



Broxtowe
Borough
COUNCIL

Broxtowe Borough Council

Response to Matter 8:

Other Main Built Up Area Site Allocations

November 2018

BROXTOWE LOCAL PLAN PART 2 EXAMINATION

MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

Main Built Up Area Site Allocations

In responding to the questions on site allocations the Council should identify and address specific key concerns raised in representations e.g. in terms of adverse impacts, delivery etc

ISSUE: Whether the proposed site allocations are justified, effective and consistent with the Framework and the ACS.

Matter 8 Other Main Built Up Area Site Allocations

Policy 3.3	Bramcote (East of Coventry Lane)
Policy 3.4	Stapleford (West of Coventry Lane)
Policy 3.5	Severn Trent (Lilac Grove)
Policy 3.6	Beeston Maltings
Policy 3.7	Beeston Cement Depot
Policy 3.8	Wollaton Road, Beeston

- 1. Is there evidence that the development of each allocation is suitable, available, sustainable, viable and deliverable?**
- 2. What is the expected timescale and rate of development? Is this realistic?**
- 3. Having regard to the respective Main Modifications, are the Key Development Requirements appropriate and justified? How significant are the Key Development Aspirations to achieve a sustainable development? Should they be Requirements for eg measures to mitigate highways impact?**
- 4. What are the site constraints, potential impacts or infrastructure requirements of the allocation and how would these be addressed?**
- 5. How have the Opun Design Reviews informed the respective policies?**
- 6. Where a site is to be released from the Green Belt, have the exceptional circumstances for releasing the site from the Green Belt been demonstrated? Would the release of the site prejudice or conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt?**

Policy 3.3 Bramcote (East of Coventry Lane)

1. Is there evidence that the development of each allocation is suitable, available, sustainable, viable and deliverable?

- 1.1 Yes, the [Site Selection Document \(CD/26\)](#) details the site selection process that the Council has been through in order to ensure that the most suitable sites have been chosen for allocation.
- 1.2 The site is available for development and as detailed in the draft Statement of Common Ground the landowner is actively promoting the site for development.
- 1.3 The Sustainability Appraisal ([CD/12](#) and [CD/13](#)) indicates the sustainability credentials of the site.
- 1.4 The site is located within one of the highest value sub-markets in Broxtowe. Evidence to inform the ACS found that large sites create their own sub-market and as detailed in the [Whole Plan & Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment and Appendix \(BBC/05\)\(BBC/05A\)\(BBC/05B\)](#) new build houses will typically outperform the average existing housing stock value making them more viable.
- 1.5 The site is within the ownership of Nottinghamshire County Council who (as Education Authority) is keen to bring the site forward quickly in order to fund the delivery of a new Secondary School.

2. What is the expected timescale and rate of development? Is this realistic?

- 2.1 The expected timescale and rate of development is shown in Table 5: Housing Trajectory of the [Submission Version of the Part 2 Local Plan \(CD/04\)](#), and as outlined in the draft Statement of Common Ground, are agreed with the landowner.
- 2.2 The timescales and rate of development are realistic. They are the result of on-going discussions with the respective landowner/developer to take into account site specific circumstances and have been verified against evidence of past delivery and assumptions set out in the [17/18 SHLAA \(HO/02\)](#) whereby the assumptions themselves have been the subject of separate developer panels to ensure that they are realistic.

3. Having regard to the respective Main Modifications, are the Key Development Requirements appropriate and justified? How significant are the Key Development Aspirations to achieve a sustainable development? Should they be Requirements for eg measures to mitigate highways impact?

- 3.1 Yes, the Main Modifications to the Key Development Requirements (set out in the [Schedule of proposed Main Modifications \(BBC/02\)](#)) are appropriate and justified, and as outlined in the draft Statement of Common Ground are agreed with the landowner.

