



Broxtowe  
Borough  
COUNCIL

# **Broxtowe Borough Council**

## **Response to Matter 9:**

## **Other Site Allocations**

**November 2018**

## **BROXTOWE LOCAL PLAN PART 2 EXAMINATION**

### **MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS**

#### **Other 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 9 Other Site Allocations**

Policy 4.1	Land west of Awsworth
Policy 5.1	Land East of Church Lane, Brinsley
Policy 6.1	Walker Street, Eastwood
Policy 7.1	Land South of Kimberley, including Kimberley Depot
Policy 7.2	Land South of Eastwood Road, Kimberley
Policy 7.3	Eastwood Road Builders Yard, Kimberley

- 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 4.1 Land west of Awsworth**

### **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 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 the Kimberley housing sub-market however, evidence to inform the ACS found that large sites create their own sub-market and are therefore less influenced by the submarket in which they are located. In addition as detailed in [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?**

- 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 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 Statement of Common Ground are agreed with the landowner.

- 3.2. Main Modifications relating to the location and direction of pedestrian and cycling routes, specifying the Great North Path as a Green Infrastructure Corridor 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.
- 3.3. The Policy as amended at submission has additional requirements to retain hedgerows, protect and mitigate negative impact on Common Toads and ensure that the development maintains or enhances the setting of heritage assets including the Grade II\* Listed Bennerley Viaduct and where possible contributes towards its conservation or enhancement, these requirements will not compromise the delivery of housing and are not in dispute with the Landowner.
- 3.4. 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 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?**

- 4.1. 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.
- 4.2. 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 Opun Design Reviews informed the respective policies?**

- 5.1. The [Awsorth Opun Design Review \(OPUN/01\)](#) 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 P2LP.
- 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. The proposed allocation is one of the only realistically available sites on the edge of Brinsley that will not lead to the merging of settlements.
- 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 5.1 Land East of Church Lane, Brinsley**

### **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 Statement of Common Ground the landowner is actively promoting the site for development. There are no access or ownership issues that would amount to any impediment to development.
- 7.3 The Sustainability Appraisal ([CD/12](#) and [CD/13](#)) indicates the sustainability credentials of the site.
- 7.4 The site is located within the Eastwood housing sub-market but as a Greenfield site development is viable as detailed in the [Whole Plan & Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment and Appendix \(BBC/05\)\(BBC/05A\)\(BBC/05B\)](#).

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

- 8.1 The expected timescale and rate of development at the point of submission is shown in Table 5: Housing Trajectory of the [Submission Version of the Part 2 Local Plan \(CD/04\)](#). This is broadly consistent with the development rate in the Statement of Common Ground.
- 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 e.g. 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.

- 9.2 The Main Modification relating to the conservation rather than preservation of the Listed Church (St James the Great) was 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 this is appropriate and justified and adds clarity to expectations of the Policy rather than a fundamental change to the Policy.
- 9.3 The Policy as amended at submission has additional requirements to provide traffic calming measures to reinforce the existing 30mph speed limit on the A608, provide additional planting in an area already agreed for SuDs and to make this area a publically accessible amenity space and to retain hedgerows, these requirements will not compromise the delivery of housing.
- 9.4 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 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 It is within close proximity to a Local Wildlife Site, Grade II\* Listed Church and Brinsley Headstocks and these have been fully considered as part of the site allocation process (see [Part 2 Local Plan Consultation Statement \(CD/20\)](#)). 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 Opun Design Reviews informed the respective policies?**

- 11.1 The [Brinsley Opun Design Review \(OPUN/02\)](#) 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.
- 11.2 The Modifications to the plan provide additional protection to the open area to the south of the allocation between the Grade II\* Listed St James the Great

Church and Brinsley Headstocks with opportunities for further public links between the two.

**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 P2LP.
- 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 [CD13](#)) was also used as a tool to ensure that the most sustainable site was allocated for development after all reasonable alternatives were considered.



## **Policy 6.1 Walker Street, Eastwood**

### **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 Eastwood housing sub-market but as a Greenfield site development is viable. In addition, evidence to inform the ACS found that large sites create their own sub-market and are therefore less influenced by the submarket in which they are located. In addition 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.
- 13.5 Nottinghamshire County Council (the land owner) has also been successful in a £1 million Land Release Fund bid to prepare the site for development and £20,000 from Homes England to accelerate delivery on the site which has been spent on a comprehensive access strategy.

