

# Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies – Issues and Options

## Response Form

Please return by **5pm on Thursday 24 March 2016** to:  
 Planning Policy, Rushcliffe Borough Council  
 Civic Centre, Pavilion Road  
 Nottingham. NG2 5FE  
 Or to: [localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk](mailto:localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk)

Your Details		Agent details (where applicable)
Carol Collins (Mrs)	Name	
Church End, 61 Main Street, Kinoulton, Notts., NG12 3EL.	Address	
	E-mail	

### Housing Development

#### Housing Development at the Main Urban Area

**Question 1:** Do you agree with the Council's view that no other sites on the edge of West Bridgford or Clifton should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered NO, please could you identify which site(s) on the edge of West Bridgford or Clifton should be removed from Green Belt and identified as suitable for

*development and why.*

I have concerns about Edwalton Golf Club being designated as White Land which implies development at some stage. I believe that Grass Snakes and Water Voles have been recorded there.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Housing sites within the Main Urban Area

**Question 2:** Which sites within West Bridgford should be allocated for housing development in the LAPP?

	Yes	No
Site WB1 – Abbey Road Depot (potential capacity around 50 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site WB2 – Central College (potential capacity around 90 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site WB3 – South of Wilford Lane (potential capacity around 200 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Site WB4 – land between Lady Bay Bridge and Radcliffe Road (potential capacity around 25 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
At any other location (please specify which)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers. For any of the sites, this could include comments on the services and facilities required to support development and the design, mix and layout of development.*

The land south of Wilford Lane has ecological value and is next to a Local Wildlife Site.

## Housing Development at the 'Key Settlements'

### ***Bingham***

**Question 3:** *Do you agree that the LAPP should not allocate further greenfield land for housing development at Bingham in the plan period (up to 2028)?*

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

*Please provide any comments you wish to make in support of your response.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### ***Cotgrave***

**Question 4:** *Do you agree that the LAPP should not allocate further greenfield land for housing development at Cotgrave in the plan period (up to 2028)?*

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

*Please provide any comments you wish to make in support of your response.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**East Leake**

**Question 5:** *Do you agree that, apart from those eight sites that already have planning permission for housing development (as shown on Figure 3), further greenfield land should not be allocated for housing development at East Leake?*

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

*Please provide any comments you wish to make in support of your response.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Keyworth

**Question 6:** Do you agree that the draft Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan's proposals to allocate land north of Bunny Lane (site KEY A), land off Nicker Hill (site KEY B) and land off Platt Lane (site KEY C) (as shown on Figure 4) are appropriate in meeting the minimum target for 450 new homes at Keyworth over the plan period (up to 2028)?

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

Please provide any comments you wish to make in support of your response.

Site KEY B (land off Nicker Hill) is adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site which would inevitably suffer from disturbance.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Radcliffe on Trent

**Question 7:** With respect to general directions around the village, do you support housing development:

	Yes	No
To the east of the village	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To the south of the village	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
To the west of the village	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Yes

No

Please provide any comments you wish to make in support of your response.

Sites to the south are less well-connected to the centre of RoT and therefore less sustainable. Sites to the West have ecological value: they consist of farmland and hedges and are not far from a large nature reserve and Holme Pierrepont Country Park.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Question 8:** Do you support housing development at:

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site RAD1 – land north of Nottingham Road (potential capacity around 300 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Site RAD2 – land adjacent Grooms Cottage (potential capacity around 50 homes)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site RAD3 – land off Shelford Road (potential capacity around 400 homes)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site RAD4 – land north of Grantham Road to north of railway line (potential capacity around 900 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site RAD5 – land north of Grantham Road to south of railway line (1) (potential capacity around 200 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site RAD6 – 72 Main Road (potential capacity around 7 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
<i>Site RAD7 – land north of Grantham Road to south of railway line (2) (potential capacity around 180 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
<i>Site RAD8 – land south of Grantham Road (potential capacity around 20 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
<i>Site RAD9 – land at Radcliffe on Trent Golf Course (west) (potential capacity around 10 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
<i>Site RAD10 – land at Radcliffe on Trent Golf Course (east) (potential capacity around 10 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
<i>Any other location (please specify which)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers. For any of the sites, this could include comments on the services and facilities required to support development and the design, mix and layout of development.*



(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Ruddington

**Question 9:** With respect to general directions around the village, do you support housing development:

	Yes	No
To the north of the village	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To the north east of the village	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
To the east of the village	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
To the south of the village	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To the west of the village	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Please provide any comments you wish to make in support of your response.

