

*It is therefore considered unnecessary to include reference to HS2, employment needs and green belt review in a Neighbourhood Plan a good distance away from the station location partly because all of these issues are receiving detailed consideration over the Housing market area geography, but also because growth ambitions for HS2 are focussed in the urban south of Broxtowe (not near Nuthall) and the timing of HS2 is such (opening 2033) that any reference to employment needs and other matters can be addressed in full cooperation with Broxtowe housing market area colleague councils a full 10 years before the station is open.*

**Q6. The Woodland Trust supports policy 4 but argues that the Plan should also ensure that development conserves mature trees and hedgerows. It put forward a number of proposed changes to strengthen the approach to protecting trees and securing new planting. What is the Parish Council's response to this?**

A6. Agree and please see suggested changes to Policy 4

**Q7. Nottinghamshire County Council wrote in support of a reference to developer contributions to provide supportive bus services and transport infrastructure, as it could "afford a higher probability of successfully negotiating for future development funding". Should the section of the Plan covering public transport be enhanced as suggested by the County Council? Also, should more information be given about the role of community transport?**

A7. No objections in principle but it is considered that the issue of the provision of the necessary infrastructure (which will include the necessary financial contributions to provide it) is included in Policy 1.

**Q8. Nottinghamshire County Council also requested an amendment to Map 7, so that all A roads in the County have the same classification. Does the Parish Council support this?**

*A8. Yes and map 7 can be amended.*

**Q9. Greasley Parish Council proposed clarification as to the Core Strategy's requirement for the Kimberley area to provide up to 600 new homes over the Plan period (to specify what area is covered by Kimberley), and to explain what is a SHLAA. What is the Parish Council's view?**

*A9. Agreed that it's helpful to show this. This is on page 9 of the BBC Part 2 Local Plan for Kimberley and on page 228 for the definition of the SHLAA*

**Q10. Does the Parish Council have any other comments to make on the Regulation 16 responses? For example, does it wish to make additional references in the Plan to trams, or comment on the proposed housing site south of 121 Kimberley Road?**

*A10. The Parish Council thanks you for the opportunity to raise any further comments. We are supportive of transport interventions to reduce the use of private car. Policy 1 already gives support to the principle of housing in the built-up area. Other than this, we currently do not have any additional references to put forward in relation to the Plan to trams and we do not have any further comments to make on the proposed housing site south of 121 Kimberley Road. It is considered that the tram and other major public transport interventions would be strategic matters to be addressed as part of the Core Strategy Review referred to previously.*

**Q11. Should Page 7, which indicates that Hemsill Hall was demolished, be modified?**

*A11. Yes.*

#### **Questions arising from the Plan**

**Q12. Policy 1: New Housing Criterion v. seeks a minimum of 20% of new homes in developments of 5 or more units to be for elderly residents or people with limited mobility. Is the 20% figure underpinned by factual evidence and, if so, what is it?**

*A12. The 20% figure is indeed underpinned by factual evidence. In the 'Appendix 1: Supporting Background Evidence on Page 28 of the Neighbourhood Plan, the aged population is visually represented in the population graph. In addition to this, it is noted on the same page that '18% of the population (1,135 people) in Nuthall are over the age of 65', and indeed as the population ages, as will the figure of elderly residents. Further evidence from the Neighbourhood Plan, which supports the 20% figure can be drawn from Page 33 upon which it is stated that 'The retired population is 783', which is in fact more than double of the student population and the population of individuals who work from home. Again, with time this figure will only continue to increase as the population ages, and it is important that the homes available reflect this.*

*With this in mind, the Parish Council consider that the 20% figure is fair and realistic in supporting the elderly and individuals of limited mobility who reside in Nuthall.*

**Q13. Policy 8 of the Aligned Core Strategy and Policy 1 of the emerging Broxtowe Local Plan Part 2 expect new housing development to include a proportion of affordable housing. Nuthall is included in the Kimberley housing sub-market where some 20% or**

more of new housing should be affordable. Even though Appendix 1 of the Plan indicates that the affordability ratio (median house prices to median income) is below average for England, it also states that house prices are in line with the Nottinghamshire average. The Aligned Core Strategy seeks to build 30% of new housing as affordable. Please would the Parish Council explain why the Neighbourhood Plan's Policy 1 is silent on the matter of providing affordable housing?

