

## **AWSWORTH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – REG 16 SUBMISSION DRAFT CONSULTATION - OCTOBER 2019**

### **Comments by Awsworth Parish Council / Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group**

The following comments are made in response to the formal consultation responses received by Broxtowe Borough Council to the Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan Submission Draft Plan. It is understood that Broxtowe Borough Council have been invited to add any further comments. We acknowledge that the Examiner will wish to consider all comments as part of his independent examination of the submitted plan.

**Our comments are made with reference to the Schedule of Regulation 16 Representations** listing: Statutory Consultees / Duty to Co-operate Partners (1-12); Awsworth Parish Council / Steering Group / Councillors (13-17); Local Community Organisations (18-20); Landowners / Agents / Businesses (21-25); Residents (Awsworth / Cossall / Other) (24-26).

#### **1. COSSALL PARISH COUNCIL – Opposed to any boundary changes – Appendix 1 – Parish Projects**

**AIM APB 1 – Awsworth Parish Boundaries** - As explained in the plan this concerns a Parish Council ‘aim’ and not a Neighbourhood Plan ‘proposal’ to which the respondent objects. In this respect our plan does not seek to impose any policy on Cossall Parish, nor can it, as our plan relates only to Awsworth Parish.

In relation to parish boundaries we consider there to be both historical and practical anomalies. We believe our Community Questionnaire demonstrates support (by residents in Awsworth Parish) for reviewing local boundaries. We believe a strong case exists for examining boundary arrangements at the local parish level in relation to Awsworth. The plan makes clear that we would want to work constructively with our neighbouring authorities (Cossall, Greasley and Kimberley). In other words, this issue is not solely in relation to Cossall.

However, we also fully recognise that the matter of considering and making administrative boundary changes is governed by formal procedures. Our plan reflects this important fact and that a wider review, which had been expected to commence in 2021, would provide the appropriate opportunity to consider this matter, including any views or concerns expressed by our neighbours before any formal decisions are taken.

We are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view.

#### **2. DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL – Comments**

In relation to ‘**Awsworth Today**’ and paragraph 2.50 –

We **note and agree with the comments regarding the Nottingham – Derby Green Belt**, especially the main purpose of preventing coalescence of Awsworth with surrounding settlements including Ilkeston to the west. Also, the fact that the Green Belt in this location is narrow means it is important that any significant scale of development within Awsworth Parish does not impact on the openness of the Green Belt and thereby impact on the separation of the two settlements.

We would also note that by implication the same considerations and concerns apply when looking at **possible future uses for the derelict land at the former Bennerley Coal Disposal Point (Bennerley Land)**, given its location in this same highly sensitive part of the Green Belt between Awsworth and Ilkeston (ANP Policy DCDP1 refers).

In relation to ‘**6.0 Housing**’ –

ANP Policy H1 sets out a policy approach to support the development of land west of Awsworth for 200 dwellings. We note the confirmation of DCC's view that although a large scale of development for Awsworth Parish, the site is well-contained by the Awsworth – Cossall Bypass and so the development is unlikely to have any significant impact on the openness of the Green Belt between the two settlements of Awsworth and Ilkeston or impact adversely on their coalescence.

In relation to **'New Homes' (on 'land west of Awsworth')** –

We note and welcome DCC's suggested additional requirements for (a) Provision of electric charging points and (b) Broadband, for the reasons stated. This is subject of course to Broxtowe BC's views and ultimately those of the Examiner.

In relation to **12.0 'Bennerley Viaduct & Nottingham Canal'** –

We welcome DCC's generally supportive comments for our commitment to restore and enhance features of historic industrial and transport interest in the area, notably the Bennerley Viaduct and the old Nottingham Canal. We especially welcome their support for the idea that fragments of the otherwise derelict canals should be preserved and their value as wildlife habitat and quiet recreation space enhanced, which, in turn, supports an uplift of the area, even some distance from the site. We note that this uplift would extend into neighbouring Erewash Borough in Derbyshire.

We are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view.

### **3. EREWASH BOROUGH COUNCIL – No Comments**

In relation to **Erewash BC having no comments** to make –

We would draw attention to the fact that **EBC made some very supportive comments at the initial draft consultation stage**, which we consider are not negated by their 'no comments to make' at submission stage.

We are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view.

### **4. FORESTRY COMMISSION – Standing Advice**

In relation to the **Forestry Commission's Standing Advice** we would draw your attention to the fact that they **previously responded to our initial draft consultation plan and we amended the plan accordingly**. While this was essentially in terms of generic advice we had regard to this in refining and proof-checking the submission version. We are satisfied that relevant policies in our plan generally accord with FC advice and intentions, for example Policy GI 5 in relation to 'Local Woodlands, Tree Belts & Hedgerows', which responds to FC's previous concern to acknowledge ancient woodland (none currently identified in the plan area) and veteran trees. Also, paragraphs 8.38 – 8.59 particularly refer.

### **5. HISTORIC ENGLAND – General Advice**

We **note and welcome Historic England's general advice**.

We were particularly mindful in drawing up our plan to acknowledge the fact, as identified by Historic England, that the area encompasses a number of important designated heritage assets. This is a key theme underpinning and found throughout the document. For example, Policies BED1, BED2, NC1, BV1, BV2 refer.

We would draw attention to the fact that **Historic England previously responded to our initial draft consultation plan and we amended the plan accordingly**. While this was essentially in terms of generic advice we had regard to this in refining and proof-checking the submission version. We are satisfied that relevant policies in our plan generally accord with HE advice and intentions, for example in relation to the Grade II\* Listed Bennerley Viaduct, the former Great Northern Railway Line more widely, the old Nottingham Canal, Local Heritage Assets etc. Also, to note that we consulted and liaised with Broxtowe Borough Council's Conservation Officer at an early stage and took advice from Nottinghamshire County Council as regards Historic Environment Records. While we also attempted to engage with our Local History Group this did not result in any response (and the group is now understood to be moribund).

We are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view.

## **6. NATIONAL GRID (AVISON YOUNG) – General Advice**

In relation to comments made on behalf of National Grid by Avison Young –

We note that **National Grid have identified no high voltage electricity or high pressure gas pipeline assets within our plan area.**

## **7. NATURAL ENGLAND – No specific comments – Standing Advice**

In relation to **Natural England having no specific comments** – We would draw attention to the fact that NE previously responded to our draft consultation plan. While this was essentially in terms of generic advice we had regard to this in refining and proof-checking the submission version. We are satisfied that relevant policies in our plan generally accord with NE advice and intentions.

As regards the **annex which covers the issues and opportunities** that should be considered when preparing a neighbourhood plan, we consider that our plan policies have had appropriate regard to this generic advice. Also, that this accords with NE's statutory purpose to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. This is a key theme under-pinning and found throughout our plan, for example Policies GI 1 – 5 (including Green Corridors) and NC1 (former Nottingham Canal which is also a Local Nature Reserve) refer.

We are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view.

## **8. NOTTINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL – Various comments – including H1**

In relation to **Nottinghamshire County Council's strategic planning observations** below –

As regards **'Minerals and Waste'** – We note and welcome that our plan does not appear to conflict with the Minerals or Waste Local Plans or any permitted facilities. The fact that the entire Neighbourhood Plan Area lies within a Minerals Safeguarding Consultation Area for surface coal is acknowledged in our plan (paragraph ? tbc).

As regards **'Strategic Transport'** (in relation to Policy H1 page 39) – DCC's comments are about proposed Policy H1(f)(i) supporting a primary (vehicular) access to the A6096 Shilo Way and a secondary vehicular access to Newtons Lane with no direct vehicular access via Park Hill or Barlow Drive South. Also, concern is raised that a further access onto the A6096 Awsworth Bypass will inevitably adversely impact on the safe and

efficient operation of the major road network. Further, that this proliferation of access junctions onto the bypass could be avoided if the development were served directly from a combination of Newtons Lane, Park Hill and Barlow Drive South.

While the suggested combination would share traffic flows it is not clear which one would in practice be most likely to become the primary vehicular access. There are potentially serious implications for, either Newtons Lane (in Cossall) and/or Park Hill / Barlow Drive South (in Awsworth), were either to become the main access and egress point.

We are concerned that the alternatives suggested would directly conflict with our plan policy and show a lack of understanding or examination of the existing traffic situation or future implications for Park Hill and Barlow Drive North in particular. Our understanding has always been that a new purpose-built primary access from the bypass was both required and preferable subject to necessary highway design and safety requirements being satisfied. This would need to include provision of a light-controlled junction incorporating a segregated right-turning lane. While concerns were previously raised by NCC Highways in relation to our consultation draft plan and in respect of Harworth Group's outline planning application, we understood that these outstanding highway concerns and issues have been resolved that would allow a primary new access junction to be provided safely and that would not unacceptably impact on bypass traffic flows.

