

## APPENDIX 3

**TOTON AND CHETWYND BARRACKS STRATEGIC MASTERPLAN SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD)  
CONSULTATION STATEMENT**

| Respondent          | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action   |
|---------------------|---|--|--|
| <b>Individual 1</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly objects to development around Wheatgrass Farm, in the region bounded by the A52 to the north and the tram line to the south.</li> <li>• Supports development at Chetwynd Barraks but does not agree with development on Green Belt land.</li> <li>• Holds that there is not much emphasis on green spaces or emphasis on carbon neutral strategies being employed. Suggests the planting of trees to offset the carbon footprint of development.</li> </ul> | <p>Development is not proposed in the Green Belt around Wheatgrass Farm</p> <p>The Council is not proposing development of Green Belt land.</p> <p>Various sections of the SPD address these issues.</p> |  |
| <b>Individual 2</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests new plans to be proposed following the IRP.</li> </ul>  | The SPD has been reviewed following the IRP.   | Additional text included in response to the IRP, the |

| Respondent          | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action  |
|---------------------|--|---|---|
|                     |  |   | rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton. |
| <b>Individual 3</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expresses support.</li> </ul>   | Noted.  |   |
| <b>Individual 4</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Holds that a station at the Sidings has little purpose. Notes that as HS2 is no longer going to be at Toton, regards that the proposed development at Toton should instead be developed at East Midlands Parkway.</li> <li>Notes that justification text (specifically regarding the proposal's estimate of 84,000 jobs) for a number of issues is needed.</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Not directly related to the main part of the SPD.</p>  |   |
| <b>Individual 5</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposes proposed development on the farmland between Toton, Stapleford, Chilwell, Beeston and Bramcote and holds that such development would negatively impact upon the environment and local green space.</li> <li>Proposes that if a new school is required, this should be the 'derelict one near to Bramcote</li> </ul>   | The Council is not proposing development of Green Belt land. The vast majority of the land in this area is Green Belt and would remain as such. |   |

| Respondent          | Comment Summary   | Council Response                                | Action |
|---------------------|---|---|--------|
|                     | Baths'.   | It is understood that this is being demolished. |        |
| <b>Individual 6</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly regards that Stapleford Lane cannot be used as a vehicular access point. Further holds that green spaces should be left and that the area cannot accommodate any additional housing or cars.</li> </ul>   | Noted.  |        |
| <b>Individual 7</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requests that certain views within the Borough (including the view from the top of St Michael's Church from the A52) are maintained as far as possible.</li> </ul>   | Agree - where possible.                         |        |
| <b>Individual 8</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes that it would be ideal to consider small-gated communities such as high-quality retirement homes, with appropriate security measures.</li> <li>Notes that the Toton Park and Ride could accommodate coach pick up.</li> <li>Suggests the development of Victorian type manor house style properties comprising of small apartments.</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>       |        |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action   |
|----------------------|---|--|--|
|                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests that solar panels be included on new developments.</li> </ul>   | The document already aspires for zero-carbon.  | Wording of Net Zero Carbon section has been reviewed and expanded. |
| <b>Individual 9</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fully supports the development of Chetwynd Barracks for housing but holds that the use of personal vehicles should be discouraged for environmental reasons.</li> <li>Expresses concern regarding the proposed development of the fields surrounding the A52 from Bardill's Island to Bramcote.</li> </ul>   | <p>Agree – where possible.</p> <p>The Council is not proposing development of Green Belt land.</p> |  |
| <b>Individual 10</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests, in view of the Environment Act, that paragraph 2.37 on page 32 be reworded to reflect the new legislation, e.g.: “development proposals are required to protect and enhance these, as well as creating new habitats to ensure biodiversity net gain”.</li> <li>Considers that Green Space and Green Infrastructure should be increased and that Wildlife Corridors should be connected.</li> <li>Holds that clarity is required confirming that</li> </ul> | <p>Agree</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council agrees that</p>  | Section in relation to the Environment Act has been updated.       |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary  | Council Response   | Action |
|----------------------|--|--|--------|
|                      | <p>Wildlife Corridors do not include back gardens.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regards that developer contributions should stay within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</li> <li>• Seeks clarity on Moor Wood.</li> <li>• Holds that advice given by Natural England has not been acted upon and would like to know why.</li> </ul> | <p>Wildlife Corridors should not include back gardens and the SPD text has previously been amended to reflect this position.</p> <p>Noted. Additional detail would need to be provided at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Natural England has not objected to the SPD within their latest representations to the consultation of the SPD.</p> |        |
| <b>Individual 11</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regards that the Masterplan cannot progress until the “5-mile radius” cycle-route has been designed and further notes that the Masterplan fails to comply with the “walking</li> </ul>  | Noted.   |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action  |
|------------|---|---|---|
|            | <p>and cycling” elements of a number of local and national policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that the cycling elements need to comply with the standards specified in <i>Cycle Infrastructure Design</i>.</li> <li>• Proposes some changes to the text within the draft document, as well as additional text within certain sections.</li> </ul><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regards that the Masterplan cannot progress until sufficient thought has been given to the likely bus-routes.</li> </ul><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that the SPD fails to comply with the public transport elements of national / local policies.</li> </ul> | <p>All proposed cycle ways will comply with national standards.</p><br><p>Noted.</p><br><p>Disagree. The Masterplan can progress. Thought has been given to potential bus-routes, but this could potentially be made more explicit in the text.</p><br><p>Disagree.</p> | <p>Wording in relation to through-routing of bus routes has been added.</p> |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action  |
|----------------------|---|--|---|
|                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bus gates may be required to prevent rat-running.</li> <li>• Regards that the SPD does not make clear the effects of certain traffic measures.</li> </ul>  | <p>This has been considered within the SPD.</p> <p>Noted.</p>  |   |
| <b>Individual 12</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In light of the IRP, requests that develops a new Masterplan based upon the new context that we are now in. Also requests that the Green Belt as well as green space sites are protected.</li> </ul>   | <p>The SPD has been reviewed as a result of the IRP. The Council is not proposing development of Green Belt land.</p>  | <p>Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton.</p> |
| <b>Individual 13</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly objects to development at the area near Inham Road (outlined in red).</li> <li>• Regards that the consultation process has been frustrating which would have caused many to not respond, therefore resulting in the consultation not being representative.</li> </ul> | <p>The Council is not proposing development of Green Belt land.</p> <p>Noted. The consultation has attracted a high number of responses both from members of the public and other organisations, but the Council will endeavour to</p> |   |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action   |
|----------------------|---|--|--|
|                      |   | learn from any feedback to further improve future consultations.   |  |
| <b>Individual 14</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that following the cancellation of HS2 to Toton the whole plan should be shelved. Regards that a new station is not required and additional housebuilding would overdevelop an area which already suffers from poor road infrastructure.</li> </ul> | Noted. The SPD has been reviewed as a result of the IRP.   | Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton. |
| <b>Individual 15</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emphasises a desire to see increased green infrastructure as well as cycle paths and walk paths.</li> </ul>  | The SPD includes significant proposals for green space and cycle paths.  |  |
| <b>Individual 16</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poses a number of questions regarding the future of the proposed link road as well as putting forward other queries in relation to traffic management (such as on Swiney Way and Stapleford Lane).</li> </ul>  | Noted. Technical work is ongoing. Local improvements may be needed, subject to any representations made by National Highways and |  |



| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|--|---|--------|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="427 571 1126 676">• Also questions whether protection of historical features has been considered and notes the importance of them and their integration.</li><li data-bbox="427 943 1108 1082">• Appreciates the notion of carbon neutral homes and states that these should be designed so that they fit in with the character of the area.</li><li data-bbox="427 1129 1108 1198">• States the importance of green corridors and retaining trees.</li></ul> | <p data-bbox="1155 312 1507 418">Nottinghamshire Council during the planning application stage.</p> <p data-bbox="1155 568 1563 820">This has been considered within the SPD. In addition, draft policies within the Neighbourhood Plan provide additional protection through a 'local list' of local heritage assets.</p> <p data-bbox="1155 938 1256 967">Noted.</p> <p data-bbox="1155 1123 1554 1267">The Council agrees with the importance of green corridors, and where possible, retaining trees.</p> |        |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action  |
|----------------------|---|---|---|
|                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regards that the SPD does not deal with how roads being at full capacity during rush hour will be dealt with, or how additional traffic will be alleviated.</li> </ul> <p>Notes that a link road from the A52 would dissect the fields off Baulk Lane and therefore queries whether anything will be put into place to protect wildlife.</p>                         | <p>Technical work is ongoing to try to better understand these issues.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing, but the Council agrees that it will be necessary ensure that mitigation measures protect any potential impact upon wildlife.</p> |   |
| <b>Individual 17</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcomes the proposition that some parts of Chetwynd road would be public transport/bicycle access only but express concerns about how big a vehicle (i.e. bus) could navigate through. Wishes for the development to make roads safer for pedestrians.</li> <li>Welcomes the net zero carbon aspect of the proposal and would like to see electric buses</li> </ul> | <p>The Council agrees that all development should promote highway safety and that, where possible, facilitate access by public transport, including buses.</p> <p>Controlled parking zones would unfortunately be</p>                     | <p>Wording in relation to through-routing of bus routes has been added.</p> |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action |
|----------------------|---|--|--------|
|                      | <p>in operation. Also welcome the introduction of controlled parking zones around development.</p>  | <p>outside of the scope of the SPD.</p>  |        |
| <b>Individual 18</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Feels that the area near Birth Forest should be left alone and that the proposal for the A52 link road should be abandoned.</li> </ul> | <p>All land currently allocated as 'Green Belt' remains protected under this designation. The SPD does not propose that Green Belt boundaries should be amended.</p> |        |
| <b>Individual 19</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is against a through-road ever being created off Welbeck Gardens.</li> </ul>   | <p>Noted, although some links may be necessary so that the new development is well-linked with surrounding areas.</p>  |        |
| <b>Individual 20</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regards that the Council needs to provide homes and create jobs on land that could still be influential for the region.</li> </ul>     | <p>Agree.</p>  |        |
| <b>Individual 21</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regards that the extension of the NET tram to</li> </ul>   | <p>Agree. The Council would</p>  |        |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action                      |
|----------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|
|                      | <p>the Hub station remains essential and that a station at Toton should still be included in the Masterplan even without HS2 in the area. Notes that the advantages of HS2 can still be brought to the borough.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Holds that the Masterplan should not adversely affect the operational needs of the freight train operators based at or using the Toton TMD.</li> <li>• Support the net-zero intentions.</li> <li>• Hold that significant community facilities must be readily accessible by public transport and active travel.</li> <li>• Welcome the enhancement of the Railway Corridor.</li> </ul> | <p>like to see the extension of the NET tramway into the Toton site.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |                             |
| <b>Individual 22</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that the Masterplan should be revisited</li> </ul>  | The SPD has been reviewed  | Additional text included in |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action  |
|----------------------|--|---|---|
|                      | <p>in light of the decision not to bring HS2 to Toton.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regards that the references to net-zero are undermined by the proposals in relation to the A52, which will encourage traffic and the use of cars. Encouraging cycling/walking and public transport should be a priority. Puts forward concerns about traffic congestion.</li> <li>• Notes that the maintenance and enhancement of the open space network and the Green Belt is vital.</li> <li>• Regards that the 'spine road' from Chetwynd should not cross the tram lines and should be terminated at the tram terminus.</li> </ul> | <p>as a result of the IRP.</p> <p>Noted. Technical work is ongoing in relation to the proposed link road, but mitigation measures will be required.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Noted. It may be necessary for the road to continue in order to serve additional sites / land.</p> | <p>response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton.</p> |
| <b>Individual 23</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Holds that as the HS2 station will no longer be</li> </ul>  | The Council considers that  | Additional text included in   |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action  |
|------------|--|---|---|
|            | <p>at Toton, the intended development for Toton should not go ahead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For each proposed development, housing numbers and densities and floorspace etc as well as infrastructure should be specified.</li> <li>• Regards that the estimated capacity of the site for 4,500 homes must be justified. Holds that demand for employment land at the site must also be demonstrated, as well as a definition of the Innovation Campus.</li> <li>• Notes that the proposals will result in Toton losing much of its green space, and as such, regards that there should be replacement green spaces.</li> <li>• Regards that detailed mechanisms for mitigating the noise from HS2 should be specified.</li> </ul> | <p>the site remains highly sustainable for a variety of development. There may be the potential for a mainline railway station at the site.</p> <p>Detailed issues will be considered at the planning application stage.</p> <p>This would be considered within the Greater Nottinghamshire Strategic Plan.</p> <p>The SPD proposes that considerable areas of green space should be provided at the sites.</p> <p>No longer applicable as a result of the IRP decision</p> | <p>response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton.</p> |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action |
|----------------------|---|--|--------|
|                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes that a detailed survey of current and predicted traffic should be performed before proposing any new roads and that demand for adding cycle paths to existing roads must be justified.</li> </ul>  | <p>Noted. Technical work is ongoing and there is ongoing liaison between the Borough Council and National Highways and Nottinghamshire County Council.</p>   |        |
| <b>Individual 24</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes that the aerial photography is useful.</li> <li>Queries whether there could be provision for allotments.</li> <li>Regards that there is limited green space proposed and that more provision is needed.</li> <li>Holds that the primary focus should be on providing safe pedestrian and cycle routes and public transport.</li> </ul> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>Allotments are referenced on the Spatial Framework Plan.</p> <p>The Strategic Masterplan proposes significant areas of open green space.</p> <p>Agree. The Strategic Masterplan provides for safe pedestrian and cycle routes</p> |        |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary  | Council Response   | Action |
|----------------------|--|--|--------|
|                      |  | with provision for public transport.   |        |
| <b>Individual 25</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expresses concerns regarding additional traffic. Further holds that existing main roads such as Stapleford Lane is required to be upgraded before the development begins.</li> </ul>  | Technical work is ongoing in relation to these issues.   |        |
| <b>Individual 26</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requests that there is no development on the Green Belt and regards that road infrastructure is insufficient for any traffic increases and that road investment would be needed to support the housing developments.</li> <li>Is supportive of wildlife corridors and is pleased that there will be open space at Chetwynd Barracks.</li> <li>Holds that the extension of the tram to Long Eaton is critical and that local facilities need implementing in phase 2.</li> </ul> | <p>The Council is not proposing development of Green Belt land.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Unfortunately, the SPD can only directly influence development within Broxtowe Borough (Long Eaton is located in Erewash Borough).</p> |        |
| <b>Individual 27</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regards that the location is 'not strategic'.</li> </ul>  | Disagree. There remains an opportunity to create a   |        |



| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|--|---|--------|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="427 571 1120 639">• Regards that green space is being developed for 'no real reason'.</li> <li data-bbox="427 794 1120 935">• Requests that proportions of housing, affordable housing, office, industrial and leisure development are provided in the final document.</li> <li data-bbox="427 1054 1120 1123">• Questions whether the Innovation Campus will create new jobs.</li> <li data-bbox="427 1315 1120 1383">• It is positive that the lack of healthcare provision is finally being recognised and</li> </ul> | <p data-bbox="1155 312 1574 491">strategic transport node connecting the strategic road network, tram and heavy rail. This is a sustainable location for growth.</p> <p data-bbox="1155 568 1525 708">Disagree. Green Space is being developed for much needed housing and employment.</p> <p data-bbox="1155 791 1532 898">Detailed issues will be considered at the planning application stage.</p> <p data-bbox="1155 1050 1576 1227">The Council is of the view that a very significant number of good quality new jobs will be provided by the proposed development.</p> <p data-bbox="1155 1310 1249 1337">Noted.</p> |        |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action |
|----------------------|---|---|--------|
|                      | addressed.  |   |        |
| <b>Individual 28</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes concerns over the link road. States that a link road connecting Eskdale Drive to the A52 could cause congestion, create access difficulties and be dangerous around schools, as well as remove/spoil a popular area where people enjoy to walk.</li> </ul> | Technical work is ongoing. Mitigation measures will be needed.  |        |
| <b>Individual 29</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Feels that the final document should include provision/encourage custom and self-build development.</li> </ul>   | It is not considered that there is enough demand for this.  |        |
| <b>Individual 30</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not think that the Barracks should be closing and further holds that infrastructure cannot support additional housing.</li> </ul>   | Any decision to close the Barracks would be made by central government / the Ministry of Defence and so this issue is outside of the control of the Council. The Council needs to respond to the opportunities of land becoming available for development. New infrastructure would be provided as a part of any development of the site. |        |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action   |
|----------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Individual 31</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regards that the implication of the proposed developments have not been considered in relation to Toton High Road, which is not able to cope with traffic demands.</li> </ul>   | Technical work in relation to highways is ongoing.  |  |
| <b>Individual 32</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Holds that the Plan is very positive.</li> </ul>  | Agree.  |  |
| <b>Individual 33</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Queries what will happen now that HS2 is not going to be at Toton.</li> <li>Queries who will make decisions and how the project will be managed especially if there are conflicts between ambitions within the plan.</li> </ul> | <p>The SPD has been reviewed following the IRP.</p> <p>Decisions will be made by the Council as part of the Development Management process. If established within primary legislation, the emerging East Midlands Development Corporation</p> | Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton. |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action |
|----------------------|--|---|--------|
|                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that protecting and retaining areas such as Hobgoblin Wood and the barracks sports field makes absolute sense.</li> <li>• Highlights the importance of cars for many people's daily lives.</li> </ul>   | <p>(EM DevCo Ltd) may take control of planning for the site in the future.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Noted. Technical work is ongoing in relation to highways.</p> |        |
| <b>Individual 34</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Holds that the overall plan has been well thought out and developed. Despite the HS2 setback at Toton, regards that the plan should still move forward in principle.</li> </ul>   | <p>Agree. The Council aspires to see the sites developed and any opportunities maximised.</p>   |        |
| <b>Individual 35</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that it is vital the existing Barracks sports ground is ring fenced for leisure/recreation and also notes the general importance of green and open spaces.</li> <li>• States that surface water drainage at the Barracks is an issue.</li> </ul> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>Noted. Severn Trent Water were consulted as a part of the consultation of the SPD. This is already referred to</p>                           |        |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action |
|----------------------|---|---|--------|
|                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries why there is no tram link between both the Toton site and the Chetwynd site.</li> <li>• States that there is no mitigation shown for traffic through Chilwell Village to the High Road or Field Lane.</li> </ul>   | <p>within the 'Green Infrastructure' section of the SPD.</p> <p>Noted. The Chetwynd Barracks site is already located within very close proximity to the existing Toton Park and Ride railway station.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> |        |
| <b>Individual 36</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thinks that linking both projects (Sites) together would not be as beneficial as looking at both separately.</li> <li>• States that it is vital the Chetwynd Neighbourhood Plan is taken on board.</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to electric</li> </ul> | <p>Noted. There is a commitment within Broxtowe's Part 2 Local Plan for both sites to be considered together.</p> <p>Agree.</p>   |        |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action  |
|----------------------|---|--|---|
|                      | <p>vehicles and the infrastructure/power necessary for this. Ground Source heat pumps should also be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes the facilities which will be needed at Chetwynd Barracks.</li> </ul>  | <p>The Council agrees that a number of measures to transition to 'Net-Zero' should be considered at Toton and Chetwynd Barracks.</p> <p>Agree.</p> | <p>Wording of Net Zero Carbon section has been reviewed and expanded.</p> |
| <b>Individual 37</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Queries what sort of energy will be used for housing.</li> </ul>   | <p>Noted. The implications of transitioning to 'Net-Zero' will need to be further considered following the adoption of this SPD.</p>               | <p>Wording of Net Zero Carbon section has been reviewed and expanded.</p> |
| <b>Individual 38</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Queries whether Derby and Nottingham to East Midlands Parkway can be linked without HS2 at Toton. Holds that a station at Toton should still be provided.</li> <li>Regards that the feeder road from the Toton tram hub to the A52 is better routed via Toton</li> </ul> | <p>The Council understands that technical work to better understand some of these issues is ongoing.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p>         |   |

| Respondent                  | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action  |
|-----------------------------|---|--|---|
|                             | <p>Lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes further concerns regarding traffic and its impacts.</li> </ul>  | <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p>  |   |
| <p><b>Individual 39</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that the whole vision and document requires a fundamental re-think [due to IRP].</li> <li>States that the proposals do not take into account the impacts of Covid (eg. Working from home and implications for town centres).</li> <li>States that the proposals are 'anti-car'.</li> <li>Regards that investment in bus or cycle lanes is wasted and even counter-productive.</li> <li>The proposals will put a strain on the existing and proposed road networks.</li> <li>Off-road parking and electric vehicle charging</li> </ul> | <p>The SPD has been reviewed as a result of the IRP.</p> <p>This issue will be considered as a part of the production of the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan (the Aligned Core Strategy)</p> <p>Disagree.</p> <p>Disagree.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> <p>Agree.</p> | <p>Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton.</p> |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action |
|----------------------|---|---|--------|
|                      | <p>points at properties should be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regards that terraced properties are not wanted in Toton.</li> </ul>   | Noted.  |        |
| <b>Individual 40</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that the proposed walking/cycling route which crosses Sandiacre Lock appears to cross private land.</li> <li>• Regards that the easier option for access to the towpath and then the subsequent station would be via the existing recognised footpaths at Dockholme Lock or Station Road in Sandiacre.</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>   |        |
| <b>Individual 41</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Holds that the definition of Open Space within the document is limited.</li> <li>• The walking and cycling links across the Erewash Canal and River Erewash do not align and that many of the green corridors do not link together.</li> </ul>   | <p>Disagree. A wide range of Open Spaces are referred to within the document.</p> <p>Walking and cycling links are indicative and the routes may be influenced by a variety of factors. It is not necessary for all of the green corridors to link together although most</p> |        |



| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action  |
|------------|---|--|---|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regards that the location of proposed tram stops seems illogical</li> <li>• A wider view needs to be take given the cancellation of HS2.</li> <li>• The Toton West area will be visually and psychologically cut off from the rest of the development.</li> <li>• Feels that there are limited connections to local centres.</li> <li>• Disagrees with the proposed A52 link road and regards that altering Bardills round-about to a grade-separated junction would be far more beneficial solution.</li> </ul> | <p>do and the others are connected by open space.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The SPD has been reviewed as a result of the IRP.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> | <p>Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton.</p> |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action   |
|----------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Individual 42</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regards that the document fails to recognise Long Eaton as another potential hub for local development in need of rail connections.</li> <li>• States that ‘the potential access roads appear to cut across current farm land that contain well used public rights of way’ and that ‘converting these to roads will destroy this vital connectivity for accessing green spaces’.</li> </ul> | <p>Unfortunately, the SPD can only directly influence development within Broxtowe Borough (Long Eaton is located in Erewash Borough).</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> |  |
| <b>Individual 43</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is interested to know how the changes made to HS2 will impact the proposals for Chetwynd and Toton.</li> </ul>  | Noted.  | Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton. |
| <b>Individual 44</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to know how traffic disruption will be kept to a minimum during construction phases.</li> </ul>  | This would be considered as part of the planning application process through appropriate measures.  |  |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action |
|----------------------|---|---|--------|
|                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries whether the trees overlooking Swiney Way can be preserved.</li> <br/> <li>• Encourages the inclusion of a dedicated space for worship.</li> </ul>  | <p>This is probably too great a level of detail for this SPD, but the Council will endeavour to retain trees wherever possible.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |
| <b>Individual 45</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that the new proposals for electrification of the Midland Main Line and a proper station connection at Toton now require addressing.</li> <br/> <li>• Notes that Bardills roundabout is difficult and confusing to many people and that the cross roads near Tesco are busy and the traffic lights struggle to keep the traffic flowing efficiently due to it being a four-way junction.</li> </ul> | <p>A station at Toton has been considered as part of a review of the SPD.</p><br><p>Technical work is ongoing.</p>                                |        |
| <b>Individual 46</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that better bus connections between Attenborough Station and Beeston Station would be beneficial.</li> </ul>  | <p>Agree.</p>   |        |
|                      |   |   |        |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary  | Council Response   | Action   |
|----------------------|--|--|--|
| <b>Individual 47</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to see plenty of affordable housing.</li> </ul>  | The Council would expect 30% affordable housing to be provided.  |  |
| <b>Individual 48</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that it is crucial for the development to be net zero carbon.</li> </ul>   | Noted.   |  |
| <b>Individual 49</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that as HS2 will no longer be at Toton, the whole strategy will need to be re-thought.</li> <li>• Urges that the link from Depot Corner to the present Barracks entrance should be made available to all traffic.</li> <li>• Has concerns about increased traffic.</li> </ul> | <p>The SPD has been reviewed as a result of the IRP.</p> <p>This is currently proposed by the SPD.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> | Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton. |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action |
|----------------------|---|--|--------|
|                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Feels that the inhabitants of the redeveloped Barracks area should have a choice of exiting towards Toton or Beeston, whichever part they live in.</li> </ul>  | Noted.   |        |
| <b>Individual 50</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that Woodstock Road junction with Stapleford Lane needs to be improved.</li> </ul>  | Noted.   |        |
| <b>Individual 51</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that Stapleford Lane is already extremely congested so traffic planning needs to be done carefully.</li> <li>Strongly advocates the construction of one or more places of Christian worship.</li> </ul> | <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> <p>Noted.</p>                  |        |
| <b>Individual 52</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes that there is a definite need for new surgeries as well as new primary and a secondary school.</li> </ul>  | Agree that new surgeries and primary schools should be provided. |        |
| <b>Individual 53</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes that necessary infrastructure for 4500 homes will be integral.</li> <li>Regards that Green Belt should not be developed.</li> </ul>  | <p>Agree.</p> <p>Agree.</p>                                      |        |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action  |
|----------------------|---|---|---|
|                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is pleased to see cycling provision being considered.</li> <li>• Holds that numerous sections rely heavily on the provision of HS2 and a revised timescale should be published.</li> <li>• The layout of the plan (different sections) is good.</li> </ul>   | <p>Agree.</p> <p>The SPD has been reviewed as a result of the IRP.</p> <p>Agree.</p>  | <p>Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton.</p>   |
| <b>Individual 54</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All references to HS2 should be removed and now that there will be no HS2, there is no justification for development on the Green Belt.</li> <li>• Points which rely on HS2 should be re-examined.</li> <li>• Is pleased with the net zero carbon section.</li> <li>• States that there is no need for additional</li> </ul> | <p>The SPD has been reviewed as a result of the IRP. The Green Belt is not proposed for development.</p> <p>The SPD has been reviewed as a result of the IRP.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council would seek the</p> | <p>Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton.</p> <p>Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton.</p> |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action  |
|----------------------|--|---|---|
|                      | <p>schools in the area as existing schools are not at capacity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers that horse-riders should be catered for within the document.</li> <li>• States that the 'new secondary road north of Swiney Way to Staplfd Lane should be controlled for local access only and no through traffic across the depot.'</li> </ul> | <p>views of the Local Education Authority at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Technical work is ongoing.</p> | <p>The text has been amended to refer to equestrian users.</p>  |
| <b>Individual 55</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that new homes should be accessible to first-time buyers.</li> <li>• Concerned about losing the green space around Toton Sidings as this is used by horse riders and dog-walkers.</li> </ul>   | <p>Agree.</p> <p>The SPD includes significant areas for Open Space.</p>   |   |
| <b>Individual 56</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries what the effect of no HS2 will be on the plan.</li> </ul>   | <p>The SPD has been reviewed as a result of the IRP.</p>  | <p>Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton.</p> |
|                      |  |   |   |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action   |
|----------------------|---|---|--|
| <b>Individual 57</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hopes that the new homes include a large proportion of council housing.</li> </ul>   | The Council would expect 30% affordable housing to be provided.               |  |
| <b>Individual 58</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As HS2 is no longer going ahead at Toton, the plan should be re-written.</li> </ul>  | The SPD has been reviewed as a result of the IRP.                             | Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton. |
| <b>Individual 59</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that the proposed cycling route in Section 7 is not suitable for designated cycling. Provides a number of observations.</li> <li>Queries what will be done to stop the housing estate west of Toton from becoming a 'free car park' for those using the station.</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing in relation to highway issues.</p> |  |
| <b>Individual 60</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Queries how the plans will change now that HS2 will not be at Toton.</li> </ul>  | The SPD has been reviewed as a result of the IRP.                             | Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton. |
|                      |   |   |  |



| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action  |
|----------------------|---|---|---|
| <b>Individual 61</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that a new link road from the A52 would dissect the fields off Baulk Lane which is the last vast green space in Toton. Queries what would be put in to place to protect wildlife?</li> <li>• Queries whether Attenborough will get more services to spread capacity for a new station?</li> <li>• States that the roads leading up to the A52 are already at full capacity.</li> <li>• Queries how the proposals will be impacted by HS2 no longer being at Toton.</li> <li>• Pleased that the plan recognises that's schools and GP surgeries are at capacity</li> </ul> | <p>This is an indicative design and the final design must take into account wildlife impact and mitigate accordingly.</p> <p>Attenborough is outside of the area of the SPD.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> <p>The SPD has been reviewed as a result of the IRP.</p> <p>Noted.</p> | <p>Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton.</p> |
| <b>Individual 62</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries whether the link road will still go ahead now that HS2 will not be at Toton.</li> <li>• States that the proposed green spaces should be more clearly depicted.</li> </ul>  | <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> <p>Disagree. These are clearly depicted in the document.</p>  |   |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response                          | Action |
|----------------------|---|---|--------|
|                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pleased about the inclusion of carbon neutral homes but notes that the design of these should be in keeping with the area.</li> <li>• States that the Primary School and Medical Centre should be part of the Chetwynd High Street and therefore should be in Chetwynd East, not Chetwynd West.</li> <li>• Fig 22: The hatched area "Homes within the Plan Period" does not include any of Chetwynd West. However, the text (5.3) implies that 500 homes will be built in Chetwynd West within the plan period.</li> </ul> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |
| <b>Individual 63</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that the number of jobs proposed to be added in the area should be better detailed with an indication of how many jobs are expected to be created in each of the Character Areas.</li> <li>• Regards that the document is too vague to create a "successful place" as it leaves too much still to be considered.</li> </ul>   | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Disagree.</p>            |        |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action |
|----------------------|---|--|--------|
|                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Queries how policies will be enforced.</li> <li>• Notes that the Primary School in Chetwynd should be part of the Plaza / Chetwynd High Street area to encourage footfall, not separated in Chetwynd West.</li> <li>• Notes that Healthcare facilities should be part of the Plaza / Chetwynd High Street not separated into Chetwynd West.</li> </ul> | <p>The document will be a material consideration in the determination of any planning application.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |
| <b>Individual 64</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that care should be taken to ensure there is no mixed industrial/ commercial/residential development.</li> <li>• Holds that more Green Space and Biodiversity is needed.</li> <li>• Regards that the A52 link road will cause problems for Swiney Way.</li> </ul>   | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The SPD includes significant Open Space and opportunities for Biodiversity.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> |        |
| <b>Individual 65</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Holds that more Green Space and</li> </ul>   | The SPD includes significant   |        |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action  |
|----------------------|---|--|---|
|                      | <p>Biodiversity is needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Consultation should be updated and repeated now that HS2 is not going forward at Toton.</li> <li>• Regards that the Masterplan cannot progress whilst the Council's Leisure Strategy is being developed.</li> </ul> | <p>Open Space and opportunities for Biodiversity.</p> <p>The SPD has been reviewed as a result of the IRP.</p> <p>The Leisure Strategy is an ongoing document which will be developed independently from this process.</p> | <p>Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton.</p> |
| <b>Individual 66</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not know how to respond now that HS2 will no longer be at Toton.</li> </ul>   | <p>Noted.</p>  |   |
| <b>Individual 67</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes the proposed Open Spaces but holds that they should be managed and monitored (litter, youths etc).</li> <li>• States that changes to Bardhills roundabout will be needed as the proposed developments</li> </ul>                              | <p>Agree. All open spaces are monitored by the Council's Environment team.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p>   |   |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary  | Council Response   | Action  |
|----------------------|--|--|---|
|                      | <p>will result in extra vehicular traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expresses concern regarding a new road junction at a high speed point on the A52.</li> <li>States that proposed high-rises buildings are not acceptable and that no buildings should be higher than residential houses.</li> </ul>   | <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> <p>Noted.</p>                                      |   |
| <b>Individual 68</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regards that the document is far too vague.</li> </ul>  | Disagree.  |   |
| <b>Individual 69</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Queries how the Masterplan will be impacted by HS2 no longer going forward at Toton.</li> <li>States that there is a need to develop additional public transport opportunities.</li> <li>Queries what considerations are being made in respect of increased services from Attenborough station and also car parking at</li> </ul> | <p>The SPD has been reviewed as a result of the IRP.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> | <p>Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton.</p> |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action   |
|----------------------|--|---|--|
|                      | Attenborough.  |   |  |
| <b>Individual 70</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that the document fails to achieve Part 2 Local Plan cycling objective.</li> </ul>   | Disagree. The SPD meets the objectives of the Part 2 Local Plan.  |  |
| <b>Individual 71</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that the document fails to achieve Part 2 Local Plan cycling objective.</li> <li>States that the Masterplan makes no mention on how existing green infrastructure surrounding the plan area will be protected and enhanced from the impact of the circa 10,000 new inhabitants.</li> <li>Regards that the document needs to make a commitment to protect existing greenbelt boundaries which neighbour the plan site.</li> <li>The plan should go further to achieve the required biodiversity net gain with degrading biodiversity outside the plan area.</li> <li>As HS2 is no longer going to be situated at</li> </ul> | <p>Disagree. The SPD meets the objectives of the Part 2 Local Plan.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Green Belt is protected by legislation.</p> <p>The SPD will allow for biodiversity net gain opportunities.</p> | <p>The section in relation to the Environment Act 2021 and biodiversity net gain has been amended.</p> |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action  |
|----------------------|---|---|---|
|                      | <p>Toton, the link road is no longer necessary. Notes further issues regarding the link road and traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building 157 at Chetwynd Barracks must be retained to realise the historic value. Other buildings should be recycled and re-used to help tackle climate change.</li> </ul>   | <p>The SPD has been reviewed as a result of the IRP and technical work is still ongoing.</p> <p>Noted. This might have an impact upon the viability / deliverability of the site.</p>   | <p>Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton.</p>   |
| <b>Individual 72</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that without HS2, this is no longer a strategic location. The Masterplan should be re-written to reflect that HS2 will no longer be based at Toton.</li> <li>• Regards that the document is not clear how anyone will be able to measure the achievement of a net zero community and how this will be monitored to ensure this is sustained.</li> <li>• Welbeck Gardens needs to be maintained as a cul-de-sac (planning teams have confirmed this but wanted to include point in comments).</li> </ul> | <p>The SPD has been reviewed as a result of the IRP.</p> <p>This is a very complex area of assessment and the Council will work with developers and the Development Corporation to achieve this.</p> <p>Noted. Some additional access points may be necessary to ensure connectivity with the wider area.</p> | <p>Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton.</p> <p>Wording of Net Zero Carbon section has been reviewed and expanded.</p> |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary  | Council Response   | Action  |
|----------------------|--|--|---|
| <b>Individual 73</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As HS2 will no longer be based at Toton, the Masterplan should be re-written and re-consulted on as economic benefits will not materialise.</li> </ul>  | The SPD has been reviewed as a result of the IRP.                      | Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton.  |
| <b>Individual 74</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that the East Midlands Development Corporation must be independent of party politics.</li> <li>Regards that full reassessment of this plan is required in light of the IRP.</li> </ul>                     | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The SPD has been reviewed as a result of the IRP.</p> | Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton.. |
| <b>Individual 75</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Holds that the labelling of the diagram "public transport, walking, cycling and wheeling" is unclear.</li> <li>Is pleased that a nature area is included within the Masterplan. States that it is also</li> </ul> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>Agree.</p>  | The term 'wheeling' has been clarified within the text.   |



| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action |
|----------------------|---|---|--------|
|                      | <p>vital to ensure that any building operators also clear the area in preparation for building with a mind to the wildlife already inhabiting the area.</p>   |   |        |
| <b>Individual 76</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regards that the map on page 44 needs to be clearer as to the nature of the "green" corridors. States that it also needs to be made clear if the green corridors contribute to the minimum of 16 hectares of green infrastructure.</li> </ul>  | Noted.  |        |
| <b>Individual 77</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pg 11 section 1.36 refers to "new" green space. As much of the site is currently green space it should not be described as new. "creating amenity green spaces close to where people live" would be a more accurate description.</li> <li>• Pg 13 section 1.41 and 1.42. Both give reference to a minimum area for each land use. It would be useful to include the total land area and what proportion of the development will be for each land use. This would also enable an indication of the amount of green space that can be retained.</li> </ul> | <p>The term 'new' refers to the fact that the space will be publically accessible green space.</p> <p>Noted</p> |        |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action |
|----------------------|---|---|--------|
|                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding George Spencer, states that the text about relocation should be removed as there needs to be an additional secondary school in the area.</li> <li>• On page 42, George Spencer should be included in the fixes.</li> <li>• Holds that it is unclear if the plans create an adequate width of green space to be viable in ecological terms and some sort of aspiration needs adding which would formally link all the areas and create minimum widths.</li> <li>• States that the possible link to Stapleford Lane would be only acceptable if this was a bus/ active travel gate.</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |
| <b>Individual 78</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Active travel to other strategic locations should be actively promoted and specific mention made.</li> <li>• States that whilst the importance of green blue assets are mentioned there is no indication of how they would be linked nor mention of nature recovery networks and bio diversity gain all of which are important</li> </ul>  | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>                             |        |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action   |
|----------------------|--|---|--|
|                      | elements of the NPPF.  |   |  |
| <b>Individual 79</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes that pg 53 section 3.63-3.65 conflicts with the carbon reduction statements earlier in the document.</li> <li>States that car use should be vastly reduced in residential areas.</li> <li>States that on pg 62 4.6 'Toton North' is 'actually Stapleford South'.</li> </ul> | <p>Disagree. Multi-modal accessibility is important to reducing carbon emissions</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>This relates to administrative boundaries, which don't bear on the development.</p> |  |
| <b>Individual 80</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like to see lots of trees and wild plants.</li> </ul>   | Agree.  |  |
| <b>Individual 81</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Perceives an issue with wording and states that military heritage should be 'commemorated' rather than 'celebrated'.</li> <li>Welcomes the commitment to net carbon zero.</li> </ul>  | <p>Agree.</p> <p>Agree.</p>   | A minor amendment has been made to the text to reflect this comment. |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action   |
|----------------------|---|---|--|
| <b>Individual 82</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that a new plan is needed now that HS2 will no longer be at Toton.</li> <li>• Holds that the Erewash Valley is a key resource and must be enhanced and protected.</li> <li>• Regards that the plan does not give enough attention to new nature reserves, biodiversity gain and significantly extra area to green open space and sports facilities.</li> <li>• States that the plan must think of the future and provide green and blue facilities for both people and wildlife.</li> </ul> | <p>The SPD has been reviewed as a result of the IRP.</p> <p>Strongly agree.</p> <p>The SPD includes significant areas of green space.</p> <p>Agree.</p> | <p>Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton.</p> <p>The section in relation to the Environment Act 2021 and biodiversity net gain has been amended.</p> |
| <b>Individual 83</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that Toton should not be ignored now that HS2 will no longer be there.</li> </ul>   | <p>Agree.</p> <p>Once 'made' (adopted) the</p>  |  |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action   |
|----------------------|--|---|--|
|                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that the Neighbourhood Plan is key and must be considered.</li> <br/> <li>• Nature recovery and biodiversity are important considerations.</li> </ul>   | <p>policies of the Neighbourhood Plan will be a 'material consideration' in the determination of planning applications.</p> <p>Agree.</p> | <p>The section in relation to the Environment Act 2021 and biodiversity net gain has been amended.</p> |
| <b>Individual 84</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not understand how the plan will achieve net carbon zero.</li> <li>• Would like to see more bicycle paths.</li> <li>• Is concerned about traffic and the potential issues which the proposed link road will create.</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The SPD includes significant opportunities for cycle lanes.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p>                        | <p>Wording of Net Zero Carbon section has been reviewed and expanded.</p>                              |
| <b>Individual 85</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that the minimum green space requirement should be increased and that</li> </ul>   | <p>Noted.</p>   |  |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action |
|----------------------|---|---|--------|
|                      | there should be a maximum number of homes for each character area.  |   |        |
| <b>Individual 86</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the need for the additional road from A52 / Stapleford Lane / Swiney Way, but states that this should be done in a way that does not encourage too much additional traffic. Further feels that the map is not clear and suggests multiple junctions and entry points.</li> </ul>  | Technical work is ongoing.  |        |
| <b>Individual 87</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that there should be provision for a new primary school at Chetwynd Barracks.</li> <li>Pleased to see that Toton Fields Nature Reserve will be maintained. This area should not be closed or overprotected but accessible 'wildland'.</li> <li>States that there should not be any road access into the barracks development from Stapleford Lane as Stapleford Lane cannot cope currently with the traffic trying to negotiate existing junctions.</li> <li>Regards that there should not be any road access into the Barracks from Stapleford.</li> </ul> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> |        |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action |
|----------------------|---|---|--------|
| <b>Individual 88</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that the 'approach and proposals appear exemplary'.</li> <li>Notes that new direct access from the A52 may no longer be necessary but continuing the NET to Long Eaton will enhance the Toton site.</li> <li>Considers that further thought could be given to the scale of development in each character area.</li> </ul> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing. Long Eaton is outside of Broxtowe Borough Council's jurisdiction.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |
| <b>Individual 89</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that the 'approach and proposals appear exemplary'.</li> <li>Notes that new direct access from the A52 may no longer be necessary but continuing the NET to Long Eaton will enhance the Toton site.</li> <li>Considers that further thought could be given to the scale of development in each character area.</li> </ul> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing. Long Eaton is outside of Broxtowe Borough Council's control.</p> <p>Noted.</p>      |        |