*A13. The issue of affordable housing is addressed in Broxtowe Borough Council's Part 2 Local Plan, which has now been submitted. Therefore, we do not feel that it is necessary to give reference to the topic as it may lead to unnecessary repetition.*

**Q14. Policy 2: Nuthall Village Centre sets a standard for new retail and business development not to exceed 250sqm. What is the justification for this?**

*A14. The initial thinking behind, and justification for the 250sqm figure was due to Sunday opening and floor space issues for a non-town centre location. However, we agree to an amendment of 280sqm which is in line with this.*

**Q15. Having regard for HS2, and questions 4 & 5 above surrounding the likely impact of major rail infrastructure development on Nuthall, is there a case for adding a short section to the Neighbourhood Plan committing the Parish Council and Local Authority to Monitor and review its content? Whilst I recognise there is no requirement to review or update a neighbourhood plan, there is a statutory requirement that local plans must be reviewed at least every 5 years. The Nuthall Neighbourhood Plan addresses a time period of considerable uncertainty due to the planned changes to the rail system. There is a significant risk that the Neighbourhood Plan may become out of date. If the Neighbourhood Plan policies conflict with revised policies in any updated local plan for the area, then in such cases, the more recent plan policy takes precedence. Careful monitoring and, if necessary, review of the Neighbourhood Plan would allow for some future flexibility as the HS2 project moves forward, and enable the Neighbourhood Plan to remain both robust document and prevent it being undermined by any revised local plan policies. Are the Parish Council and Local Authority willing and able to make a combined commitment to such a modification, to undertake to monitor, manage change, and possibly review the Neighbourhood Plan in the future? I recognise this lies in the margins of my remit in assessing the Basic Conditions and recommending modifications, but it would seem to me, nonetheless, to be a very important issue given the considerable work that has been invested in producing this draft Plan to date.**

*A15. All policies are monitored on an annual basis by the Local Planning Authority and the results are published in Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) to ensure that they remain relevant.*

*Given that the HS2 project will be delivered outside of the plan period it is likely that the Neighbourhood Plan will need to be reviewed prior to this date in any event.*

**Q16. Bottom of Page 16 – it is stated that “the travel to work ratio is therefore relatively high”. Does this mean that the majority of residents who are in employment travel out of the Parish to their place of work, and not many people commute inwards to work?**

*A16. Yes. This statement does mean that the majority of Nuthall residents who are in employment travel out of the Parish to their place of work and as such, not many people commute inwards. Supporting this, Page 33 of the Neighbourhood Plan states that ‘The largest employment sector for Nuthall residents is Retail’ and following from this on Page 34 of the same document it is noted that ‘Retailing is very limited in the Nuthall Parish itself’.*

**Q17. Maps 9 and 10 show black and white hatched lines. Should these be explained in the keys to the maps?**

*A17. Yes. This is the Borough boundary which has now been included in the Legend. For clarity this amendment has also been made to maps 3 and 6.*

**Q18. The last paragraph on Page 35 states that some 23% of Nuthall's population is "in the most environmentally deprived area". What does this mean, and how does the Plan seek to address the deprivation in future?**

*A18. The term "in the most environmentally deprived area" relates to the issue of sub-standard air quality and the lack of green landscape in particular around junction 26 of the M1 motorway. The main cause of sub standard air quality is emissions from cars. A further reference to the Neighbourhood Plan can be added to explain this.*

*The neighbourhood plan attempts to address this by encouraging the following-*

- The provision of the necessary infrastructure to reduce the need to travel by private car (policy 1)*
- The provision of appropriate small scale retail development to support the local area (Policy 2)*
- The encouragement of live work units (Policy 3)*
- The encouragement of significant green infrastructure enhancements (Policy 4 as amended)*

*The first three of these are intended to reduce the need for trips by private car. The fourth is to secure an uplift in green infrastructure to encourage more walking and cycling.*