A major concern for the local Awsworth community is to avoid any rat-running through the new housing development and through the existing settlement, particularly via either Park Hill or Barlow Drive North (paragraph 6.23 refers). The existing Glebe Farm Estate immediately east of the proposed housing site is only served by a single vehicular access (Park Hill) which is both narrow and overloaded. The suggestion that proliferation of access junctions onto the bypass could be avoided if the development were served directly from a combination of Newtons Lane, Park Hill and Barlow Drive North, ignores the facts and issues in relation to the existing access to the Glebe Farm Estate (c440 dwellings) and if implemented would seriously worsen the traffic situation for a large part of the village. By contrast, Newtons Lane, although currently a cul-de-sac, was until the building of the bypass, a through route to Ilkeston. We believe this road is of sufficient width, has capacity and has been significantly underused over the last 20+ years.

The promoters of the new housing development (Harworth Group) and Awsworth Parish Council have always shared the view that the primary access would need to be taken from the bypass. We believe that Broxtowe Borough Council share our view. The promoters and APC also agree that no vehicular access should be taken from either Park Hill or Barlow Drive North (see paragraph 6.27 which notes that Harworth no longer intend to provide vehicular access via Barlow Drive North in response to local community concerns). Both agree that a secondary access should use Newtons Lane which is wider and has spare capacity. The Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan and Harworth Group's outline planning application both reflect this shared understanding. There has been close co-operation between the two organisations including public consultation events to provide opportunity for local community engagement, scrutiny and input.

As regards **Policy H1(f)(vii)** – and NCC's suggestion to specify a requirement for the development to be suitably connected into both Park Hill and Barlow Drive North to maintain permeability on foot and by bicycle. Although this is our intention (and note Harworth's indicative scheme layout shows links at these two points) it is only implicit in our policy and we agree could be helpfully made explicit and clear (at Policy H1(f)(vii)).

As regards NCC's comments in relation to **'Transport and Travel Services'** –

We welcome the recognition that our plan now incorporates various changes that NCC previously suggested and are also complemented by other references in support of the role of public transport, including Policy TT3.

We welcome the recognition that our plan identifies public transport as a key issue and agree that it is critical that future development supports the viability of public transport.

As regards **whether Policy CFS2 ‘New or Enhanced Community Facilities’ could be enhanced by also referring to public transport**, the final part of policy states that ‘Proposals that seek to co-locate community facilities and that are located conveniently for public transport.....will be considered favourably’. However, it is accepted that it might be helpful to include similar reference within the listed policy criteria which are intended to apply to all development proposals (we would suggest criterion (d) would be the most appropriate). We are content for the Examiner to take a view.

In relation to **what section 2.54 of the plan says about housing growth in Awsworth and nearby areas**, we also welcome NCC’s recognition that the plan has been amended in response to this issue to include a new policy DC1 which refers to requesting developer contributions for planning sites including towards improved public transport services and infrastructure.

We particularly welcome the support for our plan expressed by NCC’s Transport and Travel Services Team.

As regards NCC’s comments in relation to **‘Public Health’** –

NCC have made a number of references relating to sources of advice. They have made several references in terms of strategies, ambitions and priorities intended to improve the health and wellbeing of local people. They have also referred to various sources of useful information when considering the health and wellbeing of residents covered within the plan area. In particular they **recommend that a health checklist should be completed** to enable potential impacts of our plan to be assessed. Whilst this was considered, advice we received confirmed that this is not a requirement. While we fully support the aims and objectives of improving the health and wellbeing of our local community this was not specifically raised as an issue which the plan should explicitly address or include. However, we are of the view that **this could be completed outside of the plan process** if it was considered necessary.

That said, the importance of promoting health and wellbeing is strongly reflected throughout the plan. For example, walking and cycling features heavily, including in relation to Local Green Spaces, local heritage routes (such as the former Great Northern Railway), local heritage assets (especially Bennerley Viaduct) and potential future assets (such as the former Bennerley Coal Disposal Point). We recognise that local planning policies play a vital role in ensuring health and wellbeing and appreciate how planning matters impact on health and wellbeing locally.

We consider that our plan is a good fit with the six TCPA Themes that are referenced (particularly: 1. Movement and access; 2. Open spaces, recreation and play; 4. Neighbourhood spaces; 5. Building design).

We also consider that our plan strongly reflects the Ten Principles of Active Design which are also cited (particularly: 1. Activity for all; 2. Walkable communities; 3. Connected walking and cycling routes; 5. Network of multifunctional open space; 6. High quality streets and spaces).

We are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view.

## 9. NOTTINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL – PUBLIC HEALTH ENGLAND – Local Health Report

As regards **‘Nottinghamshire County Council – Public Health England’** –

The **PHE Local Health Report** shows Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan area within a considerably wider area, including Cossall and Trowell, as well as more urban areas on the northwest fringes of Nottingham City. As such, while interesting and generally applicable to our plan area, we consider it is not possible or critical to try to directly relate the findings to Awsworth Parish or for the plan to specifically respond in a meaningful way.

We are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view.

## 10. SEVERN TRENT WATER – Various comments

We welcome that **STW remain generally supportive of the principles of our plan**. We also note their response differs from that received for the pre-submission version as a result of changes to their processes. It is unfortunate that these comments were not made in time to inform the submission plan. We note their full response and various suggested amendments (and are content to let the Examiner take a view).

We particularly welcome the **support for the approach in Policy H1 criterion (c) ‘Building for Life (BfL) 12’**, likewise **support for criterion (j) in relation to SuDS**.

As regards **STW’s recommendation for expanding policy wording in relation to SuDS and supporting text**.

We recognise the importance of ensuring that surface water from new development is discharged sustainably and not the suggested wording, which we assume is recommended for inclusion in Policy H1. If so, perhaps the wording might be slightly amended to read more clearly along the lines of ‘.....drainage hierarchy, such that discharges to the public sewerage systems are avoided, where possible’.

We welcome STW’s general support for our approach at criterion (k) to protect to protect boundary features. We note and support their recommendation to also include watercourses and ditches in policy and, by implication, to explain in supporting text.

As regards **criterion (l) and the need to incorporate green corridors**, we welcome the recommendation to include reference to Blue-Green Corridor for the reasons given and, by implication, to add to supporting text (albeit we would suggest Green-Blue Corridor to accord with the plan format e.g. Policy GI 1).

We note **STW’s comments in relation to Policy BED 3: ‘Design Principles’**. Their first two paragraphs appear to imply that this policy (and supporting text) might usefully be amended to reflect general concerns about sustainable design in respect of SuDS and surface water run-off. The 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph referring to water efficiency specifically advises that policy wording is incorporated to promote use of the optional water efficiency target, as detailed in Building Regulations Part G. We support the intention of this suggestion (also to appropriately expand supporting text) subject to the view of the Examiner.

**Policy GI 1: Green and Blue Infrastructure Network’** – We welcome STW’s support for our policy and would agree the suggested amendment to include reference to Blue Infrastructure (but to refer to ‘Existing Green-Blue Infrastructure’ rather than ‘Blue-Green’ to accord with the plan format).

**Figure 14 – ‘Local Blue Infrastructure’** – We note STW’s comment that Figure 14 does not appear to cover all watercourses and ditches within the area. We also recognise that these features will provide some ecological and hydrological function and as such will need to be protected. We acknowledge that some watercourses and more particularly ditches might not be indicated. Figure 14 is not necessarily fully comprehensive but more indicative. We are reliant on having sufficient information which can come from a variety of sources. It would be more helpful were STW able to identify which watercourses and particularly (main) ditches they consider should be shown on Figure 14. We are happy to review Figure 14 to include as much information as we are able to find. We suggest that this is in any case a technical exercise that could be legitimately be done outside the examination process. The various theme maps such as Figure 14 and main Proposals Map are likely to require some amendment post-examination, whether by way of necessary updating or correction and this is not unusual. Further, we suggest that Figure 14 might usefully need to make clear that the information shown while as accurate as it can be is indicative as regards minor watercourses and ditches. We are happy to be guided by Broxtowe BC’s views and ultimately those of the Examiner.

**Policy GI 4: ‘Designated Local Green Spaces’** – We welcome and support STW’s recommendation to amend policy by adding reference to flood resilience schemes within Local Green Spaces.

**Policy GI 5: ‘Local Woodlands, Tree Belts and Hedgerows’** – We welcome STW’s support for protection of woodlands, trees and hedgerows which our plan proposes. We would welcome their recommendation for policy to also cover watercourses (and ditches) if this is considered appropriate. However, we would not want to detract from Policy GI 5. The issue would seem to be whether it is more appropriate and clearer to cover watercourses (and ditches) elsewhere in the plan, probably as part of another policy (for example Policy GI 1) rather than as a free-standing new policy. We would particularly welcome Broxtowe Borough Council’s view on this matter and, of course, ultimately the Examiner’s view.