- 3.2 Main Modifications relating to the location of pedestrian and cycling routes, location of Green Infrastructure Corridors, the removal of vegetation from the sandstone cutting, the use of existing sports facilities and the requirement for a single junction to serve both allocations (3.3 and 3.4) were included in response to representations made to the Publication Version of the Part 2 Local Plan as set out in the [Part 2 Local Plan Consultation Statement \(CD/20\)](#). The Council considers that these are appropriate and justified and add clarity to expectations of the Policy rather than a fundamental change to the Policy.
- 3.3 The increase from 300 to 500 homes and increase in site size from (16.6ha to 18.9ha) to include the Hillside Gospel Hall Trust Land (which is immediately adjacent to the allocation as proposed in the Publication Version of the Part 2 Local Plan and is a Previously Developed site in the Green Belt) is in recognition of further availability of land.
- 3.4 Information received from the Nottinghamshire Biological Records Centre [email \(HO/05\)](#) and [plan \(HO/05\)](#) and [Sustainability Appraisal Appendices Part A \(CD/13\)](#) review of the Local Wildlife Site showed that the specific interest is restricted to the south west of the site, the additional requirements to ensure that the loss of any of the Local Wildlife Site is mitigated / compensated at equivalent quality within close proximity to its current location is achievable on publically owned land to the south of the proposed residential allocation. This will not compromise the delivery of housing, will not conflict with the specific wildlife interest and will increase the overall availability of developable land.
- 3.5 The Council consider that the exceptional circumstances needed to justify Green Belt amendment are not present where no development is proposed and therefore the area of land included in the Publication Version of the Part 2 Local Plan as Local Green Space has been retained in the Green Belt in the [Submission Version of the Part 2 Local Plan \(CD/04\)](#).
- 3.6 In relation to the Highways Key Development Aspiration these are in addition to the Key Development Requirements which are specified in the Policy (including single junction for both sites (Policy 3.3 and 3.4)). Policy 2 of the Part 2 Local Plan already makes reference to the additional suite of Development Management policies that would need to be addressed for all developments including access / transport issues. The detail of the specific highways measures will be determined through the usual Development Management route.
- 3.7 In relation to the Leisure Centre this is an ambition which is dependent on a number of issues which are unresolved. One issue is the conclusion of the Council's Leisure Strategy and the funding of a Leisure Centre is not resolved at this stage.

4. What are the site constraints, potential impacts or infrastructure requirements of the allocation and how would these be addressed?

- 4.1 These matters are recorded in the Submission Version Part 2 Local Plan [Sustainability Appraisal Appendices A \(CD/13\)](#), which has been updated with additional information on the Local Wildlife Site, and the [IDP \(CD/18\)](#). Evidence in these documents is that the potential impacts will be mitigated.
- 4.2 The main constraint on the site is the Local Wildlife Site (Bramcote Moor Grassland). However, the Nottinghamshire Biological Records Centre has subsequently confirmed in an email [email \(HO/05\)](#) that “the qualifying interest is rather restricted to an area in the South West corner close to Coventry Lane” as shown on this [plan \(HO/05\)](#). The Council consider that the area of interest can be incorporated into the design of the development (at detailed planning application stage) and where loss does occur that it can be mitigated / compensated to equivalent quality elsewhere (as per the updated Key Development Requirement and detailed in the response to question 3) without hindering the delivery of housing on the site.
- 4.3 The key infrastructure requirements of the allocation are detailed in the Policy and amount to a single junction for both sites (Policy 3.3 and 3.4) and a replacement school. Other requirements will be addressed through the Development Management process.

5. How have the Opun Design Reviews informed the respective policies?

- 5.1 The [Bramcote/Stapleford Opun Design Review \(OPUN/07\)](#) was part of an iterative process of refinement to develop the key design principles for the site. The principles raised in the review were used as a framework for the subsequent site specific workshop (details of which are included in the [Part 2 Local Plan Consultation Statement \(CD/20\)](#) with a larger group of stakeholders the results of which formed the basis on which the Part 2 Local Plan Policy was drafted.

6. Where a site is to be released from the Green Belt, have the exceptional circumstances for releasing the site from the Green Belt been demonstrated? Would the release of the site prejudice or conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt?