| Respondent           | Comment Summary  | Council Response   | Action |
|----------------------|--|--|--------|
|                      |  |  |        |
| <b>Individual 91</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that the area remains a key regional location with or without HS2, now with the space to develop other important functions more comfortably and with less uncertainty.</li> <li>• Notes that the loss of HS2 removes a measure of uncertainty for both sites and Long Eaton and allows the DB facilities to remain intact.</li> <li>• Notes that there is enough traffic using Chetwynd Road and this should not be 'opened up' for additional traffic.</li> <li>• Regards that more Green Space and leisure facilities are needed as opposed to residential development.</li> </ul> | <p>Largely agree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Disagree in part. Residential is an important form of development and is needed within the Borough. The SPD has significant green space provision. The Leisure Strategy is an ongoing document which will be developed independently from this process.</p> |        |



| Respondent           | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action |
|----------------------|---|--|--------|
|                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requests that the playing grounds at the barracks should be maintained and not built on.</li> </ul>  | Agree.   |        |
| <b>Individual 92</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that the all development plans (not just those at Toton and Chetwynd Barracks) should be reviewed due to the IRP.</li> <li>Notes that Toton Link Road/Innovation Park plans will close Bardills Roundabout to Stapleford traffic, and holds that this is 'unacceptable to Stapleford residents'.</li> <li>Regards that the Consultation process should be widened. States that a consultation cannot be comprehensive if it is 'narrowly scoped to exclude bordering areas, like Stapleford'.</li> <li>Considers that Stapleford will be ignored and that all plans made within the past decade need to be reviewed.</li> </ul> | <p>The SPD can only consider development at Toton and Chetwynd Barracks as it is not a Borough wide document.</p> <p>Noted. Technical work is still on-going.</p> <p>The consultation was open to all members of the public and a far-reaching set of responses was received.</p> <p>It is not within the scope of the SPD to plan for areas outside of the masterplan area. It is also not the role of the SPD to review other plans.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response   | Action |
|------------|--|--|--------|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that the proposed new train station needs to be integrated with Stapleford and notes that plans for a Stapleford and Sandiacre train station are now equally as likely as a Toton main-line station.</li> <li>• Suggests that Bessel Lane may be a better location a train station.</li> <li>• Writes that the Innovation Park may be suitable for a Rolls-Royce SMR power-station, in order to provide electricity to Innovation Park, wider afield, and electrified Network Rail.</li> <li>• Makes a number of comments and observations regarding HS2.</li> <li>• States that safeguarding has been 'immensely damaging to Stapleford'.</li> <li>• States that the Borough has 'concentrated solely on HS2, and ignored other projects'.</li> <li>• Notes that 'cycle paths are all very well, but sustainable means sharing cars, not needing</li> </ul> | <p>Noted. Technical work is ongoing in relation to highways.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Comments specific to HS2 cannot be addressed within this SPD.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Disagree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |

| Respondent                              | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action |
|---|---|---|--------|
|   | <p>parking spaces, but having hoppers that can drop people to or near their homes’.</p>   |   |        |
| <p><b>Ministry of Defence (DIO)</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request that policy should state that developments which attract environments for large and flocking birds, should be refused or have mitigation measures if they are hazardous to aviation.</li> <li>• Further request that developers are made aware of the implications of developing within an area containing MOD safeguarded zones and that policy provision is provided that applications for development that would not compromise/restrict/degrade the operational capability of safeguarded MOD sites and assets will be supported.</li> </ul> | <p>Agree and noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>   |        |
| <p><b>Canal &amp; River Trust</b></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider that the Masterplan should look to identify and promote opportunities to provide links from the Toton and Chetwynd Barracks sites to the canal towpath.</li> <li>• Consider that identifying appropriate routes to allow access to the towpath is an important</li> </ul>   | <p>Noted. Future opportunities for the expansion of canal networks will be looked into when applicable.</p> <p>Noted. Developer contributions will be</p> |        |

| Respondent                                   | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action |
|--|--|---|--------|
|  | <p>development principle. The Masterplan should consider how this can be achieved and how far there may be a need to fund improvements via developer contributions.</p>  | <p>considered at the planning application stage.</p>    |        |
| <p><b>Nottinghamshire County Council</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes the opportunity to make observations on the SPD.</li> <li>• Notes that ‘The County Council has strongly supported this initiative and has financially supported the delivery of the Draft SPD by the commissioning of Arups to support Broxtowe BC.’</li> </ul> <p><b><u>HS2 and Toton – Integrated Rail Plan announcement</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that although ‘HS2 East Midlands Hub station will no longer be provided at Toton is a significant change but does not appear to necessarily “de-rail” the proposals as outlined in the Draft SPD.’</li> <li>• Is ‘responding to this Draft SPD on the basis that there will not be changes to the land use assumptions in light of the IRP decision, despite the reduction in accessibility which the relocation of HS2 station will bring and the</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response                          | Action |
|------------|--|---|--------|
|            | <p>consequential impacts on public transport connectivity.'</p> <p><b><u>Highways and Transport</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that 'in principle from a highway and transport perspective, there is support for the concept and aims of this document, particularly the proposals to link the Chetwynd Barracks site with access roads serving the Toton site and which seek to mitigate impacts on the A52 Bardills junction and establish the need for both sites to contribute to strategic transport infrastructure.'</li> <li>Notes that 'in light of the recent announcement that the HS2 station will now be located at East Midlands Parkway, the East Midlands Development Corporation will need to help secure land and obtain private and public funding to deliver the associated link roads to serve a regional scale rail station in the manner set out in the SPD.'</li> <li>Considers that whilst 'a local station may still be delivered at Toton, it is contingent on 50/50 match funding. Funding to achieve other items such as extension of the NET line</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action  |
|------------|--|---|---|
|            | <p>into the site or other local improvements such as the Toton Link Road will remain equally important.’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Holds that the document is aspirational and there is little in terms of detailed policy or quantifiable evidence such as a formal transport assessment to support its proposals. There is little detail on how this will impact on the local highway network, whether significant improvements are required and how if required such improvements will be funded or delivered’. Adds that ‘further clarity would be helpful in the final SPD to describe when this work will be undertaken and by whom to add further detail and define how the proposed allocations will be delivered.’</li> <li>• Requests that the following reference is removed:</li> </ul> <p><i>“Evidence prepared by Nottinghamshire County Council in support of the Part 2 Local Plan concluded that no more than 1,000 new homes could be accommodated by the existing highway network, across the two sites, without the need for upgrades. Without such upgrades or improvements, there would be severe impacts on the operation of the highway network, making the proposals</i></p> | <p>Technical work in relation to highway infrastructure is ongoing.</p> <p>Noted.</p> | <p>Reference to 1,000 homes has been removed.</p> |

| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action  |
|------------|---|--|---|
|            | <p><i>unacceptable in planning terms.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that ‘The final SPD will need to be revised in the light of the revised rail proposals for Toton’ and that the ‘changing nature of public transport connectively needs to be factored into any revisions which are made to the SPD development proposals.’</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Schools and Education</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discusses capacity at a number of existing schools and the process of potential expansion etc.</li> <li>States that ‘there remains a clear need for additional primary school provision to serve the Toton Chetwynd development.’</li> <li>Notes that a 1FE primary school is still required to serve the proposed redevelopment of Chetwynd Barracks and a site needs to be reserved in the development. A further primary school is required to serve the Toton development on the basis of an additional 2000 dwellings being delivered in this area and a site should be reserved.’</li> <li>Support is specifically given to the</li> </ul> | <p>The SPD has been reviewed following the IRP.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Nottinghamshire County Council will be consulted as part of a planning application and at that point, detailed requirements can be considered.</p> | <p>Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton.</p> |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|--|---|--------|
|            | <p>‘appropriate references’ in paragraphs 5.11 and 5.12.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support is also given to the ‘flexible approach outlined in relation to the potential expansion or new provision for secondary school places in para 5.13 but the second sentence should be amended as follows with the addition of the red text:</li> </ul> <p><i>A range of options will therefore need to be considered, including the potential expansion of existing secondary schools or new provision in which case land will need to be provided by the developer’</i></p> <p><b><u>Public Transport</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>‘The emphasis on providing connectivity to key services at ES.11 is supported, together with the aspiration for new boulevard type streets and excellent connectivity through new public transport.’</li> <li>‘The principle of extending the NET tram system to Long Eaton is supported.’</li> <li>Considers that ‘Developer funded contributions for new developments will be required to support the provision of public</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |



| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|---|---|--------|
|            | <p>transport, especially in the early phases of the development’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Support is given the statement at 3.51 regarding the provision of a safe, accessible and efficient movement network.’</li> <li>• Notes that Policy 3.1 refers ‘to the provision of a bus route through the site’ and states that ‘it is likely that the site will be served by more than one bus route, to provide access to and from destinations towards Nottingham and Derby and access to destinations to the north.’</li> <li>• States that Policy 3.2 ‘prioritises good quality transport links from and to nearby town centres including a north/south link road to provide local vehicle, walking and cycling access to the station and to facilitate through bus services’ and further notes that ‘it is assumed that the proposals will be reviewed in light of the Integrated Rail Plan proposals.’</li> <li>• ‘Proposals for a bus terminus / hub are supported, and it is assumed that the proposals will be reviewed in light of the Integrated Rail Plan proposals. The facility will need to be designed to provide capacity for</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response   | Action |
|------------|--|--|--------|
|            | <p>existing and future services based on projected future demand. The bus terminus should also consider current and emerging bus technologies (electric, hydrogen, etc.) and charging facilities including infrastructure should be considered as an integral part of the hub design.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'New and extended bus routes are supported, including 'bus gate' restrictions within Chetwynd Barracks to allow buses to serve the site and Chilwell without creating rat-runs for drivers. In addition, other bus gate restrictions and the consideration of making Bessell Lane a Bus, Cycle and Walking restricted road is supported.'</li> <li>• States that 'early developer contact with the local highway authority is encouraged' and notes that 'any bus service extensions will be subject to the provision of developer funding'.</li> <li>• Suggests that 'any planning approvals should be subject to a Planning Condition requiring a Public Transport Strategy to be submitted and approved which sets out details of bus services and how developer funding is to be used.'</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The Council will continue to engage with the Local Highways Authority.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|--|---|--------|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hold that the provision of funding contributions including Section 106 Agreements 'will need to be explored further'.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Rights of Way</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding Rights of Ways, response states that 'due attention should be made to the treatment of them in the application for development.'</li> <li>Notes that it is important that these are linked to the other networks (inside and outside of the development) and are of a good design that encourages safe and attractive use.'</li> <li>States that 'an upgrade of an existing footpath to allow cycling will require additional legal orders.'</li> <li>States that 'public rights of way may need to be diverted to enable building to take place which is a separate legal process to the planning application. Other considerations include the potential upgrade of an existing pedestrian (public footpath) route to one that allows cycling, will also require a separate legal order.'</li> </ul> | <p>Noted. This will be a consideration at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and agree.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response   | Action  |
|------------|--|--|---|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes an illustrative plan 'showing 'public rights of way network in the area'. States that 'inaccuracies or misalignments of the routes on a legal diversion may result in two paths being legally recorded and generating further inaccuracies and problems, especially for future house buyers and the sellers.'</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Heritage</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that 'the section on page 28 which covers the historic environment is brief and entirely focussed on the Built Environment. There is also no reference to the County Historic Environment Record (HER) being consulted.'</li> <li>Notes that 'the document does not reference any written assessment of built heritage assets at the Chetwynd site and the HER has not received a copy of any such document.'</li> <li>States that 'page 28 identifies 6 buildings through photographs as heritage assets worthy of retention and they are marked 1-6 on the accompanying map. There is also another building marked as an asset, which remains unidentified. There are also subterranean military heritage assets</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Borough Council's GIS includes references to the County Historic Environment Record.</p> <p>As Chetwynd Barracks is an active MOD base, many of the assets may not have been previously recorded.</p> <p>Noted.</p> | <p>The plan has been updated accordingly.</p> |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|--|---|--------|
|            | <p>identified but again with no details as to any assessment of its significance.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The HER points 'to a garden city type layout of the barracks housing', response recommends 'that consideration is also given to the role this plays in the wider setting and context of the heritage assets.'</li> <li>• Notes that 'as with the barracks, there is no reference to any written assessment of the railway site or the village of Toton.'</li> <li>• States that 'the HER identifies a historic village core in Toton and the statement in the masterplan is contradictory to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan which is identifying built assets within the village. It is recommended that those assets are considered and the HER would be happy to aid in the assessment of these using tested survey methods.'</li> <li>• Notes that 'both sites have a specific interest as a military base and railway siding. It is strongly recommended that a study is carried out to assess them by people or an organisation with knowledge and experience of these monument types with building types being considered within a national context in</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action |
|------------|---|--|--------|
|            | <p>terms of rarity and survival.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that 'Any existing assessments of the heritage assets should be referenced within the document to support the statements made; a copy should also be provided to the HER to enable us to create more accurate records or made available in the appendix.'</li> <li>Holds that the SPD 'should also consider archaeological potential which is omitted entirely from the document'.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Built Heritage</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considers that 'the need for a proper and detailed examination of the heritage significance of both sites covered by the SPD is crucial to the correct delivery of the stated aims of the SPD as presented in October 2021.'</li> <li>Notes that 'the NPPF will require professional investigation, reflective of each site's potential heritage significance, as and when development proposals come forward. It is appropriate for the SPD to identify this, and to clarify the requirements of pre-development Heritage Impact Assessments, especially</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Archaeological investigations will be carried out at the planning application stage.</p> <p>This will be carried out at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response   | Action |
|------------|--|--|--------|
|            | <p>when heritage interest has been identified but not examined, as in this case.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is pleased 'to see the images of the Chetwynd site used throughout the October document'.</li> <li>• States that the SPD 'would be a far more useful document' if it has examined things such as 'green spaces, parks, existing buildings and monuments, road layouts and urban tree coverage' and their 'individual and collective value to the character and the future appearance of the site'.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Archaeology</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that 'there is need for a proper and detailed assessment of the historic environment and heritage significance. No mention is made in the consultation document to the archaeological resource or potential for the sites.'</li> <li>• States that 'a thorough assessment is necessary to mitigate risk. Such an assessment would need to combine information from the HER with landscape and topographic analysis, as well as map regression.'</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council considers that these elements have been examined.</p> <p>Historic Environment investigations will be carried out at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |

| Respondent                              | Comment Summary   | Council Response                          | Action |
|---|---|---|--------|
|   | <p><b><u>Minerals</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advises that there 'are no safeguarding concerns in respect to this site and the County Council does not wish to raise any objections to the proposal from a mineral's perspective.'</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Waste</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that 'there are no existing waste sites within the vicinity of the site whereby the proposed development could cause an issue in terms of safeguarding existing waste management facilities.'</li> <li>• Notes that 'it would be useful for the application to be supported by a waste audit'.</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |
| <p><b>Derbyshire County Council</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although HS2 will no longer be coming to Toton, the Government are still 'clear that the regeneration planned at Toton will need effective transport links such as a station for local/regional services'.</li> </ul>  | <p>Noted.</p>                             |        |



| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|---|---|--------|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that ‘the IRP still proposes that a station hub should be established’. Therefore ‘many of the principles’ established in the Masterplan are still ‘highly relevant’.</li> <li>• Supports the scale of housing and employment land identified and notes that the provision of 4,500 new homes and the creation on 6,000 new jobs will ‘contribute significantly to meeting the future housing and employment requirements of Broxtowe Borough and the wider area of Greater Nottingham’.</li> <li>• Is supportive of the strategic locations for growth.</li> <li>• Considers that the Chetwynd Barracks site is situated in a very sustainable location and ‘would be well located to take advantage of the recent opening of the NET extension’.</li> <li>• Regarding the Toton site, the response notes that ‘the broad area of the site would form a logical urban extension to the existing large area of residential development in Toton to the south of the allocation and west and north-east of the B6003 Stapleford Lane’.</li> </ul> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Agree.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action |
|------------|---|--|--------|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that as ‘much of the area of land included in the allocation is Green Belt land, it is an important consideration in the design of the scheme that significant areas of landscaping and open space should be incorporated to ensure that the separation of the separation of the urban areas...are maintained’.</li> <li>• States that the Toton site is ‘well placed to facilitate good connectivity with the wider surrounding area’.</li> <li>• Broadly supports the ‘key development principles road locations for development land uses; design principles for future development; and the transport and green infrastructure networks needed to support development including linkages to the surrounding area’.</li> <li>• Considers that the broad design and layout of the masterplan area has been ‘well conceived and appropriately seeks to maximise the connectivity of the two strategic sites’.</li> <li>• Notes that ‘this is a unique opportunity to create a new large carbon zero sustainable</li> </ul> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Agree.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|--|---|--------|
|            | <p>community, which is appropriately set out in the Vision and design principles’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes and supports ‘the provision of an extensive network of green infrastructure and open space’ and states that these should be appropriately planned to maintain the identity of surrounding settlements.</li> <li>• ‘The location of the two key employment areas are well positioned to be within relatively close proximity to residents in the settlements of Long Eaton and Sandiacre, which is fully supported’.</li> <li>• States that ‘proposals will clearly both generate significant movements of people and bring about large changes in travel behaviours across all modes of transport over a wide catchment area.’</li> <li>• States that ‘Whilst generally supportive of the scheme, it is clearly both complementary to and tied up with the (previously) proposed East Midlands Hub Station.’</li> <li>• Considers that the ‘proposed improvements to local public transport connections will improve access to Derby and Nottingham’s city</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Agree.</p> |        |

| Respondent                            | Comment Summary   | Council Response                          | Action |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|--------|
|                                       | <p>centres for adjacent communities’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regards that the proposals ‘will provide improved connectivity and accessibility to local, regional, and national destinations whilst providing a sense of place.’</li> <li>• Notes that the Education proposals ‘should ensure that the primary and secondary school place needs of the masterplan are appropriately met within the site should have no impact on school place provision within the adjoining Local Education Authority in Derbyshire.’</li> <li>• Welcomes ‘the opportunity to engage in ongoing discussions with Nottinghamshire County Council and Broxtowe Borough Council on this [Education] as proposals for the schools on the site are progressed’.</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |
| <p><b>Erewash Borough Council</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Welcome the proposals for green infrastructure along the River Erewash boundary with Erewash Borough’.</li> <li>• Supports the ‘proposals for new pedestrian crossings of the Erewash Canal to improve east-west connectivity between Long Eaton...and Toton’.</li> </ul>   | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>               |        |

| Respondent                              | Comment Summary  | Council Response                          | Action |
|---|--|---|--------|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anticipate that the proposals of the IRP will 'require a review of the business case for any extension of the NET Tram network into Erewash Borough'.</li> </ul>  | Noted.                                    |        |
| <b>Unite Nottingham Retired Members</b> | <p><u>Accommodation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that housing for the elderly should have provision for 2 bedrooms; should have the latest safeguarding devices installed; and have an associated green oasis.</li> </ul> <p><u>Health Centre</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considers that the centre should be within easy distance of elderly housing and have the provision of GP services with associated wellbeing facility such as dentistry.</li> </ul> <p><u>Bus Travel</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like bus stops to have a shelter and have a service that links with inter-city buses, railway station, and the city centre'.</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |
|   |  |   |        |

| Respondent                  | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action  |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|
| <b>Ramblers Association</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feel that many questions which were put forward in the October/November 2020 Consultation have been unanswered.</li> <li>• The IRP decision to no longer have HS2 at Toton also leaves a number of questions which need to be answered.</li> <li>• Have major concerns in respect to many issues regarding the Countryside (which were raised during 2020 Consultation).</li> <li>• Stresses the importance that there is a 'clear picture in how the green countryside infrastructure will be protected and enhanced.'</li> <li>• Emphasises the importance of 'full protection to the rights of way network, no dead ended rights of way leaving the ROW user to have to access dangerous roads'.</li> <li>• Are 'particularly pleased to see there has been a large public concern about this Masterplan from the local community'.</li> <li>• Would like to be 'fully involved in all aspects of the Masterplan' and 'welcome a full site visit'.</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> | <p>Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton.</p> |

| Respondent                | Comment Summary   | Council Response            | Action   |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------------------|--|
| <b>The Coal Authority</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirm no specific comments.</li> </ul>   | N/A                         |  |
| <b>Historic England</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not wish to offer any comments.</li> </ul>  | N/A                         |  |
| <b>Natural England</b>    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not wish to provide specific comments. However, advise to consider issues such as Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity Enhancement, Landscape Enhancement, Strategic Environmental Assessment / Habitats Regulations Assessment; as well as other design features.</li> </ul> | Noted.                      | The Council has considered these issues and the SPD has been screened for SEA / HRA and Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency have been consulted. All three consultation bodies agreed that an SEA / HRA was not required. |
| <b>Environment Agency</b> | <p><u>Flood Risk</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Details how development should take account of flood risk measures/climate change allowances.</li> <li>Would welcome proposals to create space for flood waters within the development site.</li> </ul>   | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |  |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|--|---|--------|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development should look at opportunities to support the maintenance of the existing flood defences in the area.</li> <li>• Note that any works on or within 8m of the flood defences on site or the River Erewash will require a flood risk activity permit.</li> </ul> <p><u>Ground water and Contaminated Land</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given Chetwynd's current and previous use future development will need to demonstrate that contamination risks will be adequately addressed through the course of the development.</li> </ul> <p><u>Biodiversity Net Gain</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcomes that the document highlights the opportunity to provide biodiversity net gain.</li> <li>• Opportunities for the enhancement of the River Erewash corridor should also be incorporated within section 3.39.</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |



| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|--|---|--------|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State that whilst HS2 is now not proposed to be at Toton, would strongly encourage the SPD to include the requirement of a wildlife corridor through the creation of new habitats and other wider environmental enhancements such as opportunities to reduce flood risk and improve water quality.</li> <li>• Would encourage that the SPD asks future developers to provide for a minimum of 20% biodiversity net gain across the site.</li> <li>• State that green corridors proposed within the development site should be designed to provide additional habitat and also work as wildlife habitat corridors and that areas within and connecting to the floodplain of the River Erewash should look to provide enhanced habitat through the creation of habitats.</li> <li>• Regards that there appears to be a lack of</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>This is something which may be considered through the Local Plan review.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|---|---|--------|
|            | <p>east-west habitat and green infrastructure linkages through the northern part of the development (Toton North, South and East character area sections 1,2 &amp; 3).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would welcome discussions to inform potential off-site habitat enhancement along the River Erewash.</li> </ul> <p><u>Water infrastructure and Water Efficiency</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that the SPD must consider the potential impact development can have on the water environment, and how policy would seek to mitigate this.</li> <li>• Notes that development and growth must not impact upon the quality of watercourses in the area.</li> <li>• States that plans should show consideration in consultation with the incumbent water company to ensure the sewerage infrastructure and sewage treatment works have the capacity to accept and treat the additional effluent to a suitable quality</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and agree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |

| Respondent          | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action |
|---------------------|---|--|--------|
|                     | <p>standard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes that growth should not result in an increase in the frequency or duration of spills from overflows within the downstream sewer network.</li> <li>Recommend that the SPD should include a requirement for all new residential development to meet the tighter water efficiency measures of 110 litres per person per day as found in Part G of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010.</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. This would be considered within the Local Plan review.</p> |        |
| <b>Severn Trent</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supportive of the approach to de-culvert the watercourse running along the southern boundary of the site.</li> <li>Note that part of the site is detailed to be at risk from flooding and recommend that any critical sewerage infrastructure is designed to be flood resilient and, where possible, located outside of flood risk.</li> <li>Supportive of the approach to progress towards Net-Zero carbon.</li> </ul>      | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>  |        |

