
**CHETWYND:
THE TOTON AND CHILWELL
NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM**

SUPPLEMENTARY PLAN MODIFICATIONS

October 2021

CONTENTS

1	Introduction	3
2	Policy Changes following Strategic Environmental Assessment	4
3	Policy Changes Suggested by Broxtowe Borough Council at SEA Screening	14

1. Introduction

This supplementary Plan modifications document details the policy revisions made to the June 2020 submitted version of the Neighbourhood Plan following the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Environmental Report received in September 2021.

The Environmental Report recommended modifications to three Plan policies, plus suggested beneficial changes to one further policy (Section D), and also to one guideline (Section C).

In addition, the Forum Steering Group agreed to revise other policies based on suggestions received from Broxtowe Borough Council at the SEA Screening Stage in February 2021. These were mainly to improve clarity, and relate to four Plan policies (Section D). The Steering Group declined to change two further policies as the suggestions relating to these were not supported or required in the final SEA report. Nevertheless for transparency, the two latter suggestions are included in the relevant section below.

Changes are noted in red or as red strikethrough in the tables below. Where no changes were considered necessary, a comment has been provided in the table. Where changes have been made to policy wording in Section D, this has also been amended in Appendix III: Alignment with Planning Policies. Where necessary page numbering has been updated in the contents table on page 4.

The only exception (noted here only) is to minor changes made to the back cover of the Plan itself, where the contact details have been amended to a single generic email address, and the publication date is noted as “Published June 2020, Revised October 2021”.

2. Policy Changes following Strategic Environmental Assessment

Neighbourhood Plan Policy Changes Recommended in the AECOM Environmental Report Paragraph 4.10.1			
June 2020 Plan Policy Wording (& Appendix III)	Recommendation	New Policy Wording	Additional Comments
<p>ENV01 Toton Fields LNR, Hobgoblin Wood, Memorial Garden, Ghost House Lane, Manor Farm Recreation Ground, Inham Nook Recreation Ground and Chetwynd Barracks Playing Fields are candidates to be designated as Local Green Spaces [I] to assure their long-term protection. In addition, other green spaces may be designated during the Plan period.</p> <p><u>Justification</u> Toton Fields LNR, Hobgoblin Wood, Memorial Garden, Ghost House Lane, both Manor Farm and Inham Nook Recreation Grounds and the Barracks Playing Fields are all valued and valuable green spaces in our Area. These will be protected from future development by being awarded the status of 'Local Green Space'. Once designation has been conferred, proposals to improve their biodiversity will be expected as part of the required net gain by NPPF para 8c.</p>	<p>ENV01 could be strengthened by designating the sites identified as candidate sites as Local Green Space. The policy could further be strengthened by clarifying how the plan making process will support the identification and designation of other green spaces, although this may be more appropriate to address in supporting text.</p>	<p>ENV01 Toton Fields LNR, Hobgoblin Wood, Memorial Garden, Ghost House Lane, Manor Farm Recreation Ground, Inham Nook Recreation Ground and Chetwynd Barracks Playing Fields are candidates to will be designated as Local Green Spaces [I] to assure their long-term protection. In addition, other green spaces may be designated during the Plan period.</p> <p><u>Justification</u> Toton Fields LNR, Hobgoblin Wood, Memorial Garden, Ghost House Lane, both Manor Farm and Inham Nook Recreation Grounds and the Barracks Playing Fields are all valued and valuable green spaces in our Area. These will be protected from future development by being awarded the status of 'Local Green Space'. These seven sites are all valuable and valued green spaces in our Area, and need to be protected from future development by being awarded the status of 'Local Green Space'. Additional green spaces in the Area (such as the quarry area within Chetwynd Barracks), along with the new green spaces created under ENV03, will be assessed during the Plan period. Where appropriate, these will be designated as Local Green Spaces. Once designation has been conferred, proposals to</p>	<p>The Forum is currently undertaking the process to designate the seven sites listed in ENV01 as 'Local Green Spaces'.</p>