- 6.1 Yes, the principle of removing land from the Green Belt in order to meet the Borough’s housing requirement was established in the ACS. The [ACS Inspectors Report \(PD/02\)](#) confirmed at para 111 “I agree with the Councils that the exceptional circumstances required for alterations to Green Belt boundaries exist.”
- 6.2 The Nottingham Derby Green Belt is a long established policy tool and drawn very tightly around the built up areas of Greater Nottingham. Non Green Belt opportunities to expand existing settlements are extremely limited and therefore exceptional circumstances require the boundaries of the Green Belt to be reviewed in order to meet the development requirements of the ACS and the Part 2 Local Plan.

- 6.3 The Council undertook a [Green Belt Review \(PD/13\)](#) to inform how this might best be done. The Green Belt Review used the methodology (see [Greater Nottingham and Ashfield Green Belt Assessment Framework \(GB/04\)](#)) agreed with neighbouring authorities to review the Green Belt. The review has taken account of the 5 purposes of Green Belt as set out in Part 9 of the 2012 NPPF. The assessments have allowed a view to be taken on whether there are specific areas of land that should be considered for release from the Green Belt through the Part 2 Local Plan. The release of this site for housing development is in accordance with this evidence.
- 6.4 The Sustainability Appraisal ([CD/12](#) and [CD/13](#)) was also used as a tool to ensure that the most sustainable site was allocated for development after all reasonable alternatives were considered.

Policy 3.4 Stapleford (West of Coventry Lane)

1. Is there evidence that the development of each allocation is suitable, available, sustainable, viable and deliverable?

- 7.1 Yes, the [Site Selection Document \(CD/26\)](#) details the site selection process that the Council has been through in order to ensure that the most suitable sites have been chosen for allocation.
- 7.2 The site is available for development and as detailed in the draft Statement of Common Ground all of the landowners are actively promoting the site for development.
- 7.3 The Sustainability Appraisal ([CD/12](#) and [CD/13](#)) indicates the sustainability credentials of the site.
- 7.4 The site is located adjacent to one of the highest value sub-markets in Broxtowe. Evidence to inform the ACS found that large sites create their own sub-market and as detailed in the [Whole Plan & Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment and Appendix \(BBC/05\)\(BBC/05A\)\(BBC/05B\)](#) new build houses will typically outperform the average existing housing stock value making them more viable.

2. What is the expected timescale and rate of development? Is this realistic?

- 8.1 The expected timescale and rate of development is shown in Table 5: Housing Trajectory of the [Submission Version of the Part 2 Local Plan \(CD/04\)](#), and as outlined in the draft Statement of Common Ground are agreed with the landowner.
- 8.2 The timescales and rate of development are realistic. They are the result of on-going discussions with the respective landowner/developer to take into account site specific circumstances and have been verified against evidence of past delivery and assumptions set out in the [17/18 SHLAA \(HO/02\)](#) whereby the assumptions themselves have been the subject of separate developer panels to ensure that they are realistic.

3. Having regard to the respective Main Modifications, are the Key Development Requirements appropriate and justified? How significant are the Key Development Aspirations to achieve a sustainable development? Should they be Requirements for eg measures to mitigate highways impact?

- 9.1 Yes, the Main Modifications to the Key Development Requirements (set out in the [Schedule of proposed Main Modifications \(BBC/02\)](#)) are appropriate and justified, and as outlined in the draft Statement of Common Ground are agreed with the landowner.
- 9.2 Main Modifications relating to the location of pedestrian and cycling routes, location of Green Infrastructure Corridors and the requirement for a single junction to serve

both allocations (3.4 and 3.3) were included in response to representations made to the Publication Version of the Plan as set out in the [Part 2 Local Plan Consultation Statement \(CD/20\)](#). The Council considers that these are appropriate and justified and add clarity to expectations of the Policy rather than a fundamental change to the Policy.

- 9.3 In relation to the Highways Key Development Aspiration these are in addition to the Key Development Requirements which are specified in the Policy. Policy 2 of the Part 2 Local Plan already makes reference to the additional suite of Development Management policies that would need to be addressed for all developments including access / transport issues. The detail of the specific highways measures will be determined through the usual Development Management route.

4. What are the site constraints, potential impacts or infrastructure requirements of the allocation and how would these be addressed?