We **note and welcome STW’s ‘Position Statement’** which contains general advice about their role where new development is proposed, including in relation to Sewage Strategy, Surface Water and Flooding, Water Quality, Water Supply and Water Efficiency. We especially **note and welcome their encouragement for our plan to impose the expectation on developers that properties are built to the optional requirement in Building Regulations of 110 litres of water per person per day** (STW’s earlier comment also refers).

In general terms we were mindful in drawing up our plan not to overload the document with unnecessary content both as regards policy and supporting text. Our start point was to respond to the issues raised by the local community. The plan’s contents naturally grew through the process in response to comments and input both by the local community and outside bodies.

We are content to be advised by Broxtowe Borough Council and the Examiner in the matter of how far our plan should incorporate STW’s suggested changes to plan policy and supporting text.

## **11. SPORT ENGLAND – General comments**

We **note and welcome SE’s general advice** about the importance of the planning system in relation to sport, health and wellbeing. We are satisfied that our plan adequately reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in NPPF with particular reference to paragraphs 96 and 97.

A key principle when preparing the plan was to accord with but not to repeat local plan policy but to add value wherever possible. There has been no suggestion from Broxtowe Borough Council that the Neighbourhood Plan is deficient as regards what it should say in relation to either the need for or provision of sports facilities.

That said, we fully **recognise the importance of ensuring that any new development, especially new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities**. We believe that our plan policies do this, for example by reference to Active Design, to ensure layout and design of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity (see Response 10 above). This is particularly in Policy H1 (new housing) and more generally across the plan area though policies such as BED3, GI1, GI4, BCP1, NC1, BV1, BV2, NC1.

We are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view.

## **12. THE COAL AUTHORITY – General comments**

We **note and welcome the general comments made by the Coal Authority** in relation to their role, the fact that the plan area lies wholly within the current defined coalfield and the risks resulting from past mining activities. They also acknowledge that our plan does not propose to allocate any specific sites for development, as those included within the plan were being considered as part of the Broxtowe Local Plan process. On which basis, the **Coal Authority have no specific comments** to make on our plan.

We would comment that our submission plan makes appropriate reference to the above matters, principally at paragraph 6.47 which covers ‘Ground Instability – risks from former coal workings’.

We are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view.

## **13. AWSWORTH PARISH COUNCIL & NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN STEERING GROUP – Statement**

The above relates to the **over-arching statement of support and clarification submitted jointly by Awsworth Parish Council and Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group**.

We therefore have **no further comment** to add in this regard.

## **14. AWSWORTH PARISH COUNCIL MEMBER – Former Bennerley Coal Disposal Point - Support with modifications. We note the indication of support with modifications.**

As regards **comments made in support of land at the former Bennerley Coal Disposal Point being better suited to use as a new tram terminus (large Park & Ride)**. We would note that this has not previously been raised or considered through the neighbourhood plan process as a local community issue, aim or objective which should be included as plan policy.

The **relevant policy in our submitted plan is BCDP1: ‘Former Bennerley Coal Disposal Point Land’**. This policy recognises that a number of constraints exist for any future use of this land, especially being located in the designated Green Belt. Other considerations are: the need to protect and enhance the structure and setting of the Grade II\* Listed Bennerley Viaduct; to maintain the functionality and connectivity of the Green Infrastructure Corridors; not to cause harm to the status of the area as a Local Wildlife Site.



The policy supports that the land should remain open in use and character. Its use for recreational purposes such as a 'Country Park' (or informal public open space) will be supported providing proposals do not detract from its open character and Green Belt designation. (also see **Response 21** below).

We would particularly welcome Broxtowe Borough Council's comments (in response to the suggestion for an alternative land-use of this site as a tram terminus / Park & Ride site) and for the Examiner to take a view.

#### **15. AWSWORTH PARISH COUNCIL MEMBER – Housing site - Support with modifications**

We **note the indication of support with modifications.**

As regards **integrating the proposed 250 new houses into Awsworth village** and whether or not an opportunity is being missed to address a long-standing problem. We recognise the particular issue of how best to connect the new housing development with the existing village. Various options were carefully considered. The promoters of the development (Harworth Group) and the Steering Group / Parish Council agreed that a new primary access would be necessary and preferable. We believe that Broxtowe Borough Council share this view. Further, Harworth and ANPSG/APC agreed that there should be no direct access from the new development via the existing Glebe Farm Estate i.e. via either Park Hill or Barlow Drive North.

As regards the respondent's comments, while there may be some benefits for the existing estate by providing alternative access via the new housing development, on balance it was felt that allowing even more vehicles to access the existing estate from the new housing development would cause more problems than it would be likely to solve.

We acknowledge that Broxtowe Part 2 Local Plan retains reference in supporting text to allowing for the possibility of (not a requirement for) vehicular access links from Park Hill and/or Barlow Drive North, despite ANPSG/APC making objections to the Part 2 Local Plan because of the importance the local community attach to not permitting any direct vehicular links at these points. Mindful that local plan policy does not specifically require such vehicular links, we are of the view that the neighbourhood plan generally accords with the local plan in this particular regard.

We would be interested for Broxtowe Borough Council to comment on this matter, especially in relation to their Broxtowe Part 2 Local Plan, also their understanding of the Highway Authority's position (via HA's involvement with the current outline planning application). (see also **Response 8** above). We are also content for the Examiner to take a view.

#### **16. AWSWORTH PARISH COUNCIL MEMBER – Duplicates Response 14 above**

No comment. See comments to **Response 14** above.

#### **17. PARISH COUNCILLOR – Support**

We **welcome the unqualified support** for the plan.

## 18. AWSWORTH PRIMARY & NURSERY SCHOOL – Policy DC1 – Support with modifications

We **note and welcome the support for our plan subject to modifications**, although noting that **no suggestions are made as to what modifications are being sought**.

Comment is made in relation to **Policy DC 1(f) which concerns Developer Contributions** to education.

The section ‘Education provision – potential impact of new homes’ paragraphs 6.48 – 6.49 explain the position in respect of the local school, including in relation to pupil numbers and existing school capacity and overcrowded classrooms. We would point out that the Local Education Authority were formally and informally consulted but despite repeated reminders provided no response. We were therefore obliged to rely on information provided by the school which is what paragraphs 6.48 and 6.49 comprise.

As regards the **planned development for additional housing** we acknowledge the potential for further increased demand for school places to require financial support from the Local Education Authority, in order to accommodate extra pupils which will require the building of additional classrooms. We are happy to include appropriate reference in supporting text to reflect the above, subject to any views from Broxtowe Borough Council and in due course the Examiner.

The additional concern raised is about the **issue of exacerbated parking problems for parents / carers increasing with a rising school population**, as the current situation is already very congested with staff vehicles and as a result visitors to school are unable to park on the school site.

We would point out that this is essentially a matter for the school to consider, including in liaison with the LEA as necessary, as it concerns the way in which the school chooses to use their site for operational purposes. For example, it might be that the school makes better use of their existing on-site parking in a different re-configured way, or they might consider the need for provision of more parking on site, perhaps including dedicated visitor parking spaces.

The Parish Council has long been concerned about the parking situation outside the school and nursery premises. This is essentially in relation to parents / carers causing problems during drop-off and pick-up times during the school/nursery day, including safety concerns for pedestrians and anti-social impacts on nearby local residents. Paragraph 9.10 of our plan confirms that the car park(s) at the rear of the Village Hall is (well) used as a drop-off / pick-up point for the school opposite. Clearly, our preference is for people to walk or cycle wherever possible. Paragraph 11.28 in support of Policy TT 3: ‘Sustainable Transport’ makes clear our concern at reliance on the car which includes journeys to drop off and collect children at the local school. While the Parish Council makes the Village Hall car parks available for this purpose to avoid conflict in front of the school, it would clearly be preferable for parents (and carers) to walk and/or cycle with their children to school.

We consider that the plan does all that it can in this regard, although it is always open for the school to approach the Parish Council, to consider what more might be done and how far the Parish Council might help.

We are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view.

## **19. AWSWORTH PRIMARY & NURSERY SCHOOL – Duplicates Response 18 above**

No comment. See comments to **Response 18** above.

## **20. FRIENDS OF BENNERLEY VIADUCT – Bennerley Viaduct – Support**

The Friends of Bennerley Viaduct's **general support for our plan** is very much welcomed given the importance of Bennerley Viaduct to our parish and plan.