		improve their biodiversity will be expected as part of the required net gain by NPPF para 8c.	
<p>HAS02 In developments of 50 homes or more, the number of new dwellings should be such that the number of all dwellings of all sizes (new and existing) meets the future needs of residents in the Area. Developers should ensure that there is adequate provision of smaller homes (with fewer bedrooms) and bungalows to provide a dynamic housing market and encourage both first-time buyers and last-time buyers.</p> <p>Justification The Broxtowe Local Plan Policy 15 [IV: <i>ibid</i>] states: "Developments of market and affordable housing should provide an appropriate mix of house size, type, tenure and density to ensure that the needs of the residents of all parts of the Borough, and all age groups (including the elderly), are met." Analysis of the 2011 Census data reveals that the Area has a higher percentage of 4+ bedroom houses than Broxtowe Borough (19.6% vs 17.2%) as well as a higher percentage of three-bedroom houses (52.1% vs 49.5%). This indicates there is a shortage of one- and two-bedroom properties in the Area. During the consultations, there were references to the need for houses suitable for last-time buyers [1] to downsize without leaving the Area. The lack of bungalows was particularly noted, and views were expressed that the availability of such housing would</p>	<p>HAS02 could be strengthened by referencing and requiring development proposals to accord with a detailed mix of housing types and sizes supported by recent and neighbourhood area specific evidence. Flexibility could also be incorporated in the policy to ensure long-term sustainability by allowing variations to the housing mix where justified by more up-to-date evidence at the local scale.</p>	<p>HAS02 In all developments of 50 homes or more on Chetwynd Barracks and the Strategic Location for Growth (and elsewhere in developments of 10 homes or more), the number of new dwellings should be such that the number of all dwellings of all sizes (new and existing) meets the future needs of residents in the Area. Developers should ensure that there is adequate provision of smaller homes (with fewer bedrooms) and bungalows to provide a dynamic housing market and encourage both first-time buyers and last-time buyers.</p> <p>Development proposals should provide a mix of housing types and sizes as outlined. However, where justified by new evidence during the Plan period, variation to the housing mix will be considered by the Neighbourhood Forum in future.</p> <p>Justification – no changes made</p>	

<p>improve occupancy rates as people would have the opportunity to downsize allowing families to move into the larger houses.</p>			
<p>LHC02 Development of the Barracks must respect its heritage and seek to conserve/re-purpose its significant assets where feasible.</p> <p>Justification</p> <p>Significant assets [Appendix II contains a full listing] within the Barracks that should be considered for sympathetic conservation/re-purposing include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● War memorial and associated gardens ● Officers Mess (Woodside House) ● WWI Infirmary ● Building 157 (Filled Shell Store) ● The tunnels leading under Hobgoblin Wood. <p>Proposals to re-purpose one of these assets as a local museum celebrating the history of the site will be strongly supported (see Chapter 10). It needs to be noted that the tunnels have not been fully assessed, so should be treated as a 'local hazard' that requires further investigation before decisions can be made as to their future role/purpose.</p>	<p>LHC02 could be improved by designating the identified significant assets (listed in the supporting text and Appendix II) as local listed buildings and features. This should add an additional level of protection to these buildings. The policy could further be strengthened by setting out measures to require new development to preserve and where possible enhance the historic significance of these assets. A presumption in favour of their protection or requirement for substantial public benefit to offset any harm or loss of the heritage asset would be desirable.</p>	<p>LHC02 Development of the Barracks must respect its heritage and seek to conserve/re-purpose its significant assets where feasible. New developments are required to preserve, and where possible, enhance the historic significance of these assets. There is a presumption in favour of their protection and/or re-purposing for public benefit.</p> <p>Justification</p> <p>New text added at the end of the existing wording:- All the heritage assets listed in Appendix II are considered by the Forum to be of local historical significance, and should be protected from future development by being 'Locally Listed' within the Plan. Some of these assets are included in the Nottinghamshire Historic Environment Record. [IV: Chetwynd HER Report and Chetwynd Site HER Map]</p> <p>These two new references have also been added to Appendix IV: Evidence Base.</p>	