- 10.1 These matters are recorded in the Submission Version Part 2 Local Plan [Sustainability Appraisal Appendices A \(CD/13\)](#) and the [IDP \(CD/18\)](#). Evidence in these documents is that the potential impacts will be mitigated.
- 10.2 The key infrastructure requirements of the allocation are detailed in the Policy and amount to a single junction for both sites (Policy 3.3 and 3.4). Other requirements will be addressed through the Development Management process.

5. How have the Opun Design Reviews informed the respective policies?

- 11.1 The [Bramcote/Stapleford Opun Design Review \(OPUN/07\)](#) was part of an iterative process of refinement to develop the key design principles for the site. The principles raised in the review were used as a framework for the subsequent site specific workshop (details of which are included in the [Part 2 Local Plan Consultation Statement \(CD/20\)](#) with a larger group of stakeholders the results of which formed the basis on which the Policy was drafted.

6. Where a site is to be released from the Green Belt, have the exceptional circumstances for releasing the site from the Green Belt been demonstrated? Would the release of the site prejudice or conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt?

- 12.1 Yes, the principle of removing land from the Green Belt in order to meet the Borough's housing requirement was established in the ACS. The [ACS Inspectors Report \(PD/02\)](#) confirmed at para 111 "I agree with the Councils that the exceptional circumstances required for alterations to Green Belt boundaries exist."
- 12.2 The Nottingham Derby Green Belt is a long established policy tool and drawn very tightly around the built up areas of Greater Nottingham. Non Green Belt opportunities to expand existing settlements are extremely limited and therefore exceptional

circumstances require the boundaries of the Green Belt to be reviewed in order to meet the development requirements of the ACS and the Part 2 Local Plan.

- 12.3 The Council undertook a [Green Belt Review \(PD/13\)](#) to inform how this might best be done. The Green Belt Review used the methodology (see [Greater Nottingham and Ashfield Green Belt Assessment Framework \(GB/04\)](#)) agreed with neighbouring authorities to review the Green Belt. The review has taken account of the 5 purposes of Green Belt as set out in Part 9 of the 2012 NPPF. The assessments have allowed a view to be taken on whether there are specific areas of land that should be considered for release from the Green Belt through the Part 2 Local Plan. The release of this site for housing development is in accordance with this evidence.
- 12.4 The Sustainability Appraisal ([CD/12](#) and [CD/13](#)) was also used as a tool to ensure that the most sustainable site was allocated for development after all reasonable alternatives were considered.

Policy 3.5 Severn Trent (Lilac Grove)

1. Is there evidence that the development of each allocation is suitable, available, sustainable, viable and deliverable?

- 13.1 Yes, the [Site Selection Document \(CD/26\)](#) details the site selection process that the Council has been through in order to ensure that the most suitable sites have been chosen for allocation.
- 13.2 The site is available for development and as detailed in the Statement of Common Ground the landowner is actively promoting the site for development.
- 13.3 The Sustainability Appraisal ([CD/12](#) and [CD/13](#)) indicates the sustainability credentials of the site.
- 13.4 The site is located within the Beeston housing sub-market and residential re-development is viable in this location. Evidence to inform the ACS found that large sites create their own sub-market and as detailed in the [Whole Plan & Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment and Appendix \(BBC/05\)\(BBC/05A\)\(BBC/05B\)](#) new build houses will typically outperform the average existing housing stock value making them more viable.

2. What is the expected timescale and rate of development? Is this realistic?

- 14.1 The expected timescale and rate of development is shown in Table 5: Housing Trajectory of the [Submission Version of the Part 2 Local Plan \(CD/04\)](#) and as outlined in the Statement of Common Ground are agreed with the landowner.
- 14.2 The timescales and rate of development are realistic. They are the result of on-going discussions with the respective landowner/developer to take into account site specific circumstances and have been verified against evidence of past delivery and assumptions set out in the [17/18 SHLAA \(HO/02\)](#) whereby the assumptions themselves have been the subject of separate developer panels to ensure that they are realistic.

3. Having regard to the respective Main Modifications, are the Key Development Requirements appropriate and justified? How significant are the Key Development Aspirations to achieve a sustainable development? Should they be Requirements for eg measures to mitigate highways impact?

