

This matter is being dealt with by:
Nina Wilson
Reference: n/a
T 0 W nottinghamshire.gov.uk



Richard Mapletoft
Rushcliffe Borough Council

22nd March 2017

Dear Richard

Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2 Further Options Consultation

Thank you for your email dated 20th February 2017 requesting strategic planning observations on the above application. I have consulted with my colleagues across relevant divisions of the County Council and have the following comments to make. The comments have been agreed with the Chairman of Environment and Sustainability Committee.

County Planning Context

The adopted Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Core Strategy (adopted 10 December 2013) (full title Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Replacement Waste Local Plan, Part 1: Waste Core Strategy) and the saved, non-replaced policies of the Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Local Plan (adopted 2002), along with the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan (adopted 2005) (and emerging replacement plan) form part of the development plan for the area. As such relevant policies in these plans need to be considered.

Minerals

In terms of planning for minerals, paragraph 143 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that, in preparing Local Plans, local planning authorities should:

- *'define Mineral Safeguarding Areas and adopt appropriate policies in order that known locations of specific minerals resources of local and national importance are not needlessly sterilised by non-minerals development, whilst not creating a presumption that resources defined will be worked; and define Mineral Consultations Areas based on these Minerals Safeguarding Areas;*
- *set out policies to encourage the prior extraction of minerals, where practicable and environmentally feasible, if it is necessary for non-mineral development to take place'.*

In Nottinghamshire, these areas are defined in the emerging Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan and supported by Policy DM13, which also covers prior extraction.

The national Planning Practice Guidance provides information on the role of district councils, stating that *'they have an important role in safeguarding minerals in 3 ways:*

- *having regard to the local minerals plan when identifying suitable areas for non-mineral development in their local plans. District Councils should show Mineral Safeguarding Areas on their policy maps;*

- *in those areas where a mineral planning authority has defined a Minerals Consultation Area, consulting the mineral planning authority and taking account of the local minerals plan before determining a planning application on any proposal for non-minerals development within it; and*
- *when determining planning applications, doing so in accordance with development policy on minerals safeguarding, and taking account of the views of the mineral planning authority on the risk of preventing minerals extraction.'*

For information, the Minerals Local Plan was submitted to Secretary of State on 15 December 2016. Hearing sessions are currently scheduled to start in late June 2017.

The County Council has provided details at Appendix 1 of where the proposed housing sites either lie within a Minerals Safeguarding/Consultation Area or are in close proximity to an existing minerals or (or proposed allocation in the Minerals Local Plan). It is requested that these matters are given due consideration as work on the Part 2 Local Plan continues (not just in relation to the sites listed in this consultation), particularly as part of the site allocation and sustainability appraisal processes.

Waste

In terms of planning for waste, the National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW) sets out the Government's ambition to work towards more sustainable and efficient resource management in line with the waste hierarchy. Positive planning is seen as key to delivering these waste ambitions through supporting sustainable development. This includes ensuring that waste management is considered alongside other spatial planning concerns and helping to secure the re-use and recovery of waste wherever possible.

Paragraph 8 of the NPPW states that:

'When determining planning applications, all planning authorities should ensure that:

- *the likely impact of proposed non-waste related development on existing waste management facilities, and on sites and areas allocated for waste management, is acceptable and does not prejudice the implementation of the waste hierarchy and/or the efficient operation of such facilities;*
- *new, non-waste development makes sufficient provision for waste management and promotes good design to secure the integration of waste management facilities with the rest of the development, and, in less developed areas, with the local landscape. This includes providing adequate waste storage facilities at residential premises, for example by ensuring that there is sufficient and discrete provision for bins, to facilitate a high quality, comprehensive and frequent household collection service;*
- *the handling of waste arising from the construction and operation of development maximises reuse/recovery opportunities and minimises off-site disposal.'*

In Nottinghamshire, relevant policies are set out in the Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Replacement Waste Local Plan: Part 1 – Waste Core Strategy (December 2013). Although paragraph 8, as set out above, relates to the determination of planning applications, the County Council has provided details below about existing waste management facilities in proximity to proposed site allocations as the District Council may consider it prudent to give consideration to these matters at this stage, to avoid the delivery of the Plan being prejudiced by conflicts arising at the planning application stage. This approach would be consistent with Policy WCS10 of the adopted Waste Core Strategy.