Neighbourhood Plan Policy Changes Suggested by the AECOM Environmental Report Paragraph 4.7.2

June 2020 Plan Policy Wording (& Appendix III)	Recommendation	New Policy Wording	Additional Comments
<p>HAS01 In new developments of more than ten homes, at least 30% of properties should be 'Affordable'. This target should include a mix of 'Affordable to Rent' and 'Affordable to Buy'. Developments should not significantly change the Area's existing proportions of social rented, market rented and owner-occupied dwellings.</p> <p>Justification</p> <p>There is a need for affordable housing. The Local Plan Part 2 for the Beeston sub-market (which includes the Neighbourhood Area) requires that for large developments, at least 30% should be Affordable Housing to buy and rent. The Broxtowe Social and Affordable Housing Needs Study further states "a 10% target for affordable home ownership may be appropriate". [IV: <i>Social and Affordable Housing Need Study</i>].</p> <p>The most recently publicly available figures for the Area should be used to determine the ratio between rented and owner-occupied. The figures available to the Forum were the 2011 Census which showed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% of households were owner occupied • 25% of households were rented (11.5% social rented, 13.5% market rented) <p>During the consultation sessions run by the Forum, key opinions captured [IV:</p>	<p>The NDP policies support the delivery of affordable housing and requires a minimum of 30% of housing units to be 'affordable' which accords with requirements set out in the Local Plan. However, Policy HAS01 further requires this to include a mix of 'Affordable to Rent' and 'Affordable to Buy' properties. Whilst this should help diversify local affordable housing provision, the policy goes on to state that 'developments should not significantly change the Area's existing proportions of social rented, market rented and owner-occupied dwellings'. This is likely to undermine affordable housing delivery, in particular for tenures such as shared ownership and affordable rent, as demand for these tenures are likely to increase.</p>	<p>HAS01 In new developments of more than ten homes, at least 30% of properties should be 'Affordable'. This target should include a mix of 'Affordable to Rent' and 'Affordable to Buy'. Developments should not significantly change the Area's existing proportions of social rented, market rented and owner-occupied dwellings. Developments should ensure that the Tenure Mix meets the future needs of Residents within the Neighbourhood Area whilst recognising the present proportions in the Neighbourhood Area of 75% Owner Occupied (including shared ownership), 11.5% Affordable Rented and 13.5% Market Rented homes.</p> <p>Justification</p> <p>The only change is as per below:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% of households were owner occupied (including shared ownership) 	

<p><i>Housing Position Paper: Comments</i> about housing were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the ratio of rented homes/owner occupied should be maintained.• rented homes should be on a 'Build to Rent' basis to give greater security of tenure;• the percentage of social rented housing should be maintained close to present levels;• affordable homes to own (through Starter Homes, Discounted market sales or Other Affordable Routes) should be included in developments to achieve Broxtowe Local Plan targets [IV: <i>Policy 15</i>].			
---	--	--	--

Neighbourhood Plan Policy Changes Suggested by the AECOM Environmental Report Paragraph 4.10.2