- 15.1 Yes, the Main Modifications to the Key Development Requirements set out in the [Schedule of proposed Main Modifications \(BBC/02\)](#) are appropriate and justified, and as outlined in the Statement of Common Ground are agreed with the landowner.
- 15.2 Main Modifications relating to the inclusion of cycling provision on the bridge link to the canal and the addition of clarification regarding the location of vehicular access routes were included as Main Modifications in response to representations made to

the Publication Version of the Plan as set out in the [Part 2 Local Plan Consultation Statement \(CD/20\)](#). The Council considers that these are appropriate and justified and add clarity to expectations of the Policy rather than a fundamental change to the Policy.

15.3 The Policy as amended at submission has reduced the housing figure from 150 to 100 (and the site size from 13.1 hectares to 6 hectares) in response to dialogue with the landowner. Additional requirements to ensure that the management of the Green Infrastructure is secured in perpetuity, to mitigate any negative impacts on the adjacent sports pitches, locate development to ensure appropriate stand-off distances from neighbouring uses to avoid potential future land use conflict and to retain hedgerows have all been included in the submission version of the Plan in response to representations made to the Publication Version of the Part 2 Local Plan as set out in the consultation statement, these requirements will not compromise the delivery of housing and are not in dispute with the landowner.

15.4 A further Main Modification has been proposed by the Council as a result of further discussion with the landowner detailed in the Statement of Common Ground.

15.5 **Proposed modification to Policy 3.5** (shown in blue below) (will also be included within an updated schedule of Main Modifications and Additional Modifications):

“Provide pedestrian and cycling bridge to link to the canal side towpath, [unless it can be demonstrated that it is not required](#)”.

It is noted that there are canal bridges in the vicinity of the site which may be adequate subject to details connectivity as part of a planning application.

15.6 In relation to the Highways Key Development Aspiration these are in addition to the Key Development Requirements which are specified in the Policy. Policy 2 of the Part 2 Local Plan already makes reference to the additional suite of Development Management policies that would need to be addressed for all developments including access / transport issues. The detail of the specific highways measures will be determined through usual Development Management route.

4. What are the site constraints, potential impacts or infrastructure requirements of the allocation and how would these be addressed?

16.1 These matters are recorded in the Submission Version Part 2 Local Plan [Sustainability Appraisal Appendices A \(CD/13\)](#) and the [IDP \(CD/18\)](#). Evidence in these documents is that the potential impacts will be mitigated.

16.2 The key infrastructure requirements of the allocation are detailed in the Policy. Other requirements will be addressed through the Development Management process.

5. How have the Open Design Reviews informed the respective policies?

17.1 This site was not the subject of an Open Design Review.

Policy 3.6 Beeston Maltings

1. Is there evidence that the development of each allocation is suitable, available, sustainable, viable and deliverable?

- 18.1 Yes, the [Site Selection Document \(CD/26\)](#) details the site selection process that the Council has been through in order to ensure that the most suitable sites have been chosen for allocation.
- 18.2 The site is available for development; the landowner has been engaged in recent pre-applications discussions and is actively promoting the site for development.
- 18.3 The Sustainability Appraisal ([CD/12](#) and [CD/13](#)) indicates the sustainability credentials of the site.
- 18.4 The site is located within the Beeston housing sub-market and residential re-development is viable in this location.

2. What is the expected timescale and rate of development? Is this realistic?

- 19.1 The expected timescale and rate of development is shown in Table 5: Housing Trajectory of the [Submission Version of the Part 2 Local Plan \(CD/04\)](#).
- 19.2 The timescales and rate of development are realistic. They are the result of on-going discussions with the respective landowner/developer to take into account site specific circumstances and have been verified against evidence of past delivery and assumptions set out in the [17/18 SHLAA \(HO/02\)](#) whereby the assumptions themselves have been the subject of separate developer panels to ensure that they are realistic.

3. Having regard to the respective Main Modifications, are the Key Development Requirements appropriate and justified? How significant are the Key Development Aspirations to achieve a sustainable development? Should they be Requirements for eg measures to mitigate highways impact?