We also especially welcome their acknowledgement that the project to restore the Grade II\* Listed Bennerley Viaduct and the Awworth Neighbourhood Plan are mutually complementary.

We are pleased they are able to commend our plan's recognition of their project's beneficial outcome and that the Parish Council's support for the project has provided evidence of community support which has been essential to (successful) grant applications (and for the first phase of the project to commence).

We strongly agree with FoBV's conclusion that, taken together, our plan and their project show how preservation and enhancement of heritage and the natural environment can contribute to the health and wellbeing of people and communities. (also see Response 21 below)

We are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view.

## **21. HARWORTH GROUP – Former Bennerley Coal Disposal Point – Object**

We **note with disappointment Harworth's objection to Policy 13 (should be Policy BCDP 1)** which seeks to promote the site of the former Bennerley Coal Disposal Point for a 'country park'.

Harworth's comments rehearse the discussions that have taken place over the more recent stages of our plan's preparation. We appreciate that their interest is driven by economic considerations and aspirations and wishing to realise an economic return on their land holding. Their willingness to engage in relation to the future use of this land and considering what our plan might say only came to the fore in the wake of the confirmation for High Speed 2 and the intentions for Toton Sidings.

Nevertheless, we were keen to engage with Harworth to see whether and how far our plan could support their economic aspirations for the land which involve a major rail-connected, rail-related employment development. Crucially, we were interested to explore what community benefits might be possible. The Steering Group and subsequently the Parish Council expended a considerable amount of time in carefully appraising Harworth's potential scheme alternatives. This is one main reason why it has taken longer to get to the submission stage than we had hoped. There was also a public exhibition which provided an opportunity for local people to view and comment on Harworth's proposals. However, the clear community view, now expressed through the submission plan Policy BCDP 1, is that Harworth's plans should not be supported because of the likely significant adverse impacts on the immediate site, wider parish area and local community. The plan supports an alternative, more sustainable vision for the future of the area which promotes appropriate use by local people and visitors from further afield but which would need to be commensurate with protecting and enhancing the acknowledged wildlife value of the site and keeping the area open.

Chapter 13.0 paragraphs 13.1 – 13.8 refer in some detail. As the plan makes clear, the local community's strong preference is for a more sustainable future for the land at Bennerley. In response to comments made by Harworth to our consultation draft plan the policy was re-cast as BCDP 1 to better and more realistically reflect the aspirational nature of our intentions.

As regards deliverability, which we recognise to be a key consideration, clearly without the co-operation of the landowner the plan's aims for this site cannot be immediately realised. Nonetheless, we believe it is of fundamental importance that our community's long-term land-use goal for the land should be properly recognised through the development plan process and made clear so far as possible within the development plan once it is made.

Notably, Harworth refer to their disappointment that Broxtowe's own Local Plan has not supported their economic aspirations for the site. On which basis, we contend that this lends significant weight to our case for an alternative vision for the site and that this deserves to be seriously considered and supported through the plan as a means of ensuring a more sustainable future for this part of our parish. Without which, this extensive tract of derelict land will remain a serious blot on the landscape, potentially in perpetuity, with attendant serious impacts resulting from anti-social activities, particularly the blight of off-road bikers.

Harworth's reference to and reliance on the site having lawful use for the reception, storage and dispatch of coal is considered to be a tenuous, essentially technical point, in terms of a beneficial future use of the land that would also be acceptable in planning terms. The prospects for coal (from opencasting in the local area) requiring to be received, stored and dispatched from this site in future are considered to be diminishingly remote to non-existent. Buildings associated with the previous coal processing operation were removed more than 25 years ago since which time the land has remained unused. Moreover, the economic options which Harworth wanted our plan to support are vastly different to any previously established use. Since the previous use ceased, Harworth have not invested in the land in any meaningful way, for example to safeguard it and the local community from unauthorised use. Nor have they attempted to improve the appearance of the site, even on a temporary basis, rather they have allowed it to fall into further disrepair and neglect.

We fully appreciate that our plan's aspiration for this land will take time to deliver. Our hope is that once Harworth realise their economic aspirations will not be achievable for good planning reasons, they will be prepared to work constructively with the local communities and other agencies, to deliver a better more sustainable outcome for this sensitive and important site.

We would particularly welcome Broxtowe Borough Council's comments, both as regards our plan's intentions but also in the context of the over-arching Local Plan which was only recently adopted and does not include or support Harworth's case for Bennerley.

## **22. HARWORTH GROUP – Housing Site Policy H1 – Support with modifications**

In relation to Harworth's comments we **welcome their support for our plan's support for residential development which they are promoting as set out in Policy H1**. We welcome their continuing support for our policy and **all but one of the criteria**.

We note that this **support is subject to modifications being sought. This concerns criterion (p) and reference to provision of a neighbourhood shop.** They reiterate concern that the scale of housing development would not support such provision, such that this element of policy is not justified and should be deleted.

Notwithstanding Harworth's comments, we remain of the view that the reference at Policy H1(p) is justified and appropriately worded, to allow for the possibility of such provision rather than to require it and to give positive encouragement. The retention of this criterion would seem prudent if, as intended, Harworth will not be undertaking the development themselves, which leaves open the possibility of a future developer being able / prepared to provide a neighbourhood shop. Our policy makes clear: that provision of a neighbourhood shop would be supported; gives an indication of the type and size; and that provision would be subject to viability. This is an aspect that could be usefully examined when any detailed planning application is made.

We would especially welcome Broxtowe Borough Council's comments in this matter and the Examiner's view.

### **23. WELL PHARMACY – Comments in relation to Pharmacy**

We **note the comments made by Well Pharmacy in relation to their business operation at Lawrence Avenue, Awsworth.** The reference in our plan at paragraph 9.8 was based on wording helpfully provided by Well Pharmacy in response to our request for their input. Noting what is said about their pharmacies always being under review we are happy to better reflect this, including use of the additional wording provided, even though their suggested wording does not specifically mention review, which seems to be their main concern.

We would welcome any comments from Broxtowe Borough Council. Otherwise, we are content for the Examiner to take a view.

### **24. WHITEHEAD CONCRETE & FOULDS INVESTMENT – Policies Map – Objection**

Whitehead & Foulds **oppose the plan in relation to the Neighbourhood Plan Policies Map Boundary.**

Their comments in paragraphs 3 and 4 are about the **Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan area boundary cutting through their site and buildings.** This is essentially a fact of established administrative boundaries and their history. It is not something in the gift of Awsworth Parish Council to amend. The Neighbourhood Plan Area coincides with the Awsworth Parish area, which is usual for neighbourhood plans prepared by parish councils. Clearly, Whitehead & Foulds commented in relation to the designated NPA when it was consulted upon by Broxtowe Borough Council who would have considered their views before confirming the NPA.

There are other instances in our locality where boundaries on maps and development on the ground are not easy to discern. This is one reason why we have proposed to include Parish Aims (as distinct from land-use policies). Parish AIM APB 1 – 'Awsworth Parish Boundaries' refers to the need to review such historical and practical anomalies. The area along Gin Close Way is one such area where the boundaries of 3 parishes meet which can cause difficulties, including for land-use planning and planning applications. We believe that the shared Awsworth Parish / Greasley Parish boundary running through Whitehead's site marks the historical existence of an open watercourse across this land but which was subsequently culverted.

Comments at paragraphs 5 – 11 concern **Policy GI 1 – 'Green and Blue Infrastructure Network' and specifically its designation on the Policies Map.** This relates to a dashed purple line shown passing roughly

east to west through the southern part of their site, which the Policies Map key identifies as relating to 'Green Infrastructure Corridors (Indicative. GI 1)'. We acknowledge that this does appear to be an anomaly when the actual situation on the ground is considered. We would, however, refute that there has been a lack of diligence or application of common sense.

We believe that the Green Corridor shown in the vicinity of Gin Close Way and further west is intended to follow the general line of the local watercourse the Gilt Brook rather than the line of the former mineral railway which ran parallel but slightly further to the south (Figure 3 - Ordnance Survey extract 1880 shows the historical situation). It should be noted that until more recent years the northern part of Whitehead's site, although used for open storage of concrete products, still contained remnants of heathland flora once widespread in the area. However, the use of the northern part of the site for a separate new business (Oak Tree Motorhomes), combined with more intensive use of the remainder of the site, means that this element of local Green Infrastructure has been lost.

The dashed purple line shown on the Policies Map running across Whitehead's site is intended to accord with the local Green Infrastructure Corridors which are shown in more detail at Figure 11, which makes clear 'Note these are shown diagrammatically and are therefore indicative and not precise'. In the case of Whitehead's site this relates to '2.8 Kimberley Cutting – Secondary Corridor' which continues both east and west of Whitehead's site. These supporting theme maps and the main Policies Map were kindly drawn up by Broxtowe's mapping section. The dashed purple line on the Policies Map represents a GI corridor wherever it is found within our parish / plan area.