AECOM Comments (via Email)	Recommendation	New Policy Wording	Additional Comments
<p>Please refer to the Scoping Report for the recommendations which were made at the scoping stage. These mostly relate to topics which have been scoped out of the SEA.</p> <p>In regard to recommendations in the Scoping Report, these are set out under X.4 (scoping outcome) of each theme which has been scoped out. Of particular relevance are 2.4, 3.4, 4.4, 7.4 and 9.4.</p>	<p>Air Quality</p> <p>2.4.1 The NDP does not intend to allocate sites and is unlikely to propose changes that would significantly generate more road trips in the plan area (and associated particulates and NO2). The NDP area also does not include AQMAs or any known significant issues in relation to poor air quality. Therefore, due to the absence of significant and tangible air quality issues in the NDP area, air quality has been SCOPED OUT for the purposes of the SEA process. This means that the plan will not be assessed for its performance against air quality objectives (given that no significant issues or opportunities are expected to arise through the CTC NDP).</p> <p>2.4.2. Nevertheless, positive planning could be beneficial for air quality through opportunities to improve accessibility, particularly in terms of active travel and encouraging more local journeys and sustainable connections. Therefore, opportunities which address issues such as accessibility and sustainable communities whilst also enhancing air quality are encouraged.</p>	<p>No changes to the wording of policies have been made – see comments.</p>	<p>We believe 2.4.2 has been addressed through the Plan policies:-</p> <p>INF05 - reduce levels of traffic congestion & pollution;</p> <p>INF02 – new north-south road to relieve congestion;</p> <p>INF07 - re-routing bus services;</p> <p>INF09 - reduce travel demand;</p> <p>HAS03 – buildings constructed to meet the highest possible energy efficiency standards;</p> <p>HAS05 – domestic & community low carbon energy capture;</p> <p>HAS07 - Modern Methods of Construction to minimise time on site;</p> <p>URB06 - emphasis on green space and planting;</p> <p>LCH08 – provision of allotments & communal gardens within easy walking distance.</p> <p>In addition, the current suggestion by government is that the low pressure gas network will be terminated by 2050, and therefore all new homes should be constructed with electric heating, including heat pumps & solar panels which will improve air quality – see HAS05.</p>
<p>Section 3.4 more or less sets out direction.</p>	<p>Biodiversity</p> <p>3.4.1 The SEA topic ‘Biodiversity’ has been SCOPED IN to the SEA.</p> <p>3.4.2. The NDP does not propose to allocate sites for housing or employment use and therefore is</p>	<p>No changes to the wording of policies have been made – see comments.</p>	<p>We believe 3.4 has been addressed through the Plan’s Environment policies, including the amendment to ENV01 above.</p>

	<p>unlikely to cause harm or the loss of important habitats or significantly undermine ecological connectivity.</p> <p>3.4.3. The NDP presents opportunities to enhance ecological networks across the Plan area and support ecological connectivity with the Attenborough Gravel Pits SSSI, LWS and other habitats including green spaces in and around the NDP area. It will also be important to ensure that species do not rely upon habitats outside of designated habitat areas.</p>		
	<p>Climate Change (including Flood Risk)</p> <p>4.4.1 With regards to climate change, it is unlikely that the NDP will have significant effects on levels of GHG emissions as the Plan does not seek to allocate sites and any growth involved is likely to be relatively minor. Furthermore, standards for energy and water efficiency are established nationally and at strategic level. The scope for the NDP to deliver substantial improvements is therefore unlikely to be significant. Therefore, Climate Change has been SCOPED OUT of the SEA.</p> <p>4.4.2. Whilst part of the NDP area falls within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and areas at risk of surface water flooding, the Plan does not seek to allocate sites and where growth is proposed, it is unlikely to deviate significantly from the protection afforded through national and local planning policy. Therefore, Flood risk has been SCOPED OUT of the SEA, but the following recommendations are highlighted at</p>	<p>GUIDELINE: 02 Flood Risk and Drainage. Masterplans must demonstrate how they minimise flood risk across all zones both in terms of surface water flooding and flooding from other sources/water courses. Streams in the Area should be re-naturalised.</p> <p>10.10 The Forum seeks to minimise the use of water across the Area and to minimise the flood impact both upon the Area and other areas. Masterplans should demonstrate how they are safe from flooding and, moreover, do not increase flood risk elsewhere. Flood risk assessments should be carried out before any development is approved. At appropriate points, flood risk assessments (including in the Erewash valley and its catchment) should be submitted that incorporate the principles of water-sensitive urban design, limiting surface water runoff rate to the greenfield rate, and incorporating SUDS (Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems) detailed in The Environment Agency’s ‘Approach to</p>	<p>We believe 4.4.2 has been addressed through the Plan policies and Guidelines (see below), and with this additional wording to Guideline 02.</p> <p>GUIDELINE: 03 De-culvert Moor Brook. Moor Brook which runs through the Barracks, should be re-naturalised as part of the green/blue Infrastructure of the Barracks site. De-culverting will open up this watercourse and provide a sustainable outfall for surface water drainage and help create a new blue/green space.</p> <p>GUIDELINE: 07 Urban Design and Public Realm also includes flood risk and SuDS –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . use of porous surfacing where appropriate to minimise flood risk by reducing the amount of surface water entering the sewerage system, and directing water back into the natural water cycle; . use of source control SuDS, such as tree pits and bio-retention areas, to manage surface water and introduce green elements into the build environment;

