

Policy 2 The Spatial Strategy

I object to the Policy text and the Justification

3 (a)

I object to the housing target of 6,150 for Broxtowe.

I object to Field Farm (Green Belt land) being put forward as an SUE and a Strategic Site within the next five years or at anytime and any moving of the existing Green Belt boundary. I object to any development on Field Farm.

I object to Field Farm being given the status of 'strategic allocations' meaning it is expected to be delivered within 5 years whereas the brown field site of Boots is marked as a 'strategic location' meaning it is expected to deliver after five years. The Boots site should be a "strategic allocation".

3 (d)

I object to a target of 5,100 homes elsewhere within Broxtowe including or adjoining the Key Settlements of Awsworth, those parts of Eastwood within in my constituency and Kimberley. I believe the people of Brinsley object to any change in their existing Green Belt boundary and I support and adopt their objections though I am not their Member of Parliament.

I object to the lack of allocation of the remaining 2,550 houses and the lack of identification of suitable sites. This failing puts at risk all Green Belt sites identified in the SHLAA (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) including the Green Belt land at Toton. This lack of allocation has wrongly led some people to believe that if a site they do not want to see developed, is not included within the Core Strategy it is not at risk of being developed.

5. Kimberley and Stapleford have not been designated as Town Centres in the absence of any consultation with their Town Councils or the community. Eastwood has also been excluded (on the basis I represent the town's environs) again without any consultation. The process of drafting a Core Strategy should have involved all three communities in determining future development of their towns. If they had, then Neighbourhood Plans could have been compiled to regenerate and bring jobs to these three towns; development in Broxtowe appears to mean nothing more than new houses.

I by no means object to Beeston to being designated a Town Centre but do object to the lack of public consultation which could have led to a Neighbourhood Plan. There is no mention of the tram line works going through the Town centre affording considerable opportunity for regeneration and development. I note the complete absence of any development proposals on brown field sites in the Town Centre and draw attention to the long standing resistance by the Borough Council to allow development of a ten acre site on High Road for a mixed development of housing, business and community facilities.*

6. (b)

Not one road has been identified as requiring improvement within Broxtowe (the A610 and Nuthall roundabout and the roads leading to the Ikea Retail Park all require considerable improvement). I

also object to the exclusion of any extension of the existing tram network and note there has been no consultation with Kimberley or Greasley Parish Councils in relation to any extension of the network to Kimberley.

Justification

Paragraphs 3.2.1 to 3.2.23 and 3.2.36 – 3.2.43

I object to all or any parts of the above paragraphs which

- determine Broxtowe as part of the Greater Nottingham housing market,
- do not provide any evidence on what basis the overall target of 36,850 has been divided between the four Local Authority areas
- in any way moves the existing Green Belt boundary in Broxtowe or puts any Green Belt land at risk of development.

Several pieces of information lead me to doubt the adequacy of a target figure of 6,150 houses for Broxtowe.

One way in which the RSS figure of 6,150 is not relevant is that the Regional Strategy was prepared using 2004-based Household Projections.

In addition, the Housing Background Position Paper shows that it would ostensibly be credible to have a lower predicted housing figure than predicted in the Core Strategies (HBPP, p.7 Table 1). Moreover, the conclusion in the Housing Background Position Paper was reached on a predicted population of 111,800 in 2010, a figure stated in the Core Strategy (2.71).

As the 2011 Census results show, Broxtowe's population in 2011 was 109,500 having increased from 107,500 in 2001; this leads me to further doubt the relevance of a target figure of 6,150 for Broxtowe.

I fully support any development on brown field land, notably at the Boots site.