In response to their comments in paragraph 12, subject to confirmation by Broxtowe Borough Council and ultimately the Examiner's determination, we consider it reasonable to consider re-drawing the indicative line somewhat further south to run outside the site, as requested. We agree this would seem sensible, especially as the corridors shown are indicative, although it raises the prospect of Figure 11 and Policies Map then not being exactly in accord. However, we consider that Figure 11 and the Policies Map could both be amended so as to accord, without detracting from the intention of our plan policy.

There is a precedent for doing so in that another GI corridor was shown running parallel to Bennerley Viaduct rather than along its length. This may have been intended to reflect the line of lagoons and area of wet woodland to the north side of the structure. However, from a mapping perspective this appeared rather odd, so it was agreed to show the indicative line along the viaduct centre line. The important point to note is that these are corridors, which means they will by definition involve land along either side of the indicative (centre) line. The width of the corridor will therefore vary along its length depending on the situation on the ground in relation to Green Infrastructure. In the case of the indicative line shown through Whitehead's site, for purposes of our plan we agree it would be more logical for this to pass through the tree-covered area close around the southern end of the site. Note that this also helpfully coincides with the route of the former mineral railway at this point. The minor re-alignment of the indicative route in the area of Bennerley Viaduct and the suggested minor re-alignment to the south of Whitehead's site are both considered to be justifiable local interpretations in response to the situation on the ground, which we would ask Broxtowe and the Examiner to support.

As regards paragraph 13 and the request by Whitehead & Foulds to consider realigning the boundary of the Policies Map, our clear understanding is that the plan is constrained by having to adhere to the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area, which necessarily coincides with that of the Awsworth Parish area. This relates back to our comments above in response to concerns raised in paragraphs 3 and 4.

We are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view. Should any re-alignment of the indicative GI corridor be needed this can be done as a technical change when finalising the Policies Map (and Figure 11).

## **25. WHITEHEAD CONCRETE & FOULDS INVESTMENT – Figure 12 – Local Landscape Areas – Objection**

Whitehead & Foulds in paragraphs 1 – 6 express **opposition to ANP Figure 12 – ‘Local Landscape Character Areas’**. This concerns **inclusion of their site within Figure 12 as designated forming part of the ‘Babbington Rolling Farmlands Local Landscape Character Area’**. Their paragraph 6 requests that the Examiner remove the land from the designation from within Figure 12 of the Awworth NP and consequently by association, also (from within) the designation of Policy GI-2.

Our plan Policy GI 2: ‘Local Landscape Character Areas’ is explained in supporting text at paragraphs 8.20 – 8.23. Paragraph 8.23 makes clear that the neighbourhood plan seeks to ensure that the acknowledged value of all Broxtowe’s landscapes and the need to protect and enhance them is recognised and expressed at local Parish level through our neighbourhood plan.

W&F’s paragraph 2 points to the urbanised visual appearance of the site which we do not dispute. However, we do not consider that the visual appearance of the site at this location should necessarily require exclusion of the area from policy. Their paragraph 3 states that Broxtowe’s Local Plan does not define the application of Policy 30: ‘Landscape’ in graphic form, which in their view makes it even more inappropriate to identify land which does not exhibit the characteristics of the specified local landscape area. In our view this does not make it inappropriate for our plan to give expression at the local Parish / Plan level. This is one reason why it was considered to be important for our plan to express the policy at the local level and depict this on a map base.

We recognise that the designation is a general or wide-area designation. We therefore accept that there will necessarily be parcels of land within the wider designated area that do not display the typical landscape characteristics that are generally attributable to the Babbington Rolling Farmlands, either wholly or in part. However, this is not unusual for planning designations. For example, Green Belt designations cover wide areas and frequently wash over built areas and parcels of land that are not green or visually attractive, including active and disused industrial sites. A case in point in our own plan area is the former Bennerley Coal Disposal Point land.

W&F’s paragraph 4 refers to the employment use of their land being acknowledged by Broxtowe’s Part 2 Local Plan, as being designated under Policy 9: ‘Retention of Good Quality Existing Employment Sites’ and denoted as such on the Proposals Map. They refer to this policy designation also applying to land situated immediately south of Gin Close Way but which is shown within ANP Figure 12 ‘Local Landscape Character Area’ plan boundary designated as white land with no Local Landscape Character Area applying. They contend that the approach in our plan is inconsistent as regards their land and land south of Gin Close Way that has been excluded from the Local Landscape Character Area designation. They also point out that neither area exhibits intrinsic characteristics of that Local Landscape Character Area.

W&F’s paragraph 5 comments that the Policies Map of the Awworth Neighbourhood Plan identifies the land owned by Whitehead and Foulds together with land south of Gin Close Way as both being designated as subject to Policy E1: ‘Existing Employment Use’. They consider it contradictory and inconsistent for the plan to

suggest that their land in some way exhibits the stated intrinsic characteristics of the Local Landscape Character Area. They consider this also demonstrates conflict and inconsistency of policy designations on the Policies Map with that shown on Figure 12 in respect of Local Landscape Character Areas and resulting NP policy GI-2.

Essentially, our plan seeks to give clear policy expression at the local level. We have used the line of the Awsworth – Cossall Bypass along Shilo Way together with Gin Close Way as providing a logical and defensible boundary excluding the main built area. This coincides with the established boundaries used to define the Green Belt Areas (lying west and east of Awsworth village) and Awsworth Key Settlement (shown at ANP Figure 5). It should be noted that the Key Settlement is more extensive than Awsworth village and in the area of Gin Close Way includes parts of Kimberley Parish and Greasley Parish. We have sought to ensure that our plan accords with these other designated / defined areas. This explains why that part of Whitehead's land located within our Parish/Plan area is included within a Local Landscape Character Area when land south of Gin Close Way is excluded.

Clearly, the application of policy and consideration by the Local Planning Authority of any planning application will, of course, be required to have regard to the existing situation on the ground and take account of the actual appearance of and uses on the land in question. We do not therefore consider that the way our policy is expressed in relation to Whitehead's land within our plan area is unduly onerous or inappropriate. In the particular circumstances of Whitehead's site proposed Policy GI 2 would not adversely impact or unduly curtail any legitimate development proposals they might wish to put forward. We do not agree that the plan (whether at Figure 12 or Policy GI 2 as shown on the Policies Map) should be required to remove that part of Whitehead's site that is located within the designated Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan area.

In saying this, we are particularly conscious of the implications for other locations across the designated landscape areas were it to be required that other small parcels of land should be removed from Figure 12 (and the Policies Map). While excluding such parcels of land from Figure 12 or the over-arching Policies Map would be technically possible, we do not consider this to be necessary and feel it could potentially undermine the purpose of the policy intention and designation, as exemplified by reference to Green Belt, which typically washes over a multitude of land-uses.

We would suggest that it should be possible to rely on ANP Policy E1: 'Existing Employment Use' which makes clear the where existing business uses are located in the plan area, including those within Local Landscape Character Areas. We would suggest that the supporting text might usefully be expanded to cross-refer to Policy E1 and explain the likely practical implications of Policy GI 2, hopefully so as to allay W&F's concerns. We would also add that no other representations have been received in this regard.

We are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view. Should any amendment of Figure 12 or the Policies Map be needed in respect of Local Landscape Character Areas this can be done as a technical change when finalising the Policies Map (and Figure 12).

We would point out that the Policies Map requires correction on the map legend / key in relation to Policy E1. Policy E1 is denoted 'Local Business Areas' but should be denoted 'Existing Employment Use' as per Policy E1 on page 94 of the plan. 'Local Business Areas' is a reference to Figure 19 – 'Local Business Areas and Businesses' which are shown on page 95 and include Local Business Areas (in Awsworthplan area) and Neighbouring Business Areas and Buildings in Cossall, Greasley and Kimberley.



**26. RESIDENT – [REDACTED] – Cossall – Support with modifications**

We **note and welcome the qualified support with modifications** from a resident who lives in neighbouring Cossall Parish, although we note that no modifications are suggested.

Their comments relate to **Housing 6.23 and in particular Policy H1(f) and centre on traffic and parking issues along Newtons Lane and its junction with The Lane/Awsworth Lane** further east. Of course, some of these issues involve enforcement, which we would suggest is a matter for the resident to take up with Cossall Parish Council and/or Nottinghamshire Police as necessary.