	<p>this stage to help inform the NDP's development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should avoid Flood Zones 2 and 3 and should not increase the risk of fluvial flooding. • The NDP should encourage the sustainable management of surface water run-off and drainage (where possible) through measures such as SuDS, ensuring that the risk of flooding is not increased either within the Plan area or downstream. 	<p>Groundwater Protection' [IV: <i>ibid</i>].</p> <p>10.11 Porous surfaces where appropriate, and source control SUDS should be employed to minimize the impacts of development on flood risk. Surface water runoff should also be direct to sustainable outfall such as infiltration or watercourses where possible.</p> <p>10.12 Consideration should also be given to recycling water for non-potable use in residential and commercial premises to support policy HAS06. Planning contributions will be expected to fund flood mitigation infrastructure where necessary.</p> <p>10.13 Channel capacity calculations or hydraulic modelling are required to support the Flood Risk Assessment which should be completed to support any future planning application in order to ensure that the development is safe and does not increase flood risk to third parties outside the Barracks area.</p>	<p>In addition the Justification within Policy HAS06 includes:-</p> <p><u>Rainwater and Greywater Recycling:</u> should be included in all new developments. Residents have suggested that rainwater and recycled greywater should be used where mains water is not required. This approach supports the Flood Protection requirements of the NPPF, Aligned Core Strategy and Local Plan. It reduces the pressure on both providing mains water and disposing of wastewater.</p> <p>It is calculated that based upon an average household of 2.3 people, using this water to flush toilets (6 litres per flush) could save 25,000 litres of water per household per year and therefore help reduce household bills.</p> <p><u>Flood Risk Reduction:</u> by absorbing rainwater into local storage the risk of flash floods will be reduced.</p>
<p>Section 7.4 does not actually set out a recommendation as you are not allocating sites, and no unplanned significant land resources are available in the plan area.</p>	<p>Land, Soil & Water Resources</p> <p>7.4.1 The topic of 'Land, Soil and Water Resources' has been SCOPED OUT of the SEA, as the NDP is unlikely to have a significant effect on soil / agricultural land and water quality.</p> <p>7.4.2. There are important soil resources in the NDP area that ought to be protected. Whilst approximately 60 hectares of agricultural land is proposed for development, this is pre-established in the Local Plan and the NDP does not seek to allocate sites. Proposals in the NDP for the loss of soil resources is unlikely to exceed 5ha (given that the plan does not seek to allocate sites and</p>	<p>No changes to the wording of policies have been made – see comment from AECOM.</p>	