Nature Conservation

The Nature Conservation Team have no comments on the Green belt Review or CIL Charging Schedule documents, but have the following response to the questions in the Further Options consultation:

Questions 1-6

No comments

Question 7

COT6; this affects an area of woodland/scrub which contributes to a continuous belt of woodland along the southern side of the Cotgrave and is likely to be of ecological value. If allocated, the woodland/scrub would need to be omitted from the allocation, with development restricted to the open fields (but maintaining the mature field boundaries).

COT10; this is an area of rough grassland and scrub which may have ecological value – NCC would suggest it's omission unless it can be demonstrated that the site is of low ecological value.

COT11; if allocated, the relatively large pond(s) on the site should be omitted.

Question 8

No comment

Question 9

EL14; this site abuts a Local Wildlife Site (5/260) and is an extensive area of ridge and furrow grassland which may have ecological value – NCC would suggest it's omission unless it can be demonstrated that the site is of low ecological value.

Question 10

No comment

Question 11

Key4; if allocated, the Local Wildlife Site (5/2177) must be omitted.

Key10 & Key11 are large ridge and furrow grassland which may have ecological value – NCC would suggest their omission unless it can be demonstrated that the site is of low ecological value.

Questions 12-18

No comments

Question 19

CB13; if allocated, the Local Wildlife Site (2/925) must be omitted.

Questions 20-22

No comments

Question 23

GOT1; this is an area of grassland and scrub which may have ecological value – NCC would suggest their omission unless it can be demonstrated that the site is of low ecological value.

Questions 24-27

No comments

Reclamation

Rushcliffe Green Belt Review Part 2B Draft dated January 2017

Proposed insets for washed over villages

In broad agreement with the methodology, however NCC do consider that the former uses of the lands adjacent the boundary should be factored into the assessment , in particular any brownfield sites that would be suitable for future expansion / development (commercial or residential) to allow the villages to grow sustainably. e.g. Newton and linkages to Bingham , Plumtree eastern expansion and linkage to Normanton on the Wold , Gotham and extension to south west (former mine area)

Minor Amendments to Existing Boundaries

In broad agreement with the methodology, but similar comment to previous where present brownfield opportunities should be exploited to provide expansion potential for the villages.

Cropwell Bishop extension north east from Ethedene, Barlows Close and Shelton Gardens Keyworth include development to the south east of the BGS campus.

There appears a degree of contradiction between rational used to exclude the Health Centre at Cropwell Bishop from the inset area of Cropwell Bishop , whilst including the areas of Keyworth Primary School , and the garden of 12 Nottingham Road and 1 Holme Lane Radcliffe on Trent with their respective inset areas .

Key Settlement Review

Board agreement with the methodology. Improvement could be achieved with integration of previous land use to support the defensible defined boundaries e.g. RAF Newton

Travel and Transport

Nottinghamshire County Council Transport and Travel Services wish the following observations to be taken into account in response to the consultation in respect of the Initial draft of the A Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2 Consultation, including the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (PDCS).

General Comments

The emphasis on sustainable development and the environment in the document is noted and supported by Transport and Travel Services (TTS). TTS also note the [draft Rushcliffe Green Review \(Part 2\(b\)\) for additional sites](#).

Rushcliffe is primarily served by Trent Barton and Nottingham City Transport services who operate commercial bus services into the Nottingham City Centre from most parts of the Borough. These services are supplemented in part by County Council funded services which offer facilities to those parts of Rushcliffe which would otherwise be isolated from accessing essential social needs.

At this time it is envisaged that Transport & Travel Services will wish to negotiate with the developer and Highways Development Control regarding provision of appropriate bus service enhancements.

The County Council have worked in partnership to promote new transport developments with the local bus operators and other groups including business, health and community transport providers.

New developments include the provision of new public transport infrastructure in Rushcliffe and community transport services, which play an important role in the local community.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (PDCS)

TTS note the content of the PDCS including '*Provision of Park and Ride along the A52 corridor and associated bus priority measures in West Bridgford.*'

Transport & Travel Services (TTS) request be to consulted on any proposed developments which may have a significant impact on public transport and related infrastructure requirements in Rushcliffe. Some of the services currently operating in this area are supported by Nottinghamshire County Council. These services may need to be reviewed in response to future developments. TTS request that a contribution from the developer towards improved public transport services and waiting facilities is given as a criterion to be met for a site to be supported by the Local Plan. It is suggested that sites/schemes that afford access to public transport facilities should be given priority for development.