We acknowledge and share the concerns raised in relation to the proposed major new housing development on 'land west of Awsworth (inside the bypass)', which is why Policy H1 includes criteria on 'Traffic & Transport' at (f)(i)-(vii) including in relation to traffic-calming measures to deter 'rat-running'. Paragraph 6.23 acknowledges that vehicular access off Newtons Lane (in Cossall Parish) may require similar measures being considered along Newtons Lane east of Shilo Way (all in Cossall). However, this is not a matter which our plan can directly affect through land-use policy.

We welcome any comments Broxtowe Borough Council are able to add and for the Examiner to take a view.

**27. RESIDENT – [REDACTED] – Cossall – Support with modifications**

We **welcome the qualified support with modifications** by a resident from neighbouring Cossall Parish, although we note that **no modifications are suggested**.

With reference to **page 31 'Issues and Opportunities' and paragraph 3.2 'Built Environment'**. In light of 57% of Awsworth's population being aged 65 or above in 2011, the resident is concerned whether there will be adequate homes available for the elderly / infirm who wish to live independently, with particular reference to affordable bungalows and/or flats.

We fully agree that sufficient, suitable and affordable accommodation should be provided for our ageing population. Our plan specifically addresses this in Policy H 2: 'Housing Mix' and in supporting paragraphs 6.30 – 6.34 and Policy H 3: 'Affordable Housing & Local Needs' and paragraphs 6.35 – 6.41.

We are of the view that the plan acknowledges these important matters in so far as it is able. However, we are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view, as to whether the plan should and can say more.

**28. RESIDENT A – [REDACTED] – Cossall – Duplicates Response 26 above**

No comment. See comments to **Response 26** above.

## **29. RESIDENT B – [REDACTED] – Cossall – Objection**

We note the objection made to the part of the plan which specifies the alterations proposed to Newtons Lane, asking that decisions outlined in the plan regarding Newtons Lane be reconsidered, although **no specific modifications are suggested.**

This is in connection with **proposed 250 new houses on land located north of Newtons Lane** (Chapter 6.0 and Policy H1 refer to the 200 new houses that would be provided on the larger part of the site in Awsworth Parish).

Concerns are expressed in terms of traffic impacts on Newtons Lane and particularly at the junction with The Lane / Awsworth Lane. They are also concerned at the prospect of through traffic (note that Newtons Lane was made into a cul-de-sac in connection with construction of the A6096 Awsworth – Cossall Bypass in 1996).

Our plan supports using Newtons Lane as a secondary vehicular access. This vehicular link is the one proposed / supported by the promoters of the scheme (Harworth Group), Broxtowe Borough Council and the Highway Authority. It forms part of the outline planning application currently being considered by the Local Planning Authority.

Careful consideration was previously given to how to access the new housing development. One possibility discussed was creating a new roundabout on the A6096 that would re-connect to the severed western end of Newtons Lane and provide access to the new housing. Our concern was that this would also provide a direct link between the bypass and The Lane / Awsworth Lane' which would encourage 'rat-running'. We understand this was discounted by promoters Harworth as not being feasible and is in any case not being required by the Highways Authority.

In any event, the location of any new junction from the new housing to Newtons Lane and any new roundabout on the A6096 both lie outside the Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan area and within Cossall Parish. We share many of the concerns that are raised by the Cossall resident. We acknowledge and share the concerns raised in relation to the proposed major new housing development on 'land west of Awsworth (inside the bypass)', which is why Policy H1 includes criteria on 'Traffic & Transport' at (f)(i)-(vii), including in relation to traffic-calming measures to deter 'rat-running'. Paragraph 6.23 acknowledges that vehicular access off Newtons Lane (in Cossall Parish) may require similar measures being considered along Newtons Lane east of Shilo Way (all in Cossall). However, this is not a matter which our plan can directly affect through land-use policy.

We welcome any comments Broxtowe Borough Council are able to add and for the Examiner to take a view.

## **30. RESIDENT C – Awsworth – Awsworth Site – Possibly in relation to Outline Planning Application**

We note the concerns raised by a new resident in relation to proposed new building in Awsworth, which seems to refer to land west of Awsworth inside the bypass (to which our Policy H1 relates). However, reference to a letter recently received by the resident from Broxtowe Borough Council suggests that this may primarily relate to the outline planning application for the site, although we appreciate there is read-across to our plan.

As regards the numbered points listed (in so far as they relate to our plan):

**1. Amount of traffic** – We appreciate and share concerns about traffic on the main road (assume this means A6096 Bypass). Our plan Policy H1(f)(i) and (iii) specifically refer.

**2. Policing** – We have concerns in respect of effective local policing in relation to proposed new housing. Awsworth is policed by Nottinghamshire Police mainly from Eastwood. Our plan has limited scope to influence local policing directly. This comes mainly via plan policies which aim to ensure that any new development takes account of the possibility of crime and is designed and built to prevent or reduce crime wherever possible. For example, by ensuring new housing schemes allow good surveillance. In addition to influencing good design and effective physical measures, there is of course scope outside the plan process for the Parish Council to have an influence through regular contact with local police. Likewise, there is a valuable role for the local Neighbourhood Watch scheme to play which residents can join.

**3. Buyers of new properties** – Our plan looks to provide the new homes that are required by the Broxtowe Local Plan. We appreciate that issues are raised both by those buying and renting property as well as existing residents. We would all wish for good neighbours. However, we do not feel it appropriate or helpful to comment or speculate on the sort of people who typically rent accommodation. In particular we do not condone use of the term immigration housing and are surprised that this has not been redacted.

**4. Waste Disposal** – Our plan does not cover waste as such. The matter of land-use planning policy in respect of waste is covered by the Local Waste Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) via their Waste Local Plan. Broxtowe Borough Council's role includes management aspects, such as the collection of domestic waste and responding to incidents of fly-tipping.

**5. Spoilt view** – Our plan Policy H1 includes a number of criteria which we propose in order to ensure new housing development on the site in question is well designed and located, including in relation to any nearby existing properties. As regards concerns about new development spoiling the view from existing properties, there is no 'right to a view' under the planning system in England.

**6. Support services** – Our plan supports provision of local facilities and services. Policy DC1 covers the matter of the sorts of things which developers would be expected to make contributions towards, potentially including doctors and education about which the resident is particularly concerned.

**7. Property devaluation** – Any alleged impact on the value of existing property attributed to new development is not a material planning consideration when deciding whether to grant planning permission.

We are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view.

### **31. RESIDENT D – Awsworth – Awsworth Site Objection Possibly more related to Outline Planning Application**

We **note the resident's objection to our plan but which is not specified in relation to articular policies**. This concerns a number of issues but which also **appears to relate more to the outline planning application** that is currently being considered by Broxtowe Borough Council. However, we appreciate that there is read-across to our plan Policy H1.

**Traffic congestion** – We share concerns about additional traffic and pollution from the development including any adverse impacts on existing nearby residents such as those on Barlow Drive North. That is why our plan Policy H1 includes a number of criteria intended to ensure that any new housing development on the site is located, designed and built to minimise any adverse impacts. As regards existing difficulties for residents of Barlow Drive North entering / exiting the estate, it should be noted that this is why our plan criterion (i) intends there should no vehicular access to the new housing development via Park Hill or Barlow Drive North.

**Environment** – We share concerns about the loss of green spaces which is why our plan includes policies to protect and provide such areas within the parish. Policy GI 4: ‘Designated Local Green Spaces’ proposes a significant number of green spaces be designated so as to protect their openness or special character. As regards noise and air pollution from increased traffic levels and impacts on resident’s health it will be a matter for the Local Planning Authority to be satisfied in these respects when making a decision on any planning application.

**Safety issues** – As regards the police (see **Response 30-2** above).

**Privacy** – We share concerns about any unacceptable overlooking of existing properties such that privacy is compromised or daylight is lost. Policy H1(d) and (e) specifically refer to such matters to ensure that new development is acceptable.

**Affordable Housing** – The resident refers to being aware that a community centre is an alternative to building affordable housing, which they support and request that it be given consideration. We are not clear precisely what this alternative is or whether/how our plan can respond to meet what is being asked. It is possible that this is a reference to Policy DC1: ‘Developer Contributions from New Development in Awsworth’, which mentions ‘Affordable Housing’ and ‘Community facilities’. Our plan Policy H 3: ‘Affordable Housing & Local Needs’ specifically refers to the plan’s support for provision of affordable housing that clearly reflects and meets a local housing need.

We are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view.

### **32. RESIDENT E – Awsworth – Support**

**We welcome the local resident’s support for plan Policies BV1 and BV2.**

We welcome the full support for Policy BV1 which supports restoration plans for the Grade II\* Listed Bennerley Viaduct and Policy BV2 which seeks to protect the visual setting of the landmark.

We are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view.