	<p>Green Belt constraints), and so a significant effect upon soil resources is considered unlikely in any event. Soil is thus scoped out of the SEA.</p> <p>7.4.3. Despite the NDP area being covered by NVZs, it is considered unlikely that significant effects upon water quality would occur as a result of the NDP. The scope of the plan and scale of growth is not major, and changes to land use are not anticipated to increase nitrate pollution. With regards to waste water treatment and drainage, the plan is not expected to cause issues to existing and planned infrastructure, and so significant effects in this respect are also unlikely. Consequently, water quality has been scoped out of the SEA.</p>		
	<p>Health & Wellbeing</p> <p>9.4.1 The SEA topic 'Health and Wellbeing' has been SCOPED OUT of the SEA.</p> <p>9.4.2. The NDP does not propose to allocate sites for housing, employment or other land uses. Growth is proposed in the plan area in the Local Plan which would increase some demand for local health and recreational facilities. However, Local Plan site allocations are supported with policy provisions to safeguard existing and deliver new educational, community, health and open space provision locally to mitigate pressures from the increase in local population.</p> <p>9.4.3. The NDP area has relatively good provision of health, wellbeing and recreational facilities. There are opportunities for further enhancement</p>	<p>No changes to the wording of policies have been made – see comments.</p>	<p>We believe 9.4.3 has been addressed through the Plan policies. In particular:-</p> <p>Environment – ENV01 to ENV04 Designation & access to Local Green Spaces; establishment of new blue/green infrastructure; incorporating new green corridors & green spaces in masterplans. Infrastructure – INF03 & INF04 Provision of new dedicated cycle routes & lanes. Leisure – LHC05 to LHC08 Provision of new medical facilities; provision of a new leisure centre; retention & improvement of sports pavilion & playing fields; provision of allotments & communal gardens.</p> <p>Also see comments above under Air Quality.</p>

	<p>through the NDP from further protection to existing and improved provision and accessibility to existing and new provision. However, in the absence of site allocations and major deprivation issues, the scope for the plan to have effects on health and wellbeing is unlikely to be significant. There are also no known groups that are likely to experience effects of the NDP disproportionately.</p>		
--	--	--	--

3. Policy Changes Suggested by Broxtowe Borough Council at SEA Screening

Neighbourhood Plan Policy Changes Suggested by Broxtowe Borough Council at SEA Screening			
June 2020 Plan Policy Wording (& Appendix III)	Recommendation (highlighted)	New Policy Wording	Comments from SEA
<p>INF02 In line with INF01 a new north-south primary access road is required to both relieve issues with Stapleford Lane and also act as the local infrastructure for the development within Chetwynd Barracks and SLG. This should link to the new road infrastructure being developed for the new East Midlands Hub Station.</p>	<p>One of the Key Development Requirements of the Broxtowe Part 2 Local Plan within Part 4(d) of Policy 3.1 is to 'ensure that the ability to provide a north/south road to link to the Tram Park and Ride site is positively facilitated by development'. However, Neighbourhood Plan Policy INF02 goes further by stating that 'a new north-south primary access road is required'. The construction of a new road would be likely to have a very negative impact upon the SEA issues of Landscape, Human Health and possibly other issues relevant to the environment, including Air Quality and Biodiversity. Reword the policy as an 'aspiration'.</p>	<p>No changes to the wording of this policy have been made – see comments.</p>	<p>SEA 4.8.2 supports INF02 -</p> <p>Policy INF02 sets out a requirement for a 'north-south primary access road' to link Chetwynd Barracks to the A52, relieving otherwise pressure from Stapleford Lane and providing additional capacity to facilitate proposed growth. Proposals for the access road are pre-established in the emerging Toton and Chetwynd Barracks Strategic Masterplan and detailed design for the road is being prepared. The Local Plan policies further support opportunities for a north-south road link within Chetwynd Barracks to the Toton Park and Ride (Policy 3.1), and for a masterplan for the Toton strategic growth site to consider how the site will connect to Chetwynd Barracks and necessary highway improvements to provide acceptable access to both sites (Policy 3.2). Whilst the aspirations of the policy for a new access road are pre-established, outlining the requirement for the access road in the NDP should help ensure its delivery and therefore safeguard the planned enhancement of road and associated transport connectivity and capacity in the local area.</p>