| Respondent                               | Comment Summary   | Council Response                                  | Action   |
|--|---|---|--|
| Office of Rail and Road                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has no comments.</li> </ul>  | N/A   |  |
| Erewash Riders Association               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request that the public rights of way (both footpaths and bridleways) currently within and abutting the site are retained as well as additional bridleways. Also request additional features including a Pegasus crossing and an off-road link.</li> </ul> | Noted.  | Plans within the document have been amended to show bridleways.  |
| DB Cargo (First Plan)                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome the amendments and clarifications that have been made as a result of representations made and follow up discussions.</li> <li>Note that it is the intention of DB Cargo to remain at the site for the foreseeable future.</li> </ul>               | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>                       |  |
| The Toton & Chilwell Neighbourhood Forum | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>References throughout the need to review sections and elements following the IRP.</li> </ul>   | The SPD has been reviewed as a result of the IRP. | Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a |

| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action                           |
|------------|---|--|----------------------------------|
|            | <p><b><u>Relationship to Other Plans section</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that the SPD be expanded to become a Design Code.</li> <br/> <li>• Community hub could be better placed at the heart of Chetwynd Barracks.</li> <br/> <li>• States that the 'Relationship to Other Plans' section 'needs now to acknowledge that the Local Plan's proposals for the Toton Strategic Location for Growth are now outdated.'</li> <br/> <li>• States that revisions are required to reflect national funding and it should be noted how the SPD responds to Local and National policy.</li> <br/> <li>• Regards that 'language used undermines the</li> </ul> | <p>Work is ongoing on a separate design code by the East Midlands Development Corporation.</p><br><p>Noted.</p><br><p>Disagree. The Local Plan policy remains in force until reviewed or withdrawn by the Council.</p><br><p>The Council considers that the SPD does respond to Local and National Policy. National funding is continually evolving.</p><br><p>Disagree.</p> | <p>railway station at Toton.</p> |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response   | Action |
|------------|--|--|--------|
|            | <p>authority of the CTTCNF's Neighbourhood Plan'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that the 'lack of reference' to the community-led masterplan created for the Chetwynd Barracks 'undermines the claim that this masterplan is grounded in local aspirations for the sites'.</li> <li>• States that the picture of the site 'could show neighbourhood masterplan instead'.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Community and Stakeholder Engagement section</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Holds that 'it would strengthen this section to have a summary of issues specifically from the stakeholders.'</li> <li>• States that it would be beneficial to reference other masterplans set forward by the DIO and CTTCNF.</li> </ul> | <p>Disagree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>This is included in this Consultation Statement.</p> <p>Noted. The Borough Council's Planning Policy Team has not had sight of the Neighbourhood Forum's masterplan.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response   | Action |
|------------|--|--|--------|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes that there is a 'good overall numbers of engagement'.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Summary of Constraints section</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that the 'chapter is well crafted' but regards that 'the topic of land contamination is introduced and presented as a constraint without mentioning the implications of such site conditions on future development proposals'.</li> <li>Holds that 'constraints and opportunities are described clearly with the support of good graphics'.</li> <li>Notes that 'existing heritage assets are not identified as a constraint but are key'. In addition to this the response indicates that Green Infrastructure should be recorded as a constraint.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Vision and Principles section</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes that the vision in 3.2 'needs to be reviewed and adjusted to new rail plans' and a 'different set of opportunities and constraints</li> </ul> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>This would be considered at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>The Council considers both heritage and green infrastructure assets to be an opportunity rather than a constraint.</p> <p>Disagree. The aspirations for the site are that it should be</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action  |
|------------|---|--|---|
|            | <p>will need to be considered for the development' of both Toton and Chetwynd Barracks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that paragraph 3.5 'could state the intended architectural character and styles to be delivered' and states the importance of Design Codes.</li> <li>States that 'development will no longer provide connections' mentioned in paragraph 3.7.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Creating a Net-zero Community section</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes that there is opportunity for additional details to be included in a number of paragraphs in this section.</li> <li>Regards that 'advantages and disadvantages need to be made clear throughout the document to give a transparent and unbiased</li> </ul> | <p>very well-connected irrespective of HS2.</p> <p>The Council shares the view in relation to Design Codes which is why the East Midlands Development Corporation is working on a draft Design Code document for the site.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Where possible, the Council will look to clarify this section.</p> <p>Where possible, the Council will look to clarify this section.</p> | <p>Wording of Net Zero Carbon section has been reviewed and expanded.</p> <p>Wording of Net Zero Carbon</p> |



| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action   |
|------------|---|--|--|
|            | <p>review of the masterplan ambitions’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that the diagrams are clear but ‘carbon emissions needs to consider Embodied Carbon in scope 1&amp;3’.</li> <li>• Holds that the ‘document should demonstrate realistic strategic not generic objectives’.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Development Principles for Toton and Chetwynd Barracks section</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that ‘these ambition pages work well to summarise and present the 8 principles in a concise and general way’.</li> <li>• Regards that ‘a detailed definition of net-zero is crucial’.</li> <li>• ‘Suggest a diagram should be used to show</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council is of the view that the document does include realistic strategic objectives.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Agree. The implementation of net-zero continues to evolve.</p> <p>Noted.</p> | <p>section has been reviewed and expanded.</p> <p>Wording of Net Zero Carbon section has been reviewed and expanded.</p> |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response   | Action |
|------------|--|--|--------|
|            | <p>the pros and cons of delivering the net-zero community goals highlighted in the SPD’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regards that the ‘architecture and urban environment should be mentioned as key factors’.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Fixes &amp; Policies Plan</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that ‘the document does not present the lack of a neighbourhood centre as an essential fix’ and goes on to note the importance of providing a ‘new heart for the area’.</li> <li>• Regards that it ‘would be important to state factors such as the poor street environment’.</li> <li>• Notes that the site’s topography ‘may cause future concerns in the design of new development’ and infers that this therefore should be included as a ‘key fix’.</li> <li>• States that ‘the heritage buildings identified on</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council is unsure what is meant by ‘poor street environment’ in this context.</p> <p>Noted. The topography of the site is considered within a number of parts of the SPD.</p> <p>This would be a matter to be considered at planning application stage.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|---|---|--------|
|            | <p>the map will require strategies for retention and refurbishment’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that ‘the provision of new homes is presented as a policy requirement but this needs further constraint to starter and downsizer homes to balance the prevalence of large properties in the area’.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Layer: Green Infrastructure section</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considers that this section ‘presents a clear and appropriate approach’.</li> <li>Notes that ‘Green corridors need clear designation of purpose’ and ‘currently no green corridors in the barracks are designated wildlife corridors’ which ‘limits each green space’s value for wildlife’.</li> <li>Suggest ‘the addition of walking distances’ on the map and ‘making clear the widths &amp; other requirements of the different types of green corridor’.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Layer: Movement section</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>‘do not consider the additional in-line junction with the A52 proposed to be sufficient to meet</li> </ul> | <p>The exact type of homes will be considered at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Detailed considerations will be considered at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|--|---|--------|
|            | <p>the principles of reduced congestion’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that ‘the implementation of this policy seems to disproportionately reduce Chilwell’s access to the A52’.</li> <li>• Considers that ‘little regard has been given to topography of pedestrian routes’.</li> <li>• Notes that ‘the proposed in-line roundabout paired with significant development is likely to increase congestion on and getting onto the A52’. Puts forward that ‘a single raised route over the A52 with slip lane access could accommodate the greater demand’.</li> <li>• Regards that the key could be simplified ‘by excluding unused items such as pedestrian crossing arrow’.</li> <li>• On the diagram, the response holds that ‘vehicle access at this point would further congest Stapleford Lane and damage the safety of a primary potential walking and cycling link’.</li> </ul> | <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> <p>Disagree.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> <p>The plans have been reviewed although the ‘pedestrian crossing arrow’ is in use.</p> <p>Noted. Technical work is ongoing.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action  |
|------------|---|--|---|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that if a station is provided on the sidings site, 'it would make sense to co-locate park and ride services for NET'.</li> <li>• States that the 'East Midlands hub station needs re-labelling and redesigning to be appropriate for local services only. A primary road should also be provided linking directly to the A52'.</li> <li>• Considers that 'opportunities to create active transport links into office park and housing to South and East of Chetwynd Barracks are missed'.</li> <li>• States that 'proposed secondary roads perpendicular to slope are not ideal for active transport'.</li> <li>• States that 'few tertiary roads proposed for Chetwynd South implying large format development inappropriate for the suburban-urban setting'.</li> <li>• Regards that 'new roads adjacent to and link road through the woods at the end of Welbeck gardens will damage habitats there'.</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Disagree.</p> <p>Noted. Technical work is ongoing.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> <p>The SPD has been reviewed</p> | <p>The plans have been updated accordingly.</p> |

| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action  |
|------------|---|--|---|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding the text - 'primary vehicular access to the East Midlands Hub station from new junctions from the A52' – response states that 'this would still be required with a smaller station in this location but is not shown in the Transport Layer map. 'Only secondary connections are shown'.</li> <li>• States that 'existing low-grade industrial facilities on Bessell Lane are not necessarily conducive to the proposed new development so protection of them should be carefully considered'.</li> <li>• Regards that 'opportunity to upgrade Bessell Lane as primary link for the station to the A52 is missed'.</li> <li>• Holds that the SPD document does not 'successfully incorporate' a number of connectivity elements into its design and layout.</li> <li>• Notes that 'care must be taken that active transport infrastructure does not unduly compromise habitats &amp; biodiversity'.</li> <li>• Notes that 'creation of new roads should be considered' as some roads would need</li> </ul> | <p>as a result of the IRP.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Disagree.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing</p> <p>This would be a matter for</p> | <p>Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton.</p> |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response   | Action |
|------------|--|--|--------|
|            | <p>substantial upgrades.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that 'hot-spots need identifying and addressing specifically'.</li> <li>• 'Consider proposed upgrades insufficient to handle proposed development'.</li> <li>• Put forward that 'a single new separated junction and overpass at the existing Bardills Island would be a stronger option'.</li> <li>• States that 'utilising the site of the existing George Spencer academy which is subtended by the A52 the existing topography would make an overpass simpler to deliver'.</li> <li>• Opposes link road from Stapleford Lane to potentially opposite Woodstock Road. Holds that 'a connecting Road from Northfield Close to Stapleford Lane should be considered as an alternative'.</li> </ul> | <p>Nottinghamshire County Council as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>This would be a matter for Nottinghamshire County Council as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> <p>Noted. Technical work is</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action  |
|------------|---|---|---|
|            | <p><b><u>Street Typologies section</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that 'definition of roads through green belt areas with no development required'. The response indicates that the link road should be considered differently to the Boulevards.</li> <li>• Holds that 'maximum gradients for each type of street should be added to their descriptions'.</li> <li>• States that 'care should be taken to ensure neighbourhood streets are safe for the visually impaired'.</li> <li>• Regards that 'alternative options to on street parking may be worth mentioning'.</li> <li>• Suggest moving reference to Bus Gates to previous paragraph (3.72).</li> <li>• States that 'developers will require clarity as to the appropriate numbers or car, bicycle and electric car parking places and bus stops'.</li> </ul> | <p>ongoing.</p> <p>Disagree. The SPD needs to be a flexible framework.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>A parking strategy will be considered as part of the planning application process. The Council will include this to the previous paragraph.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Specific issues would be considered at the planning application stage.</p> <p>A parking strategy will be considered as part of the</p> | <p>The reference to Bus Gates has been moved to previous paragraph.</p> |



| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action |
|------------|---|--|--------|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Adding the potential for a phased approach with gradually reduced parking provision could be considered in this section'.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Spatial Framework Section</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that 'proposals could retain more green space'.</li> <li>• States 'up and over junction with A52 on George Spencer site needs considering'.</li> <li>• States 'no Primary road provided to access new station'.</li> <li>• Considers that 'not enough attention has been paid to topography when designing the transport infrastructure'.</li> <li>• Holds that 'current plans segregate existing communities in Chilwell by providing limited vehicle access into Chetwynd through to Toton and onto the A52'.</li> </ul> | <p>planning application process</p> <p>The Council feels that the SPD has sufficient provision for green space.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> <p>Noted. Technical work is ongoing.</p> <p>Agree.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|--|---|--------|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that 'the integrated approach of green and transport infrastructure needs to be considered to protect habitats and biodiversity'</li> <li>• States that 'opportunity to introduce additional SUDS and blue infrastructure on the barracks have not been shown on the masterplan'.</li> <li>• States that there are 'insufficient quantitative requirements for the green infrastructure typologies'.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Toton North section</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Holds that the 'Innovation Campus will positively impact the character of the area'.</li> <li>• Regards that design considerations need updating.</li> <li>• Are in favour 'of the proposed medium-high density for the neighbourhood' and also</li> </ul> | <p>Provision of SUDS would be a matter for consideration at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council considers that greater amount of flexibility is required.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Work is ongoing on a separate design code by the East Midlands Development Corporation.</p> <p>The Council aspires that the provision of open space is accessible to all.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response   | Action |
|------------|--|--|--------|
|            | <p>‘encourage the use of any design considerations which integrate the provision of open spaces accessible to all’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that ‘the harsh environment adjacent to A52 needs to be converted into pedestrian friendly spaces and routes. To be successful, it should be made clear that walking and cycling routes are key aspects to be delivered’.</li> <li>Holds that ‘it is essential to mention specific physical attributes and strategies such as the integration of urban amenities’.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Toton South section</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that ‘references on ways to enhance the character of development could be more specific’.</li> <li>Holds that ‘residential development of higher densities must be encouraged to ensure that a greater area is preserved for green space’.</li> <li>Considers that the name ‘Toton South’ is ‘confusing’ and would encourage instead using the term ‘New Toton South’ as well as</li> </ul> | <p>The Council agrees that walking and cycling routes are key aspects to be delivered.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The SPD is a flexible framework and its role is not to be too specific.</p> <p>The Council agrees that the provision of green space is important.</p> <p>Disagree.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action |
|------------|---|--|--------|
|            | <p>the terms 'New Toton North' and 'New Toton East'.</p> <p><b><u>Toton East</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Holds that 'more mention should be made on the character of physical spaces'.</li> <li>• Regards that 'the proposed housing for the area should also include low-rise flats and potentially bungalows'.</li> <li>• States that there is 'incentive to retain and maintain local hedgerows'.</li> <li>• States that 'when it is mentioned there should be more accessible routes...it must be noted that this will affect the existing green spaces, so it must be mentioned that it will aim not to damage existing green infrastructure on site'.</li> <li>• Envisages 'a benefit from creating a link between the road at the end of Chilwell (Field</li> </ul> | <p>The SPD is a flexible framework and its role is not to be too specific.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Agree. The Council will add some text to the SPD to reflect this.</p> <p>Noted. Technical work is ongoing.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|--|---|--------|
|            | <p>Lane) to the A52’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers that ‘emphasis should be made on the retention of existing homes on the site’.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Chetwynd West section</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that the diversity of housing types should be increased to protect green space and create a medium level of density.</li> <li>• States that ‘new through-road should be designed considering the topography of the site; care should be applied to the positioning of routes’.</li> <li>• ‘Would contest that this isn’t the most suitable place for a new primary school’.</li> <li>• Notes that ‘the health centre should be co-located with commercial facilities in Chetwynd East’.</li> <li>• Considers that ‘the quantum of development proposed in Chetwynd West will not create a need’ for certain new facilities to be added to the area.</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree. Technical work is ongoing.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Disagree.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|--|---|--------|
|            | <p><b><u>Chetwynd East section</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Holds that the SPD ‘could name some of the heritage buildings to be refurbished and integrated into new developments.’</li> <li>• ‘Agree with the proposed residential densities and the conversion of some military buildings to other uses’.</li> <li>• States that ‘amongst the design considerations there should be a referral to the refurbishment of existing homes to current standards of living’.</li> <li>• Holds that provision of new nursery schools is important.</li> <li>• States that ‘there is great emphasis on the retention of existing green infrastructure, including the Hobgoblin Wood and Memorial Gardens. The process to achieve successful results, require equal emphasis on exemplary</li> </ul> | <p>This would be a matter to be considered at the planning application stage. This would also be appropriate for inclusion within the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|---|---|--------|
|            | <p>strategies for the enhancement of adjacent spaces. Such spaces are key to the provision of new accessible routes and the integration of military heritage spaces.'</p> <p><b><u>Chetwynd South site</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that 'this is an ideal location to put the retirement and elderly residential' typologies of housing.</li> <li>• Suggest 'that density reduces towards the south of the area'.</li> <li>• States that green links and pedestrian routes 'should connect well to the existing green space in Mountbatten Estate and the memorial garden'.</li> <li>• Holds that 'the area needs to be better connected with South-East and West and there are good opportunities to add cycle routes and pathways'.</li> <li>• States that 'the site needs better connections with the rest of the area to reduce its isolated positioning'.</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response   | Action |
|------------|--|--|--------|
|            | <p><b><u>Toton West section</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that ‘the river Erewash should be included in the map of Toton West’.</li> <li>• Holds that ‘the density suggestion is appropriate for this site given its low lying level’.</li> <li>• States that ‘the siting of the Innovation campus will need to be reconsidered’.</li> <li>• There should be reference to the importance of enhancing and preserving key habitats.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Railway Corridor &amp; Toton Fields section</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that ‘enhancements to the nature reserve should not be limited to developer contributions’.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Development Phasing section</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Holds that housing should be provided more quickly.</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>The Borough Council agrees that it would be desirable to retain and enhance key habitats.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The Council would</p> |        |



| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response   | Action |
|------------|--|--|--------|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that the ‘masterplan represents low density development which directly contrasts the wishes of local people’.</li> <li>• Advocates modular construction.</li> <li>• Emphasises that ‘landscaping and infrastructure should be built first’.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Infrastructure Delivery section</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Holds that it is essential to establish green infrastructure link from Toton Field Nature Reserve to Hobgoblin Wood early on.</li> <li>• Holds that the ‘maximum number of cycle and pedestrian points should be provided prior to build out of the site’.</li> <li>• Regards that ‘the NET extension is a priority that needs to happen as soon as possible’.</li> <li>• Holds that the relocation of the TMD and active rail use at Toton Sidings ‘may need to be brought forward to meet housing supply</li> </ul> | <p>aspire to see housing developed on site as promptly as possible.<br/>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council aspires to provide good cycle and pedestrian connectivity.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action |
|------------|---|--|--------|
|            | <p>needs as the barracks sale has been delayed’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers that ‘the feasibility for an over-road separated junction should be considered.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Schools &amp; Healthcare Delivery section</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that the ‘primary school is not at capacity, so this needs to be checked and updated’.</li> <li>• Notes that ‘it is more important to site these two schools in the right place later in the development plan to ensure long term efficacy and use.</li> <li>• Considers that ‘the suggested site in Chetwynd for a new school is far too close to the existing primary school to the existing Chetwynd Primary Academy’.</li> <li>• Notes that ‘it makes sense for the primary school (in Toton South) to be developed in tandem with development’.</li> <li>• Suggests ‘the George Spencer Academy</li> </ul> | <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The exact siting of the schools will be considered at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|--|---|--------|
|            | <p>moves, and in the process of moving, it should be situated on a site where it has space to expand.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests that the 'Health Centre should co-locate with the new local centre in Chetwynd East.</li> <li>• Holds that there 'is potential for a (temporary) community facility in Toton South to provide for the first phase of development'.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Community Facilities, Stewardship &amp; Meanwhile Uses section</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regards that the local centre for Chetwynd 'should be in Chetwynd East, not South in order to connect the area to Chilwell'.</li> <li>• States that there is community support for the first part of paragraph 5.18.</li> <li>• States that the Nature Centre should be 'located in Chetwynd East not South'.</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Regardless of where the local centre is located, the development will be well-connected to Chilwell.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |

| Respondent             | Comment Summary  | Council Response   | Action   |
|------------------------|--|--|--|
|                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes that 'Meanwhile uses should not have detrimental impact on wildlife and green space'.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Planning for a New Region section</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that 'these final pages are good and set a positive conclusion for the aspirations of the masterplan'.</li> <li>Suggests that the term 'wheeling' is defined.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Appendix A</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have used this section to highlight where the masterplan falls short of the requirements and to signpost the reader to comments elsewhere in the document.</li> </ul> | <p>Agree.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Agree. The term has been clarified.</p> <p>Noted.</p> | <p>The term 'wheeling' has been clarified.</p> |
| <b>Barton Willmore</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests greater ambition for the area, and in particular the Railway Corridor Character Area should be identified within the Masterplan.</li> </ul>  | <p>Noted.</p>  |  |
|                        |  |  |  |

| Respondent               | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action  |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|
| <b>Peveril</b>           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers that the Masterplan requires a review, in light of the IRP, with housing and employment aspirations for the site being significantly reduced.</li> <li>• Holds that land east of Toton Lane can come forward in the short term and will deliver houses, part of the Toton Lane - A52 link road and potential access to the Barracks site.</li> </ul>   | <p>Noted. The SPD has been reviewed as a result of the IRP.</p> <p>Noted.</p>   | <p>Additional text included in response to the IRP, the rationale for the development and the potential for a railway station at Toton.</p> |
| <b>National Highways</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principle interest is safeguarding the operation of the A52 and M1.</li> <li>• Note that the SPD does not appear to have been updated to account for the HS2 East Midlands Hub station no longer being situated at Toton. Therefore expect that the development aspirations, and potentially transport infrastructure proposals, will change from that set out in this consultation.</li> <li>• The provision of an additional junction onto the A52 will accommodate increased traffic flows onto a severely strained strategic link.</li> <li>• Any proposal to deliver a new junction on the</li> </ul> | <p>Technical work is ongoing as a result of National Highways' representations.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing as a result of National Highways' representations.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing as a result of National Highways' representations.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing as</p> |   |

| Respondent  | Comment Summary  | Council Response   | Action |
|---|--|--|--------|
|   | <p>SRN requires a Strategic Business Case demonstrating the need, impacts, benefits, and evidencing that the growth aspirations cannot be accommodated via upgrade to the existing junctions on the network.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This proposed junction will be located in close proximity to the existing Bardills roundabout, which itself suffers from capacity constraints and would be expected to interact with the new junction, with queues from one reaching back to and interfering with the other. This proposal will require an application for Departures from Standards to be approved.</li> <li>Is concerned that the delivery of this new connection to the A52 shall have a major detrimental impact on journey times, reliability of the SRN to serve both local and long distance trips, as well as highway safety.</li> </ul> | <p>a result of National Highways' representations.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing as a result of National Highways' representations.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing as a result of National Highways' representations.</p> |        |
| <p><b>Avison Young<br/>(on behalf of<br/>Homes England)</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that the SPD may be adopted before an outline planning application is submitted. Queries whether the SPD will be a material consideration of an application.</li> <li>Welcomes 'the clear explanation that the</li> </ul>  | <p>The SPD will be a material consideration.</p> <p>Noted.</p>   |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action  |
|------------|--|---|---|
|            | <p>purpose of the SPD is not to establish a prescriptive masterplan’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seeks clarity regarding the SPD’s relationship with other plans and for the document to confirm that it is ‘subordinate to the Local Plan Part 2’ and ‘that it would need to be consistent with the NP’.</li> <li>• Regards that the IRP ‘would not appear to have any direct influence over the...development of the Barracks’.</li> <li>• Observes that the Environment Act 2021 became law. Notes the ‘emphasis that the draft SPD places on achieving sustainable outcomes and on protecting and enhancing biodiversity’.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Existing Land Uses</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Welcomes the recognition that the Annington Homes land will not form part of the OPA [outline planning application]’.</li> <li>• States that ‘there is no reference to the evidence base that informs or supports the</li> </ul> | <p>A section of the SPD sets out the relationship between Part 2 Local Plan policies and the SPD.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> | <p>The text has been amended to reflect that the Environment Act is now law.</p> <p>The detailed depiction of</p> |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response                          | Action   |
|------------|--|---|--|
|            | <p>contents of Figure 10'. Regards that as Homes England is commissioning ground investigation works, 'it is premature for the SPD to incorporate a diagram purporting to show the location of contamination on the site'. Proposes the removal of Figure 10, or content relating to contamination to be deleted.</p> <p><b><u>Movement, Access and Connectivity</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Supports the statement in Paragraph 2.24 that there are "opportunities" to improve accessibility to public transport as part of the OPA for the site' and expects that the masterplan will 'demonstrate how the arrangement of uses, location of access points, and on-site infrastructure, will deliver enhanced accessibility to public transport.'</li> <li>• Notes that an 'existing' access point to the Barracks on its southern boundary is not an access point and should be removed.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Green and Blue Infrastructure</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that there are discrepancies in paragraph 2.26.</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> | <p>areas of contamination within Figure 10 has been deleted.</p> <p>The plan has been revised accordingly.</p> |



| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response   | Action  |
|------------|--|--|---|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that Figure 14 does not assist the interpretation of text within paragraph 2.26.</li> <li>• States that ‘a requirement to re-plant previously cleared woodland would go beyond the scope of policy 3.1’. Regards that reference to re-planting of cleared woodland should be removed.</li> <li>• Observes that ‘the Field Close Open Space, annotated as number 3 on Figure 14, is outside of the control of the DIO’.</li> <li>• States that in paragraph 2.27 ‘any suggestion in relation to the approach to the culverts seems premature’ and so suggests that ‘the SPD ought to refer to de-culverting as an “opportunity” or “potential outcome”’.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>The Historic Environment</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agrees with the general view presented in paragraphs 2.30 to 2.33.</li> <li>• Notes that Figure 16 ‘annotates Sergeant’s Mess’ as a heritage asset but ‘this is not referred to in the associated text’. Assumes that the annotation is an error and asks for this to be removed.</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Disagree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> | <p>The plan has been revised accordingly.</p> |

| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action |
|------------|---|--|--------|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that the suggestion that the footprint of Building 157 should be retained is one option, but there may be others of equal or greater merit.' Regards that the text regarding retaining Building 157 goes beyond a 'flexible framework'.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Summary of Opportunities</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agrees with an aspiration for development in the masterplan area to deliver "net-zero carbon" outcomes.</li> <li>• Agrees that there is an opportunity to achieve net gains in biodiversity through redevelopment, and notes that the draft SPD is not prescriptive about the quantum of net gain that should be targeted.</li> <li>• Supports the general objective of ensuring new development is connected to its surroundings and promotes journeys by foot and by bicycle.</li> <li>• Agrees that the redevelopment can make a significant contribution to the delivery of new housing in the area.</li> </ul> | <p>Disagree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|---|---|--------|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally supports the opportunity to maximise existing assets and integrate them into development.</li> <li>• Agrees that there is an opportunity to accommodate new facilities within the development to contribute to the new and existing community and to support place-making objectives as prescribed by Policy 3.1.</li> <li>• States ‘it should also be noted that employment opportunities will also arise from the neighbourhood centre.’</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Vision and Principles – Creating a Net-Zero Community</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the text in the SPD that says that proposals should, “maximise their contribution to supporting the transition to net-zero”.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Development Principles for Toton and Chetwynd Barracks</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 8 principles are generally consistent with the principles that it is looking to adopt in the OPA masterplan.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Key Fixes</u></b></p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action |
|------------|---|--|--------|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regards that identifying ‘fixes’ seems incompatible with the stated aim of the SPD operating as a ‘flexible framework’.</li> <li>• States that it is unclear whether heritage buildings on Figure 22 should be treated as Fixes. If this is the case, then Homes England would not support the identification of specific buildings to be retained. For clarity, proposes that these should be removed from Figure 22.</li> <li>• Notes a similar point arises in relation to green infrastructure in regards to whether or not these are ‘Fixes’.</li> <li>• Holds that Figure 22 should be labelled as indicative.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Green Infrastructure</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is important that the SPD makes clear that the contents of Figure 23 are indicative, and that it will be for planning application process to show how the green infrastructure proposals will be implemented.</li> <li>• Notes that the north-south link is shown as a proposed green corridor and is denoted as an</li> </ul> | <p>Disagree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Disagree.</p> <p>Disagree.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action |
|------------|---|--|--------|
|            | <p>'urban boulevard'. This should be reviewed, given Homes England's discussions with NCC (in its role as LHA) about the design and alignment of that link.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regards that Figure 23 should be labelled as 'indicative' and not be 'fixed'.</li> <li>• Is supportive of the design principles within the 'Green Infrastructure Framework Plan'.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Layer: Movement</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that the 'accesses and alignments shown on Figure 25 are not underpinned by evidence.'</li> <li>• Regards that Figure 25 should be labelled as indicative.</li> <li>• Puts forward a number of observations in relation to the link road and 'suggests that Paragraph 3.65 ought to be reviewed accordingly.'</li> <li>• Suggests that the commentary in the draft SPD could be amended to say the following:</li> </ul> <p><i>"The requirement to facilitate the link road applies to</i></p> | <p>Noted. Technical work is ongoing.</p> <p>Disagree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Disagree.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|--|---|--------|
|            | <p><i>any planning application for development which is submitted and which relates to land that is required to deliver any part of the link road. It is, of course, recognised that applicants can only be expected to meet this requirement within land that is in their control”.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that ‘The existing levels on the site would preclude the outcome of the link road having a straight alignment, as suggested in Figure 25.’</li> <li>• States that ‘if the link road were to be aligned as shown on the diagram in the SPD, it would be incompatible with its role within the new neighbourhood. Moreover, Homes England would have concerns about the safety of a route on a straight alignment and with a gradient of 1 in 8 and which would not meet standards in the Design Guide.’</li> <li>• Notes that ‘no design or technical evidence has been produced to demonstrate that a ‘boulevard’ on a straight alignment is feasible or deliverable.’</li> <li>• Proposes that the content of the SPD relating to the link road should be reviewed and amended to confirm that the alignment of the</li> </ul> | <p>Noted. Technical work is ongoing</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|---|---|--------|
|            | <p>section that passes through the Barracks will be designed having regard to the significant changes in levels through the site, and to ensure that it is compatible with, and fully supports, the delivery of the exemplar new residential development that the local authorities, CTTCNF and Homes England and DIO wish to see.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers that an access from Stapleford Lane could comprise an appropriate element of the overall strategy for the Barracks.</li> <li>• States that there is no requirement in Policy 3.1 to apply a test of 'necessity' to an access in this location.</li> <li>• Proposes that the SPD should simply note that any access that the OPA proposes from Stapleford must be thoroughly tested and included only as part of the overall access strategy, alongside the primary access from Swiney Way.</li> <li>• Notes that Figure 25 shows access points on land controlled by Annington Homes and which is outside the control of the DIO, and which will not form part of the OPA.</li> </ul> | <p>Technical work is ongoing.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action |
|------------|---|--|--------|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that some of the content of the Movement later is said to have been informed by a Local Connectivity Study prepared by Mott Macdonald. Regards that this study should be published.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Spatial Framework</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes that Figure 27 provides a ‘Spatial Framework, which “aggregates the fixes and the layers” found in earlier sections of the draft SPD. Therefore, the points which have already been raised in relation to the fixes and layers (including the need for the figure to be labelled as ‘indicative’) also apply here.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Character Areas</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regards that an approach which seeks to ‘define’ the type of development that can come forward in particular areas is plainly inconsistent with the objective of establishing a flexible framework.</li> <li>Welcomes the confirmation that the SPD ‘does not specify which land uses should be located next to one another’.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Chetwynd West:</u></b></p> | <p>Noted. The Council will explore whether the document can be put in the public domain.</p> <p>Disagree.</p> <p>Disagree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |



| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|---|---|--------|
|            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that Chetwynd West is described as a “primarily residential area” but also a location where “some community facilities” may be delivered given that it is expected to be first part of the site to be delivered. States that this is a different position to that expressed in Policy 3.1 of the Local Plan Part 2, which states that both the school and medical facility should be located close to the retained playing pitches at the eastern end of the site. Therefore, the commentary on Chetwynd West is inconsistent with Policy 3.1.</li> <li>• States it is important to note that the test in Policy 3.1 is that development ‘positively facilitates’ the route, and this should be reflected in the wording of the SPD.</li> <li>• Reiterates that the extent of the DIO’s ownership is such that a route can only be facilitated between Swiney Way and the boundary of DIO’s land with Annington Homes land.</li> <li>• In relation to residential uses, the first design consideration says that development will be “lower densities, primarily comprising terraced, semi-detached and detached</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|---|---|--------|
|            | <p>houses, with higher densities to the south near Chetwynd Road”. Unsure on what basis the draft SPD promotes lower densities having regards to the expectation in the Local Plan that the site will deliver 1,500 dwellings, or how ‘lower densities’ is defined given the lack of evidence to support such an approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States it is important that the SPD does not constrain unnecessarily the flexibility that is needed in relation to the housing typologies to be delivered in the Chetwynd West character area.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Chetwynd East:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The draft SPD states that this character area will be “heavily influenced by retained military heritage”. Generally do not disagree with this view.</li> <li>Considers that it should be noted that the retention and conversion of buildings will be informed by i) an assessment of their cultural and historical significance; ii) an assessment of their feasibility and readiness for conversion; and iii) market analysis on the likely suitable uses for retained/converted buildings, with all those issues to be</li> </ul> | <p>The Council considers that the document does contain sufficient flexibility.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>The Council notes that this assessment will need to be carried out by the applicant at the planning application stage.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|---|---|--------|
|            | <p>thoroughly examined and evidenced via the OPA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SPD should state that the OPA process will explore the potential for conversion and retention and should not be prescriptive about the types of uses that might be accommodated in any retained building.</li> <li>• States that the way in which development responds to the heritage of the site is a matter that is appropriately dealt with through the preparation of the OPA. Would therefore prefer that reference to ‘heritage trail’ is removed from the SPD.</li> <li>• Generally supports the commentary of the section which confirms that this character area will accommodate residential development and a new centre comprising of retail and other community uses “catering for local needs”.</li> <li>• States that the commentary also confirms that the new primary school and medical facility may be in Chetwynd East. This raises three points for Homes England:</li> </ul> <p>1. <i>The Toton SLG and Barracks sites are in</i></p> | <p>Disagree.</p> <p>Disagree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|---|---|--------|
|            | <p><i>different ownerships...Consequently the medical facilities on the Barracks should not be linked with or constrained by SLG delivery.</i></p> <p>2. <i>The phasing of development at the Barracks will be carefully examined, having regard to viability, market demand, engagement, and place-making outcomes.</i></p> <p>3. <i>The school could also be located in Chetwynd South, having regard to the place-making objectives, and noting that doing so would comply with the requirement in Policy 3.1 for the school to be "in close proximity" to the existing pitches.</i></p> <p>Based on the above, the SPD should not be prescriptive about which uses are to be provided in which character area but should instead say that uses 'could' or 'might' be in one or more character areas, with the distribution of these and phases to be assessed through the OPA process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The design considerations also refer to "lower densities". Homes England repeats its above comments about how 'lower densities' are defined, and the apparent lack of evidence to support restrictions on density in this part of the site. Again, Homes England would</li> </ul> | <p>Noted. The infrastructure for both sites needs to be considered together.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. The precise location will be a matter for the planning application process.</p> <p>Disagree.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response   | Action |
|------------|--|--|--------|
|            | <p>encourage the SPD to take a flexible approach to the densities and typologies to be delivered in this character area.</p> <p><b><u>Chetwynd South:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports that the SPD states that this will be “primarily residential”.</li> <li>• Proposes that the SPD acknowledges that the OPA will test the location, scale and type of employment use having regard to: the most up-to-date evidence base; evidence of demand and market considerations; impact on housing capacity; the amount of commercial floorspace delivered in the neighbourhood centre; and on securing the best design and masterplanning outcomes.</li> <li>• Notes that a further design consideration is that development will ‘integrate’ the culverted watercourse south of Building 157 into a SuDS and green infrastructure network. Homes England is supportive of this aspiration.</li> <li>• Notes that the text goes on to say that the watercourse should be integrated with the “restoration of Moor Wood”. State that Homes</li> </ul> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Up-to-date evidence will be considered at the planning application stage. The SPD will be one material consideration as part of the planning application determination.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response  | Action |
|------------|--|---|--------|
|            | <p>England are unsure which part of the site 'Mood Wood' refers to but speculate that it is the 'historic woodland' shown on Figure 14. If this is the case, then repeat earlier point that a requirement to re-plant woodland would be inconsistent with Policy 3.1 and so this statement needs to be amended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In relation to the residential element of this character area, states that it is important that the SPD is explicitly flexible around the types of housing that might be provided in this character area to ensure deliverability of development.</li> <li>For the SPD to meet its objective of being a flexible framework, Homes England thinks it ought to refer to the possibility of the school being located in Chetwynd South whilst acknowledging that the OPA process will put forward an evidence-based approach for its eventual location.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Development Phasing</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that no evidence has been made available to support the view that delivery of a school at Chetwynd should be linked to the delivery of development at Toton. We</li> </ul> | <p>The Council considers the SPD to be sufficiently flexible.</p> <p>Noted. The precise location will be a matter for the planning application process.</p> <p>The Council considers that</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary   | Council Response   | Action |
|------------|---|--|--------|
|            | <p>therefore repeat Homes England's request that the references to linkages in the SPD are removed in favour of wording that says that phasing of facilities will be determined during the OPA process, having regard to the views of the LEA and to place-making outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers rather than the current wording of Paragraph 5.15, the SPD should instead say that delivery of the new facility at the Barracks should be informed by discussion with the CCG and having regard to place-making objectives.</li> <li>• States that paragraphs 5.16 and 5.17 address the delivery of 'other' community facilities. Homes England's only observation is that Paragraph 5.17 states that 'Chetwynd High Street' (i.e. the new centre) will be located in the Chetwynd South character area. That is inconsistent with the statement in Section 4 of the SPD that the centre will be provided in Chetwynd East. This reiterates the point that the SPD should not, and need not, be prescriptive about where the centre is located.</li> <li>• Notes that the OPA process will test the appropriate locations for the centre, and may</li> </ul> | <p>the infrastructure for both sites needs to be considered together.</p> <p>The CCG would be consulted as a part of any relevant application.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Council considers that</p> |        |

| Respondent | Comment Summary  | Council Response   | Action |
|------------|--|--|--------|
|            | <p>include locations across both character areas, or in one or the other. By being less prescriptive, the SPD would maintain its objective of being a 'flexible framework'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SPD says that long-term stewardship "must be secured in perpetuity" as part of the OPA. Homes England acknowledges this and expects the OPA process to identify and secure outcomes in relation to stewardship.</li> <li>• Agree that 'meanwhile uses' can make a positive contribution.</li> <li>• Homes England is not convinced of the merits of obliging applicants to submit feasibility studies with planning applications. Homes England thinks that the SPD would be more effective by providing support for meanwhile uses and advocating the submission of feasibility studies where promoters want to test potential temporary uses, rather than mandating their preparation.</li> </ul> | <p>the SPD is a flexible framework.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Disagree.</p> |        |