### **33. RESIDENT E – Awsworth – Support**

**We welcome the local resident’s general support for the plan** and what it is trying to achieve for the local community. We are encouraged that they consider everything has been fully considered with a view to protect and improve the village. Likewise, we are heartened by their **support for the plan’s aspiration to see**

**the former Bennerley Coal Disposal Point land being put to good use a Country Park** and made safe for public use which would enhance our area.

They comment that they **would like to see the school more involved** and trying to think of ways it can improve and facilitate more children once the houses are built (see Response 18 above). To note that as part of the plan process the school was closely involved through a ‘planning for real’ consultation event with the children to identify their concerns, hopes and aspirations for the village and surrounding area, with a view to ensuring that the plan responded as fully as possible within the constraints of a land-use development plan. Of course, there will be opportunities outside the plan process itself for the school and children to have their say and influence how the parish develops into the future. This can be facilitated, for example, by the Parish Council.

The resident **would also like another Recreation Ground / Play Area within the new 250 houses**, which Broxtowe could maintain. Note that the promoters of the new housing development propose to provide at least 1.85 hectares of additional amenity green space and children’s play facilities which Policy H1(h) confirms. Note that Policy DC1 refers to ‘Developer Contributions from New Development in Awsworth’ and includes at (c) ‘Community facilities’, . The precise details of provision remain to be finalised through a full planning application. The matter of whether Broxtowe or Awsworth Parish Council are responsible for its ongoing maintenance would also require to be decided. The Parish Council own and maintain the two existing Recreation Grounds at The Lane and Shilo.

We are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view.

#### **34. RESIDENT E – Awsworth – Support**

We **welcome the local resident’s support for our plan Policy H1**. We note they **fully support the proposed new houses on land west of Awsworth but only subject to safeguards set out by Policy H1**.

We are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view.

#### **35. RESIDENT F – Awsworth – Support**

We **welcome the local resident’s full support for our plan**.

In particular, that **in relation to Policy H1** (new home on land west of Awsworth inside the bypass) they understand that Awsworth must have a certain number of new houses and that this land is the only feasible place they can go. Also, that following the plan ensures that the houses are included into Awsworth improving and protecting our village as best we can. We note in relation to Policies H2 and H3 their support for a good variety of houses including affordable ones being what is required.

We are happy for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view.

#### **36. RESIDENT G – Greasley – Supportive comments**

We **welcome the supportive comments** made by the resident from neighbouring Greasley Parish.

We agree the comment about shared objectives and needs and that there should be linked thinking and consultation in order to develop the whole area more effectively and support the local community and business growth.

We welcome the comment that this is a well thought out and researched plan with a profound understanding of its area and needs.

**Housing** – Reference is made to the need for all new housing to include sustainable heating and energy supply, including ground source heat pumps, solar panels etc. and asks whether all new developments could be instructed to include these in their construction. We agree with the general sentiment expressed and would be happy for Broxtowe Borough Council and the Examiner to take a view as to whether our plan should and can say more.

**Transport** – We note and share the various concerns raised about local public transport, particularly local bus services and links in the area. Our plan includes a section which covers this and includes Policy TT3: ‘Sustainable Transport’. As regards comments about Ilkeston Station Car Park, this is not a matter for our plan as it is located outside the plan area. Although, we fully support the suggestion that more joined up transport links would be welcome to the whole Borough (and **see Response 8** above)

**Business** – A number of comments are offered in relation to business.

The issue of financial support for local businesses is not a matter for our plan. Although, Policy E2: ‘Encouraging Small Businesses’ aims to encourage proposals subject to criteria being met.

Mention is made of places like the NISA store (on The Lane, Awsworth) needing access and the lack of parking being a major issue and asking whether more could be done to develop pull in places. We appreciate the issues associated with existing shops such as NISA, which can give rise to issues that are outside the plan, especially safety where vehicles park on narrow pavements. This is something which Awsworth Parish Council has been actively pursuing in relation to whether bollards can be installed outside NISA. The narrow pavement width outside the shop is problematic in achieving this and unfortunately there is insufficient room for pull-in places (or bays) to be developed as requested. It should be noted that NISA has dedicated on-road parking spaces marked out for use by customers.

In terms of what our plan can say, Policy CFS3: ‘Protection & Enhancement of Local Shops’ aims to avoid the loss of existing shops and includes criteria to support new proposals which ensure long-term viability and vitality of retail areas. This includes at (a) increased parking and cycling provision in the vicinity of the retail areas. Policy CFS4: ‘Support for Additional Shops’ outside existing retail areas subject to criteria being met, including in relation to access, servicing, cycle and car parking and amenity. Policy TT2: ‘Car Parking’ refers more generally.

We especially welcome the congratulations offered to all involved in the Bennerley Viaduct campaign. Our plan Policies BV1 and BV2 aim to make a contribution to facilitate this important restoration project, which forms a key element of the plan’s vision for the local area (and **see Response 20** above).

We are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view.

### **37. RESIDENT H – Awsworth – Awsworth Site – Possibly more related to Outline Planning Application**

We note the comment that residents of [REDACTED] are very keen on not seeing the Awsworth Project go ahead and should be given compensation if the plan goes ahead (i.e. for new houses on land west of Awsworth inside the bypass).

It is not clear but more likely that these comments were made in response to the outline planning application currently being considered by the Local Planning Authority rather than our plan although we acknowledge there is read-across to Policy H1.

We have no other comment to make but are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view.

### **38a. RESIDENT I – Awsworth?**

We note that this response appears to be confirmation of the resident wanting to be formally notified in due course of the Local Planning Authority's decision under Regulation 19 in relation to the neighbourhood development plan (i.e. whether to 'make' or 'refuse' the Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan).

### **38b. RESIDENT I – Awsworth? – Awsworth Site – in relation to Outline Planning Application**

We note that this response is made to strongly object to the outline planning application (Ref 20/00056) not specifically our plan. However, we acknowledge that there is read-across to plan Policy H1.

The resident acknowledges that the application site is allocated for residential development under Policy 4.1 of the adopted Local Plan Part 2, for 250 homes, and removes the site from the Green Belt. Nonetheless, the resident lists a number of concerns.

**Access** – They consider access points from Shilo Way and Newtons Lane are inadequate for the number of dwellings being proposed, describing them as sub-standard and presenting a number of highway safety concerns. We agree that the vehicular access points require to be designed to an acceptable standard which is a matter for the Highways Authority to be satisfied on. We understand that promoters of the scheme Harworth have responded to meet a number of concerns raised by the HA in respect of the outline planning application which has led to amended design for access junctions.

**Traffic and parking** – Our plan acknowledges that Awsworth has existing traffic and parking problems and policies are included to deal with these to the extent that this is possible for a neighbourhood plan. Policy H1 in particular includes criterion (f)(i)-(vii) to address traffic impacts on the allocation site as well as the wider road network, including traffic-calming measures. This is a matter for the Highway Authority to be satisfied on.

**Pressure on local services** – The resident raises the issue of whether the local schools are already over-subscribed and the potential for additional children from new houses adding to the problem. This is essentially a matter for the Local Education Authority (but see **Response 18** above). As regards difficulties getting a doctor's appointment, this is not something our plan can directly affect. Policy DC1 sets out the sorts of things which new development in Awsworth will be expected to make financial contributions towards,

which we consider would precisely meet the resident's concern, that s106 monies should be secured and spent on where it is needed to improve local services for both existing and new residents.

**Pedestrian safety** – Reference is made to Policy 4.1 part 2a (of Broxtowe Part 2 Local Plan) requiring proposals to provide safe pedestrian and cycle crossing points across the bypass towards Bennerley Viaduct. The resident states that the crossing arrangements proposed (by the outline planning application) do not demonstrate that this is achievable. Our understanding is that the scheme will provide safe adequate crossing for pedestrians and cyclists towards Bennerley Viaduct in the vicinity of Naptha House, which would be an integral part of the new light-controlled junction arrangements associated with the proposed primary access to the housing site from the bypass. Policy H1(vii) specifically refers to the need to 'ensure safe, convenient and integrated, high quality walking routes through the site and enhance links that connect to Awsworth village and to important community facilities (especially.....Bennerley Viaduct....)'. It should be noted that the outline application deals with certain matters but that many detailed elements are to be reserved for a later full planning application.

**Walking and cycling routes** – Reference is made to Policy 4.1 part 2b (Broxtowe Part 2 Local Plan) requiring proposals to provide walking and cycling routes through the site and enhance links to the wider network including to Ilkeston Railway Station. The resident claims that it has not been demonstrated that this can be achieved. They comment that opportunities have been identified but no details of how this will be delivered. Again, these comments relate to the outline planning application and the neighbourhood plan. As mentioned above, our plan includes Policy H1(vii) which refers to the need to 'ensure safe, convenient and integrated, high quality walking routes through the site and enhance links that connect to Awsworth village and to important community facilities (especially.....Ilkeston Station....)'. It should be noted that the outline application deals with certain matters but that many detailed elements are to be reserved for a later full planning application.