<p>LHC01 Proposals to develop one/more neighbourhood-scale, pedestrian-friendly retail centres (one preferably next to the Memorial Garden in the Barracks) will be encouraged.</p>	<p>Part 6(b) of Policy 3.1 of the Broxtowe Part 2 Local Plan, which was subjected to a full process of SA, required the provision of ‘a small retail/service centre to meet local need along the main through route’. This Neighbourhood Plan Policy arguably goes further by encouraging the provision of potentially more than one retail centre, including one adjacent to the Memorial Gardens. Part 7 (a) of Part 2 Local Plan Policy 3.1 requires the provision of ‘public access to the Listed Memorial to workers of National Filling Factory No.6’, as well as the provision of ‘public space to the south of the memorial’ and a requirement to ‘retain/ enhance the existing memorial garden’.</p> <p>There could potentially be negative impacts of the proposed Policy upon SEA issues including ‘Cultural Heritage’, as a result of encouraging a new retail centre to be located within what could be considered to be the ‘setting’ of a listed memorial. There could be further negative impacts by encouraging the development of more than one retail centre within the development site. These proposals have not been subjected to the process of SA.</p> <p>Clarify the policy so that it is clear that only one neighbourhood-scale centre is proposed on the Chetwynd Barracks site. This is not currently clear, especially as the ‘Justification’ text for the policy appears only to refer to Chetwynd Barracks.</p>	<p>LHC01 Proposals to develop one/more two neighbourhood-scale, pedestrian-friendly retail centres (one preferably next to the Memorial Garden in the Barracks) will be encouraged. One preferably next to the Memorial Gardens in the Barracks to provide a focus for the retail centre and a ‘heart’ for the new community. With the other situated within the development west of Toton Lane. See also policy EMP05.</p>	<p>SEA 4.5.2 supports LHC01 –</p> <p>Policy LHC01 supports the development of a retail centre next to the Memorial Gardens in the Chetwynd Barracks site. Whilst the gardens are not a designated heritage asset, they are of historic significance and considered to form part of the wider setting of the Grade II listed Memorial to workers of National Shell Filling Factory No.6, which falls to the south of the gardens along Chetwynd Road. In the absence of detailed design proposed through an independent masterplanning exercise, the potential for the development of a retail centre to have effects on the character and setting of the listed building and Memorial Gardens are unclear. However, other policy provisions in the NDP, local and national planning policy, including requirements in Policy 3.1 of the Local Plan Part 2 for the provision of public space to the south of the memorial, should help protect and where possible enhance the historic significance and setting of these important heritage assets.</p>
--	---	--	--

<p>LHC04 George Spencer Academy is expected to manage the large increase in pupils arising from the additional homes being built in the Area. The Academy will need to develop plans to expand capacity as the configuration of the current site is unlikely to meet demand.</p>	<p>Whilst it could be argued that the operational requirements of the George Spencer Academy are outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan and control of the Neighbourhood Forum, the potential impact of the Policy is at this stage largely unknown. Depending upon the preferred option, it could have a considerable impact upon a number of SEA issues. Reword the policy as an ‘aspiration’.</p>	<p>LHC04 George Spencer Academy is expected to manage the large increase in pupils arising from the additional homes being built in the Area. It is anticipated that the Academy will need (and should be encouraged) to develop plans to expand capacity as the configuration of the current site is unlikely to meet demand. Relocation of the Academy adjacent to the new leisure centre (see LHC06) is the preferred option and will be supported.</p>	<p>The SEA makes no comment on LHC04 i.e. no negative impacts were identified. See also ASPIRATION: 08 Relocate George Spencer Academy. Relocating George Spencer Academy to the east side of Stapleford Lane provides numerous opportunities: a) build a new, appropriately sized academy on a single site away from the high levels of pollution from the A52. b) free existing site (south of A52) to be re-used as roads/tram route to the East Midlands Hub Station.</p>
<p>LHC06 A new Leisure Centre should be built in the Area to cope with demand for leisure services arising from increased residential population as well as the significant numbers expected to be working at the Innovation Campus.</p>	<p>Part 2 Local Plan Policy 3.2 requires that a Strategic Masterplan be produced, which provides ‘space for provision of a relocated Leisure hub with space for a Leisure Centre including indoor sports centre and 25m swimming pool and outdoor sports pitches’. However, Neighbourhood Plan Policy LHC06 goes further to state that a new leisure centre ‘should be built’. Whilst such a development may make a positive contribution to the ‘Human Health’ SEA issue, it may also negatively impact upon a number of other SEA issues, including Landscape and Biodiversity. There may also be other impacts, particularly if other facilities within the local area were to be replaced. Reword the policy as an ‘aspiration’.</p>	<p>No changes to the wording of this policy have been made – see comments.</p>	<p>The SEA makes no comment on LHC06 i.e. no negative impacts were identified.</p>