In particular TTS will wish to explore with developers the provision of contributions for the provision of public transport services and waiting facilities, including real time departure displays and raised kerbs and complemented by Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL) and Traffic Light Priority (TLP) where appropriate, through Section 106 agreements. A statement within the plan which supports this approach will complement other strategic documents, and enable the council to effectively negotiate for suitable developer contributions.

Other Matters

The County Council will liaise directly with Rushcliffe Borough Council on Developer Contributions, Education and Strategic Highway issues.

Yours sincerely

Nina Wilson
Principal Planning Officer
Nottinghamshire County Council

This document is unsigned as it is electronically forwarded. If you require a signed copy, then please contact the sender.

Appendix 1 – Mineral and Waste Site comments

Site	Minerals	Waste
HOL1	Within MSA/MCA for sand and gravel. Usually, the County Council would require that any allocation of this sites should flag up the existence of the sand and gravel resource and highlight the potential for prior extraction of the mineral. However, it is recognised that there are a number of sensitive surrounding land uses that make prior extraction unlikely in this instance. However, the County Council would still ask that the presence of the mineral is highlighted during the site allocation process.	No known issues
WB1	Within MSA/MCA for sand and gravel. The site would be classed as infill development for the purpose of Policy DM13 and therefore excluded from its provisions.	The existing Abbey Road Depot is understood to carry out some element of waste transfer operations related to the Borough Council's own Waste Collection Authority and/or street sweeping functions. It is not therefore considered to raise any safeguarding policy issues as it is related to the Borough Council's own operations.
WB2	No known issues	No known issues
WB3	Within MSA/MCA for sand and gravel. The site would be classed as infill development for the purpose of Policy DM13 and therefore excluded from its provisions.	No known issues
WB4	Within MSA/MCA for sand and gravel. The site would be classed as infill development for the purpose of Policy DM13 and therefore excluded from its provisions.	No known issues
COT1-12	No known issues	No known issues
EL1-14	All of these sites lie within a MSA/MCA for underground gypsum. British Gypsum should be consulted on these allocations in terms of the history of mining in the area and any future potential. The County Council would defer to the response of British Gypsum in terms of assessing the allocations against Policy DM13.	No known issues
KEY1-14	All of these sites lie within a MSA/MCA for underground gypsum. British Gypsum should be consulted on these allocations in terms of the history of mining in the area and any future potential. The County Council would defer to the response of British Gypsum in terms of assessing the allocations against Policy DM13.	No known issues
RAD1, 6 and 11	Within MSA/MCA for sand and gravel. Any allocation of these sites should flag up the	No known issues

	existence of the sand and gravel resource and highlight the potential for prior extraction of the mineral. The County Council will require any planning applications at these site to demonstrate that they have considered the practicality of prior extraction in line with Policy DM13 (unless fully addressed at the site allocation stage).	
RAD12	The site does not lie within a MSA/MCA. It does lie within proximity of a site allocated for sand and gravel extraction in the Minerals Local Plan (MP2r – Shelford). The development of this site would bring the residential area of Radcliffe on Trent closer to this minerals site. However, the County Council do not consider that the two proposals would be in conflict with each other and therefore no issue in terms of mineral safeguarding issues are raised.	No known issues
All other Radcliffe sites	No known issues	No known issues
RUD1-14	No known issues	No known issues
CBI1-6	All of these sites lie within a MSA/MCA for underground gypsum. British Gypsum should be consulted on these allocations in terms of the history of mining in the area and any future potential. The County Council would defer to the response of British Gypsum in terms of assessing the allocations against Policy DM13.	No known issues
EBR1-9	No known issues	No known issues
GOT4, 5 and 7	All of these sites lie in part within a MSA/MCA for underground gypsum. British Gypsum should be consulted on these allocations in terms of the history of mining in the area and any future potential. The County Council would defer to the response of British Gypsum in terms of assessing the allocations against Policy DM13.	No known issues
All other Gotham sites	No known issues	No known issues
SUT1	Part of this sites lies within a MSA/MCA for sand and gravel. Any allocation of these sites should flag up the existence of the sand and gravel resource and highlight the potential for prior extraction of the mineral. The County Council will require any planning applications at these site to demonstrate that they have considered the practicality of prior extraction in line with Policy DM13 (unless fully addressed at the site allocation stage).	No known issues
TOL1-3	No known issues	No known issues