**Concept Plan** – The resident comments that the Illustrative Masterplan accompanying the outline planning application is misleading as regards the size and height of new houses which back onto existing bungalows on Barlow Drive (North). Suggestions are made which is a matter for the Local Planning Authority to consider in relation to their determination of the outline planning application currently before them. As the resident acknowledges, matters regarding layout, scale and appearance will be dealt with under any subsequent reserved matters scheme. Our plan Policy H1 is relevant in this regard. In particular, criterion (d) looks to ensure that the layout of new homes and gardens should not unacceptably impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties by way of privacy, daylight, noise and visual intrusion. Criterion (c) states that all new homes, especially higher ones, should be located an appropriate distance from each other and from existing properties.

**Density** – The resident considers the overall net density of approximately 36 dwellings per hectare to be too high and favours 30 dph to ensure design and space around dwellings is not compromised. We would be concerned if the development was too dense. Our plan Policy H1 does not specify a net density requirement. However, paragraph 6.16 states that it is considered that the part of the site in Awsworth (about 8.2 hectares) could accommodate around 200 new homes (at a net density of about 30 dwellings per hectare).



The comments are made in response to the outline planning application not our plan. However, in relation to the plan we are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view.

**39. RESIDENT J – Awsworth – Property Owner – [REDACTED]**

The resident has **commented in respect of Designated Local Green Spaces** proposed in Policy GI 4.

We **welcome that the resident considers our plan to be a well-balanced and well-considered** proposal.

However, we **note they express one slight concern**, on the basis that the Local Green Space shown along the eastern side of [REDACTED] (denoted G5 – ‘Highway Verge at Four Lanes End and east of The Lane’) while shown as a continuous strip is, in fact, punctuated by tarmac access driveways to residential properties, including their own. While they appreciate there is no intention on the part of the plan to deny access to individual properties they **would like to see some acknowledgement** included.

We can confirm that there is no policy intention to deny access across the proposed LGS denoted G5. In practical terms we acknowledge it is difficult to depict this type of linear feature accurately on a map base. The importance of the highway verge is obviously in relation to the grassed area considered as a whole rather than as individual small sections which comprise proposed LGS shown as G5 (also noting that the same considerations apply in relation to G6).

We are happy to include an acknowledgement of the sort being requested, subject to any comments from Broxtowe Borough Council and the Examiner, regarding whether and how this matter should be clarified either in the plan’s supporting text and/or maps (Figure 15 and Policies Map).

**40. RESIDENT K – Awsworth – Supportive comments – Concern on trees**

We **welcome the resident’s supportive comment for our plan**.

A **specific concern is raised in relation to overgrown and dangerous trees** and whether the plan would give the parish the power to ask residents to remove such trees. The plan does not specifically empower the Parish Council to require residents to remove such trees. We recognise that trees can be an emotive subject for those affected by trees growing close to their property. Residents have the right to remove branches from trees overhanging their property up to the shared boundary. The Parish Council would advise any resident who has such concerns to first speak with the owner of the offending tree(s) in question to try to resolve any issues. To note that if the tree is protected by means of a Tree Preservation Order it is a criminal offence to damage the tree and prior authorisation must be sought from Broxtowe Borough Council.

Our plan supports the planting of trees wherever possible. Policy GI 5: ‘Local Woodlands, Tree Belts & Hedgerows’ specifically refers. Paragraph 8.55 confirms that consultation shows significant support for the plan to include proposals and/or policies to provide and promote Green Infrastructure, including tree planting. Paragraph 8.44 points out that there are relatively few trees within the built area of the village. Paragraph 8.45 states that garden trees within the village have been diminishing over recent years, notably in the ‘new estate’, especially in front gardens as people increasingly create hard-standings for parking. This further underlines the importance of the remaining trees within the built-up area, those at the settlement edge and in the wider Parish.

We are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view.

#### **41. RESIDENT L – Awsworth – Awsworth Housing Site – Support with modifications**

We **welcome the qualified support with modifications for our plan Policy H1** concerning houses west of Awsworth, **providing that traffic light controls are installed at the site entrance.**

We would confirm our understanding that this has always been the intention of the promoters of the scheme (Harworth Group) and which we understand would in any case be a requirement of the Highways Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) given that the primary vehicular access would need to be taken from the A6096 Awsworth – Cossall Bypass at Shilo Way.

We are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view.

#### **42. RESIDENT L – Awsworth – Former Bennerley Coal Disposal Point – Support with modifications**

We **welcome the qualified support with modifications for our plan Policy BCDP1** concerning the future use of the Bennerley Coal Disposal Point Site land. We also welcome the comment for this land to be re-used as a Country Park (and see **Response 21** above).

We are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comment and for the Examiner to take a view.

#### **43. RESIDENT M – Awsworth – Support – Policy H1 and Former Bennerley Coal Disposal Point Land**

We **welcome support for new homes on land west of Awsworth (inside the bypass)** but note this is only **subject to the stringent safeguards set out by Policy H1** being in place. This is the intention of plan policy.

We also **welcome support for our plan’s aspiration (Policy BCDP1 refers) for a ‘Country Park’** on the long-disused derelict and at the Former Bennerley Coal Disposal Point, to see the land put to beneficial re-use as a ‘country park’ and made safely accessible to the public, as a more sustainable alternative future than the economic aspirations promoted by Harworth / Pegasus (and see **Response 21** above).

We are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view.

#### **38. RESIDENT N – Awsworth – Support – Whole Plan**

We **welcome the resident’s full support for the whole plan.**

We are encouraged by the comments that the plan’s objectives and policies are extremely well thought out and are believed to accurately reflect the aspirations and comments of the local community and will help to keep and foster Awsworth’s strong sense of community into the future.

We are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view.

#### **45. RESIDENT O – Cossall – Oppose – Any potential boundary change**

We **note the resident’s opposition to any potential boundary change with reference to Appendix 1 – Awsworth Parish Area.**

Their understanding is that this proposal intends to redraw Awsworth boundaries to consume the surrounding areas, including their property. They are strongly opposed, as they purchased their property within Cossall and

object to any imposed change. They say they have had no communication from Awsworth to request their feedback, and were not included in the consultation, presumably as they are not in Awsworth. They feel that any such change has to be voted on by, and only by the affected persons, and are positive that the Cossall residential vote will be to remain within Cossall (and believe that this was backed by a recent Cossall neighbourhood survey). They cannot comment about other affected areas, only to suggest that their opinions should also be sourced accordingly.

We would confirm that this 'aim' is not a land-use 'proposal' of the plan. AIM APB1 'Awsworth Parish Boundaries' explains that one that has issue emerged via our Neighbourhood Plan process concerns Awsworth's Parish boundaries and how they relate to our neighbouring Parishes (see **Response 1** above).

Also, to confirm as the resident recognises, that being a resident of a neighbouring parish would not as a matter of course require them to be formally consulted on the Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan. Nonetheless, it should be noted that we did choose to consult throughout the process with those residents in Cossall Parish who live on Newtons Lane / Awsworth Lane / The Glebe and who were most closely affected by the plan.

We are content for Broxtowe Borough Council to add any comments and for the Examiner to take a view.

#### **46. RESIDENT P – Awsworth – [REDACTED] – Objection – Local Green Space Designation G13**

We **note the resident's strong objection to proposed designation of land on their property as a (local) green space**. We assume that this must relate to the **area denoted as G13 'Glasshouse Yard Grassland' under Policy GI 4: 'Designated Local Green Spaces'**.

As the resident confirms they were **previously consulted about the proposed designation**. They were given repeated opportunities to comment at earlier stages, both in advance of and at the pre-submission consultation. However, they did not respond at the informal or formal stages. Clearly, it would have been more helpful had they done so.

Similarly, as regards their **suggestion that the land should be brought into housing use**, it would have been more helpful and timely to have made such comments earlier in the plan process in order for this alternative to be properly considered. The strategic requirement set by the Broxtowe Part 1 Local Plan (for up to 350 new houses at Awsworth between 2011 – 2028) has already been satisfied, including the major allocation for 250 new homes on land west of Awsworth (inside the bypass) contained in Broxtowe Part 2 Local Plan and supported by Policy H1 in our Neighbourhood Plan (for around 200 homes).

Further, as regards the value of the land, our plan proposes that the area denoted G13 should remain undeveloped and designated as a Local Green Space for the reasons set out at paragraphs 8.35 – 8.38.

However, we would particularly welcome any comments from Broxtowe Borough Council and the Examiner's view in this regard.

**END**