

BROXTOWE LOCAL PLAN**EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC****Response to Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions
Made on Behalf of Tej Properties****MATTER 7 – Toton Strategic Location for Growth****Preamble**

- 7.1 This Hearing Statement is made on behalf of Tej Properties ('our Client'), in advance of making verbal representations to the Examination in Public into the Broxtowe Local Plan.
- 7.2 Our Client has a land interest in the land at Toton Sidings and residual land. Our Client's site has been included as part of a mixed-use site under Policy 3.2.
- 7.3 Our response to the relevant questions in relation to Matter 7 are found below. We have had specific regard to the tests of soundness outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework'); namely that for the policies of the Local Plan to be sound, they need to be justified, effective, positively planned and consistent with national policy.
- 7.4 Our responses to each of the questions below relate to our Client's Site which is allocated under Policy 3.2 Toton Strategic Location for Growth.

1. What evidence is there that the site will be available, sustainable, viable and deliverable within the plan period?

- 7.5 The land at Toton has been considered through the Sustainability Appraisal and has been consulted upon and is accepted by the Council as an area of land that will be removed from the Green Belt and allocated as a mixed-use site.

Suitable

- 7.6 The Site is suitable for development. The Green Belt review demonstrates that it makes a minimal contribution to the surrounding Green Belt. Our Client's Site is situated within Zone 42 of the Green Belt Review which achieves a score of 9. This is the second lowest scoring Zone within the main built up area, i.e. second least important in Green Belt terms.
- 7.7 The Site offers a suitable location for development being located in close proximity to existing services and it is a major developed site in the Green Belt. Technical reports

supporting the Site's promotion demonstrate that there are no known constraints to development and it would not present any adverse environmental conditions.

Available

- 7.8 There are no legal or ownership problems associated with our Client's Site. The landowners have sole control and are committed to developing this part of the Site.

Sustainable

- 7.9 Within the Sustainability Appraisal, the Site is identified as being highly sustainable and has major positive economic innovation and transport effects.

Deliverable

- 7.10 Promotion of the Site has been accompanied by technical reports and a promotional document which demonstrate that the Site is deliverable.

2. Having regard to MM3, are the Key Development Requirements appropriate and justified?

- 7.11 Our Client wholly supports the mixed-use allocation for the Site and wider area. In particular, our Client supports the identification of requirements beyond the Plan Period to ensure that the site is treated as a whole and to ensure that future development opportunities are not compromised.
- 7.12 Our Client's Site is situated adjacent to the proposed station. We support the inclusion of the additional wording to Policy 3.2 which states that *"development should be located and designed to complement and not prejudice proposals for access to the HS2 Hub Station and Innovation Village...."*. Our Client however considers that the reference to this development *"beyond the plan period"* should be removed.
- 7.13 Throughout the stages of the Local Plan preparation, our Client has supported the release of the land at Toton for development with or without the HS2 station. The land comprises previously developed land, has significant technical work demonstrating the suitability of the site and has successfully opposed a Town and Village Green application.
- 7.14 With or without the HS2 station the Site is suitable and deliverable to be released from the Green Belt for development to take place.

3. Should the scale of development at Toton be outlined in the Policy? How would the comprehensive development of the site, appropriate phasing and design principles be ensured? Is it sufficiently clear in the Policy how this would be achieved? What mechanisms are in place or proposed to achieve this? What work has been completed to date? How would all stakeholders be involved?

7.15 As previously stated, our Client wholly supports the proposed allocation for mixed-use development on this site and the wider area.

7.16 The scale of development at Toton should be outlined within the Policy however with additional flexibility. For instance, the ACS stipulates that the allocation should include a minimum of 500 homes however Policy 3.2 simply states that 500 homes is a key development requirement.

7.17 The requirement within the Policy for development to be located and designed to complement and not prejudice proposals for access to the HS2 Hub Station and Innovation Village is appropriate to ensure comprehensive development of the site. The whole area is required for development and provides a one-off opportunity for development and so it is important that development within early phases does not prejudice the ability to deliver on this important regional site.

4. In the event of uncertainty or delay with the HS2 Project what would be the implications for bringing this site forward, in particular with regard to the delivery of housing in the plan period?

7.18 As stated above, throughout the stages of the Local Plan preparation, our Client has supported the release of the land at Toton for development with or without the HS2 station. Our Client's site comprises previously developed land, has significant technical work demonstrating the suitability of the site and has successfully opposed a Town and Village Green application.

7.19 With or without the HS2 station the Site is suitable and deliverable to be released from the Green Belt for development to take place.

5. What progress has been made in securing and delivering the Infrastructure requirements for the site summarised in Appendix A of the ACS? Are there any unresolved issues? How would these be addressed? What would be the impact of any delay in the delivery of this necessary infrastructure? Are there any cross-boundary issues and how would these be resolved?

7.20 We reserve our right to comment on this matter verbally.

6. In light of the above, is the delivery of dwellings on the site from 2019/2020 as shown on the Housing Trajectory realistic?

7.21 We reserve our right to comment on this matter verbally. Our Client is committed to working with the other developers to ensure that the site is delivered.