### **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 is 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 The Main Modifications relating to the location of Green Infrastructure Corridors 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.
- 15.3 The Policy as amended at submission has removed the explicit reference to extra care units and has included additional requirements to provide walking and cycling links through the site and ensure development does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. The policy now also includes explicit reference to the provision of SuDS and adds a requirement to provide a 1-acre site for a new community hub including a health facility, this will not compromise the delivery of housing and has been agreed with the landowner (Nottinghamshire County Council).
- 15.4 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?**

- 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 site is on stepped level with each level being relatively flat and therefore it is not an impediment to development particularly with the aspiration for separate access points.
- 16.3 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 Opun Design Reviews informed the respective policies?**

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

## **Policy 7.1 Land South of Kimberley, including Kimberley Depot**

### **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 not currently available for development. This is reflected in the trajectory which anticipates the site to be available towards the end of this Local Plan period. This is a realistic timetable to get alternative Depot provision, resolve the various site constraints and secure a start to residential development. As the largest landowner the Borough Council is in direct control of this process.
- 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 Kimberley housing sub-market. As a Brownfield site with remediation costs there are factors to be addressed which are well understood and lead to the anticipated delivery of the site later in the Local Plan period. Evidence to inform the ACS found that large sites create their own sub-market and are therefore less influenced by the submarket in which they are located. In addition 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?**

- 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 The Main Modifications relating to the location of Green Infrastructure Corridors 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 the policy expectations as proposed in the Publication Version.
- 20.3 The Policy as amended at submission has increased the housing numbers from 105 to 118 dwellings in response to the inclusion of the Kimberley Caravan site into the allocation. The Main Modifications also include explicit reference to provision of a new section of the Great Northern Path and enhancements to existing routes, enhancements to Green Infrastructure and the requirement to find alternative premises for the existing users, these modifications 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 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 most significant issue is Depot relocation and remediation required as a result of this use. These are factored in to the delivery timetable towards the end of the Plan Period.
- 21.3 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 Opun Design Reviews informed the respective policies?

- 22.1 The [Kimberley Opun Design Review \(OPUN/04\)](#) 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?

- 23.1 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."
- 23.2 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 P2LP.
- 23.3 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.
- 23.4 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 7.2 Land South of Eastwood Road, Kimberley**

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

- 24.1 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.
- 24.2 The site is available for development and the landowner is promoting the site for development.
- 24.3 The Sustainability Appraisal ([CD/12](#) and [CD/13](#)) indicates the sustainability credentials of the site.
- 24.4 The site is located within the Kimberley housing sub-market as a Greenfield site and the allocation has been amended from the 2004 Local Plan to specifically identify land to the rear of 29-47 Eastwood Road as open space as part of an overall housing scheme in conjunction with the neighbouring development site at Kimberley Depot.

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

- 25.1 The expected timescale and rate of development is shown in Table 5: Housing Trajectory of the [Submission Version of the Part 2 Local Plan \(CD/04\)](#).
- 25.2 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?**

- 26.1 Yes, the Main Modifications to the Key Development Requirements (set out in the [Schedule of proposed Main Modifications \(BBC/02\)](#)) are appropriate and justified.
- 26.2 The Main Modifications relating to additional requirements for the provision of specific Green Infrastructure Corridors and the provision of a new section of the Great Northern Path and enhancements to existing routes 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 will not compromise the delivery of housing.

- 26.3 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 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?**

- 27.1 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.
- 27.2 There are local amenity issues regarding the potential development immediately behind 29-47 Eastwood Road and the clarification in the policy that this is to be undeveloped will assist in overall site delivery.
- 27.3 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 Opun Design Reviews informed the respective policies?**

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



### **Policy 7.3 Eastwood Road Builders Yard, Kimberley**

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

- 29.1 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.
- 29.2 The site is available for development and the landowner is promoting the site for development.
- 29.3 The Sustainability Appraisal ([CD/12](#) and [CD/13](#)) indicates the sustainability credentials of the site.
- 29.4 The site is located within the Kimberley housing sub-market. As a Brownfield site with remediation costs there are factors to be addressed which are well understood and lead to the anticipated delivery of the site later in the Local Plan period.

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

- 30.1 The expected timescale and rate of development is shown in Table 5: Housing Trajectory of the [Submission Version of the Part 2 Local Plan \(CD/04\)](#).
- 30.2 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?**

- 31.1 No Main Modifications were proposed.
- 31.2 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?**

- 32.1 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.
- 32.2 The most significant issue is remediation required as a result of the use as a Builders yard. This is factored in to the delivery timetable towards the end of the Plan Period.
- 32.3 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 Opun Design Reviews informed the respective policies?**

- 33.1 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](http://www.broxtowe.gov.uk)



Broxtowe  
Borough  
COUNCIL