- 20.1 Yes, the Main Modifications to the Key Development Requirements set out in the [Schedule of proposed Main Modifications \(BBC/02\)](#) are appropriate and justified.
- 20.2 Main Modifications relating to the direction of walking and cycling were included as Main Modifications in response to representations made to the Publication Version of the Plan as set out in the [Part 2 Local Plan Consultation Statement \(CD/20\)](#). The Council considers that these are appropriate and justified and add clarity to expectations of the Policy rather than a fundamental change to the Policy.
- 20.3 The Policy as amended at submission has additional requirements to remove the reference to the noise buffer for the adjacent garage and to include the garage into the allocation incorporating landscaping to act as a buffer to the railway which now

forms the southern boundary of the allocation; these requirements will not compromise the delivery of housing.

20.4 In relation to the Highways Key Development Aspiration these are in addition to the Key Development Requirements which are specified in the Policy. Policy 2 of the Part 2 Local Plan already makes reference to the additional suite of Development Management policies that would need to be addressed for all developments including access / transport issues. The detail of the specific highways measures will be determined through the usual Development Management route.

4. What are the site constraints, potential impacts or infrastructure requirements of the allocation and how would these be addressed?

21.1 These matters are recorded in the Submission Version Part 2 Local Plan [Sustainability Appraisal Appendices A \(CD/13\)](#) and the [IDP \(CD/18\)](#). Evidence in these documents is that the potential impacts will be mitigated.

21.2 The key infrastructure requirements of the allocation are detailed in the Policy.

21.3 The site has been predominantly cleared, there will be some further investigations needed as a result of the former use as a car repair garage at the southern portion of the site. Noise constraints as a result of the proximity to the Railway line will also need to be addressed. This will be addressed through the Development Management process and will not amount to a significant impediment to development.

5. How have the Opun Design Reviews informed the respective policies?

22.1 This site was not the subject of an Opun Design Review.

Policy 3.7 Beeston Cement Depot

1. Is there evidence that the development of each allocation is suitable, available, sustainable, viable and deliverable?

- 23.1 Yes, the [Site Selection Document \(CD/26\)](#) details the site selection process that the Council has been through in order to ensure that the most suitable sites have been chosen for allocation.
- 23.2 The site is available for development; the landowner has been engaged in recent pre-applications discussions and is actively promoting the site for development.
- 23.3 The Sustainability Appraisal ([CD/12](#) and [CD/13](#)) indicates the sustainability credentials of the site.
- 23.4 The site is located within the Beeston housing sub-market and residential re-development is viable in this location.

2. What is the expected timescale and rate of development? Is this realistic?

- 24.1 The expected timescale and rate of development is shown in Table 5: Housing Trajectory of the [Submission Version of the Part 2 Local Plan \(CD/04\)](#).
- 24.2 The timescales and rate of development are realistic. They are the result of on-going discussions with the respective landowner/developer to take into account site specific circumstances and have been verified against evidence of past delivery and assumptions set out in the [17/18 SHLAA \(HO/02\)](#) whereby the assumptions themselves have been the subject of separate developer panels to ensure that they are realistic.

3. Having regard to the respective Main Modifications, are the Key Development Requirements appropriate and justified? How significant are the Key Development Aspirations to achieve a sustainable development? Should they be Requirements for eg measures to mitigate highways impact?

- 25.1 Yes, the Main Modifications to the Key Development Requirements set out in the [Schedule of proposed Main Modifications \(BBC/02\)](#) are appropriate and justified.
- 25.2 Main Modifications relating to the location of walking and cycling were included as Main Modifications in response to representations made to the Publication Version of the Plan as set out in the [Part 2 Local Plan Consultation Statement \(CD/20\)](#). The Council considers that these are appropriate and justified and add clarity to expectations of the Policy rather than a fundamental change to the Policy.
- 25.3 The Policy as amended at submission has additional requirements to increase the housing figure from 21 to 40 in response to comments received by the landowner

and the requirement to incorporate landscaping to act as a buffer to the railway; these requirements will not compromise the delivery of housing.