Policy 3: The Nottingham-Derby Green Belt

Policy and Justification 3.3.1 -3.3.5 (but not paragraph 3.3.4)

I object to the entire section which moves the Green Belt boundary in Broxtowe and which also fails to protect existing Green Belt

I particularly object to the lack of identifiable sites at the strategic locations of Eastwood and Kimberley and the policy that Green Belt boundaries will be reviewed sometime in the future. Given the importance of the Core Strategy and its avowed aim to meet the housing needs of the Borough until 2028, I object to the lack of identification of sites and a determination within the Core Strategy of the Green Belt boundary. This profound failing prevents many people in the Borough from having their say in the future of the Core Strategy and I strongly object on their behalf. It has led many people to the view that if a site has not been identified then it is "safe".

I particularly object to paragraph 3.3.2. and seek to replace the relevant part with the more accurate summary of the Nottingham-Derby Green Belt Review, Notts County Council 2006 as referenced in the June 2012 Evidence Base Report and which states "This strategic review was undertaken as part of the evidence base for the preparation of the Regional plan review. It highlighted that the area between Nottingham and Derby is overall the most important area of Green Belt....."

Policy 4: Employment Provision and Economic Development

I object to the lack of any specific proposals to strengthen and allow economic development and boost employment in Stapleford, Kimberley and Eastwood.

34,000 sq metres is to be assigned to Broxtowe at "Beeston" but there are no more details. 15 hectares of industrial and warehousing is also allocated to the Borough but again there are no details. My objection is the lack of detail and concern that new jobs will be created in the south of the Borough but Stapleford and the north of the Borough is regarded as nothing more than housing development.

Policy 6: Role of Town and Local Centres

I object to the lack of consultation with the residents of, or the elected representatives of Kimberley, Stapleford and Eastwood about the designation of their towns. I object to the lack of Neighbourhood Plans for these three towns and Beeston and the lack of consultation with residents and businesses in all four towns about the future development of their town centres.

Policy 8: Housing size, mix and choice

I believe housing to meet the needs of an increasingly ageing population should have been addressed and provision accordingly made.

Affordable Housing is defined as "social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing, provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market" and almost exclusively means housing association or council owned properties with some private rented and shared equity provision.

I object to Broxtowe having a fixed target of 30%. I note Gedling's target of "10%,20%,30% depending on location" and Nottingham's target of 20%.

I believe that Broxtowe should have the same flexibility as Gedling.

Policy 11,12,13: The historic Environment; Local Services and Healthy Lifestyles; Culture, Tourism and Sport

I object to the lack of any detail and any attempt to compile Neighbourhood Plans in any of the communities within Broxtowe.

I object to the complete lack of consultation with any community group or elected body on any of the above policies. A great opportunity to formulate local and deliverable policies has thus far been lost with only a promise of "Development Plan documents".

Although Eastwood and its environs is recognised for its link to DH Lawrence there are no plans to develop tourism and enhance the historic nature of the area.

Equally there are historic places in Beeston and Bramcote; there is the Nottingham Canal and other places and features of the Borough that have been ignored. This is because “development” is seen as delivering houses to meet Nottingham’s needs.

Policy 14 and 15: Managing travel demand; Transport Infrastructure Priorities

No road in Broxtowe been put forward as suitable for improvement despite the profound problems with the A610 and in particular the Nuthall roundabout and the roads from it leading to the IKEA area. I object to the lack of any Neighbourhood Plan for Kimberley which could have included plans to extend the tram and improve the infrastructure as outlined above.

Policy 16: Green Infrastructure, Parks and Open Space

It is somewhat ironic that this section sits within a document that will enable and allow thousands of houses on Green Belt land within Broxtowe.

I particularly note “Parks and Open Spaces should be protected from development and deficiencies addressed in site specific or other Development Plan Documents. Exceptions may be made if the park or open space is shown to be underused or undervalued”

I would ask this excellent principle be extended to the Green Belt land within Broxtowe. The above clearly proves to me that the Core Strategy is for the benefit of the City of Nottingham with scant or little regard for the wishes and aspirations of the people of Broxtowe who overwhelmingly do not want development on their Green Belt land which they both value and use.