<p>EMP02 Development of commercial property on Chetwynd Barracks should seek to reuse existing buildings where feasible. Proposals to locate the centre of employment zone around Building 157 will be strongly supported along with proposals to maximise the re-use of some/all of the building.</p>	<p>Part 6(c) of Broxtowe Part 2 Local Plan Policy 3.1 includes the provision of ‘small scale employment development’ as a ‘Key Development Requirement’ for the Chetwynd Barracks site. However, Neighbourhood Plan Policy EMP02 is not entirely consistent with this, as it states that: ‘Development of commercial property on Chetwynd Barracks should seek to reuse existing buildings where feasible. Proposals to locate the centre of employment zone around Building 157 will be strongly supported along with proposals to maximise the re-use of some / all of the building’. As there are many large buildings on the site which could be re-purposed for commercial uses, it is possible that the Neighbourhood Plan Policy could allow for significantly more commercial development than was intended by the Part 2 Local Plan, which could result in a negative impact upon some SEA issues. This should be balanced against the potential positive impacts on SEA issues of adapting and re-using existing building stock and thus reducing waste and resources.</p> <p>Amend the wording of the policy to make clear the types of potential uses which would and would not be acceptable for Building 157, along with the potential extent of these uses. Make it clear within the policy that large-scale manufacturing as well as industrial and storage and distribution centre-type uses would not be supported.</p>	<p>EMP02 Development of commercial property on Chetwynd Barracks should seek to reuse existing buildings where feasible. Proposals to locate the centre of employment zone around Building 157 will be strongly supported along with proposals to maximise the re-use of some/all of the building.</p> <p>Small to medium scale employment will be supported, but any proposals for a large scale industrial storage and distribution facility for Building 157 will not be.</p>	<p>The SEA makes no comment on EMP02 i.e. no negative impacts were identified.</p> <p>The policy justification already includes suggested potential uses for Building 157.</p>
---	---	---	--

<p>EMPO5 Create a plaza-style neighbourhood shopping centre in Chetwynd Barracks. Proposals to create such an area next to the Memorial Gardens will be strongly supported.</p>	<p>Please refer to the comments in relation to Neighbourhood Plan Policy LHC01, as the same issues also apply to this Neighbourhood Plan Policy. Amend the wording of the policy, possibly including some text from the 'Justification', to stress the importance of the siting of a neighbourhood shopping centre next to the Memorial Gardens respecting both the heritage asset and also its setting.</p>	<p>EMPO5 Create a plaza-style neighbourhood shopping retail centre in Chetwynd Barracks. Proposals to create such an area next to the Memorial Gardens will be strongly supported, as will another retail centre within the development west of Toton Lane. See also policy LHC01 for the siting of the retail centre next to the Memorial Gardens as a 'heart' for the community, and also to respect its heritage and setting.</p>	<p>The SEA makes no comment on EMPO5 i.e. no negative impacts were identified.</p> <p>Policy re-worded to be consistent with the LHC01.</p>
--	--	---	---