25.4 In relation to the Highways Key Development Aspiration these are in addition to the Key Development Requirements which are specified in the Policy. Policy 2 of the Part 2 Local Plan already makes reference to the additional suite of Development Management policies that would need to be addressed for all developments including access / transport issues. The detail of the specific highways measures will be determined through the usual Development Management route.

4. What are the site constraints, potential impacts or infrastructure requirements of the allocation and how would these be addressed?

26.1 These matters are recorded in the Submission Version Part 2 Local Plan [Sustainability Appraisal Appendices A \(CD/13\)](#) and the [IDP \(CD/18\)](#). Evidence in these documents is that the potential impacts will be mitigated.

26.2 The key infrastructure requirements of the allocation are detailed in the Policy.

26.3 The site has been predominantly cleared, there will be some further investigations needed as a result of the former use as a cement depot. Noise constraints as a result of the proximity to the Railway line will also need to be addressed; there are numerous developments that have successfully been constructed in close proximity to the railway. This will be addressed through the Development Management process and will not amount to a significant impediment to development.

5. How have the Opun Design Reviews informed the respective policies?

27.1 This site was not the subject of an Opun Design Review.

Policy 3.8 Wollaton Road, Beeston

1. Is there evidence that the development of each allocation is suitable, available, sustainable, viable and deliverable?

- 28.1 Yes, the [Site Selection Document \(CD/26\)](#) details the site selection process that the Council has been through in order to ensure that the most suitable sites have been chosen for allocation.
- 28.2 The site is available for development; the landowner has been engaged in recent pre-application discussions and is promoting the site for development.
- 28.3 The Sustainability Appraisal ([CD/12](#) and [CD/13](#)) indicates the sustainability credentials of the site.
- 28.4 The site is located within the Beeston housing sub-market and residential re-development is viable in this location.

2. What is the expected timescale and rate of development? Is this realistic?

- 29.1 The expected timescale and rate of development is shown in Table 5: Housing Trajectory of the [Submission Version of the Part 2 Local Plan \(CD/04\)](#).
- 29.2 The timescales and rate of development are realistic. They are the result of on-going discussions with the respective landowner/developer to take into account site specific circumstances and have been verified against evidence of past delivery and assumptions set out in the [17/18 SHLAA \(HO/02\)](#) whereby the assumptions themselves have been the subject of separate developer panels to ensure that they are realistic.

3. Having regard to the respective Main Modifications, are the Key Development Requirements appropriate and justified? How significant are the Key Development Aspirations to achieve a sustainable development? Should they be Requirements for eg measures to mitigate highways impact?

- 30.1 Yes, the Main Modification (set out in the [Schedule of proposed Main Modifications \(BBC/02\)](#)) relating to the Listed Building was included in response to representations made to the Publication Version of the Plan as set out in the [Part 2 Local Plan Consultation Statement \(CD/20\)](#). The Council considers that this is appropriate and justified and adds clarity to expectations of the Policy rather than a fundamental change to the Policy.
- 30.2 In relation to the Highways Key Development Aspiration these are in addition to the Key Development Requirements which are specified in the Policy. Policy 2 of the Local Plan already makes reference to the additional suite of Development Management policies that would need to be addressed for all developments

including access / transport issues. The detail of the specific highways measures will be determined through the usual Development Management route.

4. What are the site constraints, potential impacts or infrastructure requirements of the allocation and how would these be addressed?

31.1 These matters are recorded in the Submission Version Part 2 Local Plan [Sustainability Appraisal Appendices A \(CD/13\)](#) and the [IDP \(CD/18\)](#). Evidence in these documents is that the potential impacts will be mitigated.

31.2 The key infrastructure requirements of the allocation are detailed in the Policy.

31.3 The main site constraint is the proximity of the site to the Anglo-Scotian Mills Listed Building however, this can be acceptably mitigated. This will be addressed through the Development Management process and will not amount to a significant impediment to development.

5. How have the Opun Design Reviews informed the respective policies?

32.1 This site was not the subject of an Opun Design Review.

Broxtowe Borough Council
Neighbourhoods and Prosperity
Council Offices, Foster Avenue,
Beeston, Nottingham, NG9 1AB
Tel: 0115 917 7777
www.broxtowe.gov.uk