The Fairham Brook and land around it is an important wildlife corridor and I would not like to see development encroaching on this, so any extension of Ruddington to the west should not get too close to it.

Wilwell Cutting Nature Reserve is to the north and I would not like to see development extending close to this valuable reserve.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Question 10: Do you support housing development at:**

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site RUD1 – land to the west of Wilford Road (south) (potential capacity around 180 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RUD2 – land to the west of Wilford Road (north) (potential capacity around 440 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RUD3 – land adjacent to St Peter’s Junior School (potential capacity around 60 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RUD4 – Easthorpe House and adjacent land (potential capacity around 15 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RUD5 – land south of Flawforth Lane (potential capacity around 40 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RUD6 – land at Loughborough Road (potential capacity around 30 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RUD7 – land north west of Asher Lane (potential capacity around 250 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RUD8 – land west of Pasture Lane (potential capacity around 370 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RUD9 – land south of Landmere Lane (potential capacity around 10 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site RUD10 – land adjacent to Landmere Farm (potential capacity around 5 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Any other location (please specify which)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers. For any of the sites, this could include comments on the services and facilities required to support development and the design, mix and layout of development.*

If development at RUD 2 were to extend too far northwards it would impinge on Wilwell Cutting nature reserve and the line of the disused railway.

If development at RUD 8 were to extend too far westwards it would impinge on the Fairham Brook corridor which is valuable for wildlife.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### **Housing sites within key rural settlements**

**Question 11:** *Should any sites within ‘key settlements’ be allocated for development in the LAPP?*

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

*Please provide any comments in support of your response. If you answered YES, please could you identify which site(s) should be allocated for housing development.*

I presume that this means any sites other than those already suggested? My feeling is that the amount of new housing allowed for in this plan is enormous – a huge addition to what exists already – and the allocation of sites within the key rural settlements should be kept to an absolute minimum.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### Housing development at ‘other villages’

**Question 12:** Do you agree that the LAPP should not allocate any land for housing development at ‘other villages’ across the Borough?

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

*Please provide any comments in support of your response. If you answered NO, please could you identify which site(s) should be allocated for housing development.*

*It makes sense to locate new housing where there are existing facilities to accommodate the needs of new residents for work, leisure, shopping, doctors etc., etc. These facilities exist within West Bridgford and, to a lesser extent, in the “Key Settlements” but are minimal in the other villages. I therefore agree that no land should be allocated for housing development in the “other villages”.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Question 13:** *Should we allocate any sites for purely 'affordable housing' at 'other villages' across the Borough?*

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

*Please provide any comments in support of your response. If you answered YES, it would be helpful if you are able to identify which site(s) should be allocated for purely affordable housing development.*

The need for affordable housing in any particular location tends to change quite quickly and it is probably better to allow the building of affordable housing on unallocated sites in direct response to proven local need when and where this is demonstrated.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### **Accessibility and wheelchair housing standards**

**Question 14:** *Should we introduce policy in the LAPP to require a proportion of new homes to meet the enhanced Building Regulation standards for 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' and/or 'wheelchair user dwellings'.*

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

*Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)



## Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

**Question 15:** *Should the LAPP allocate any specific sites for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation?*

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

*Please provide any comments in support of your response. If you answered YES, it would be helpful if you are able to identify which site(s) should be allocated.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Custom and self-build housing

**Question 16:** *How should we specifically meet needs for custom and self-build housing across Rushcliffe?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Other issues

**Question 17:** Please identify any matters related to housing development which are not covered here or elsewhere.

The vast amount of greenfield land which will be lost through so much house building will inevitably have a substantial detrimental impact on the borough's biodiversity. There is an opportunity to compensate to some extent for this loss by ensuring that the houses built offer as much opportunity as possible for use by wildlife, but this will only happen if developers are given detailed standards to adhere to. An existing document which could be referred to is:

Designing for Biodiversity: A technical guide for new and existing buildings (2<sup>nd</sup> ed) 2013. Murphy et al. RIBA Publishing. ISBN 9781859464915

An example of an existing Supplementary Planning Document including a detailed appendix on encouraging biodiversity in new buildings is:

Residential Design Guide: Supplementary Planning Document, Appendix 2: Provision for Biodiversity in New Development. Exeter City Council, 2010.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Green Belt

### Alterations to existing Green Belt 'inset' boundaries

**Question 18:** Do you support the alterations recommended by the draft Rushcliffe Green Belt Review (Part 2b) to the Green Belt inset boundaries at:

	Yes	No
Cotgrave	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cropwell Bishop	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Yes	No
<i>East Bridgford</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Keyworth</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Radcliffe on Trent</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Ruddington</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Tollerton</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*Please provide any comments in support of your response.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Creation of new Green Belt ‘inset’ boundaries**

**Question 19:** *Do you support the Green Belt inset boundaries recommended by the draft Rushcliffe Green Belt Review (Part 2b) for:*

	Yes	No
<i>Bradmore</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Bunny</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Yes	No
<i>Cropwell Butler</i>		
<i>Gotham</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Newton</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Plumtree</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Shelford</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Upper Saxondale</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*Please provide comments to support your response.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**‘Safeguarding land’ within the Green Belt**

**Question 20** *Should we designate any further ‘safeguarded land’ within Rushcliffe?*

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

Please provide any comments in support of your response. If you answered YES, please could you identify which site(s) should be identified as 'safeguarded land'.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### Other matters

**Question 21:** Please identify any matters related to Green Belts and Green Belt policy not covered here or elsewhere.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Employment Provision and Economic Development

### Allocation of land for employment development

**Question 22:** Should we allocate any new sites for employment development in Rushcliffe?

Yes .....

No .....

*Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, please could you identify which site(s) should be allocated for employment development.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### Remaining rural employment land allocations

**Question 23:** *Should the following sites (as shown on Figures 8 to 10) continue to be allocated for employment development?*

	Yes	No
<i>Sites at Chapel Lane, Bingham</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site at Hollygate Lane, Cotgrave</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site at Hathern Works, Sutton Bonnington</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Bunny Brickworks and British Gypsum Works

**Question 24:** Should the following sites (as shown on Figures 11 and 12) continue to be identified as suitable for employment redevelopment?

	Yes	No
Bunny Brickworks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
British Gypsum Works, Gotham	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Langar and Langar Airfield

**Question 25:** Should the LAPP allow for employment development to take place on the three areas at Langar, as defined on Figure 13?

Yes .....

No .....

Please provide comments in support of your response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know whether you think the boundaries of the three defined areas are in the right place or whether one or more of them should be altered and, if so, how?



*These areas include/are adjacent to Local Wildlife Sites. The airfield as a whole includes unimproved grassland and is proving a good habitat for Grizzled Skipper butterflies.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### **Existing employment sites**

**Question 26:** *Should we continue to protect viable employment sites through the inclusion within the LAPP of a criteria based policy similar to Policy EMP4 of the Rushcliffe Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan?*

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

*Please provide comments in support of your response. If you answered NO, it would be helpful to identify what alternative approach you think we should take.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Centres of Excellence

**Question 27:** *Should the LAPP include further policy in relation to the Centres of Excellence?*

**Yes** – further detailed policy is required .....

**No** – there is sufficient policy already within Core Strategy Policy 5.....

*Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know what policy should be included in the LAPP and whether any land should be allocated to allow for the expansion of any of the sites.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Rural Diversification

**Question 28:** *Should the LAPP include further policy in relation to rural diversification?*

**Yes** – further detailed policy is required .....

**No** – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. Core Strategy Policy 5).....

*Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know what policy should be included in the LAPP.*

Farmers are under huge pressure to diversify but unless there are policies to ensure that their new activities are suitable for rural areas, the countryside and its wildlife can be eroded just as seriously as by any other development. The policies need to limit the scale of built development, hard surfaces, traffic, noise and light pollution, and to ensure that neither tranquillity nor biodiversity is diminished.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Other matters

**Question 29:** Please identify any matters related to economic development and employment land provision not covered here or elsewhere.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Regeneration

**Question 30:** Should the following sites be identified as suitable for regeneration and be allocated as such through the LAPP?

	Yes	No
<i>Bunny Brickworks</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
<i>Former Islamic Institute, Flintham</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>At any other location (please specify which)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers. For any of the sites, this could include comments on the design, mix and layout of development and any services and facilities required to support development.

Bunny Brickworks is close to valuable woodland, in particular the nature reserve and Local Wildlife Site at Bunny Woods. If the brickworks site were to be regenerated, the new use would have to be compatible with the protection of the woodland.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Other matters

**Question 31:** Please identify any matters related to regeneration not covered here or elsewhere.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Retail Centres

### Defining the boundary of centres and primary shopping areas

**Question 32:** Do you support the suggested centre boundaries, primary shopping areas, primary frontages and secondary frontages, as defined at Appendix C, for:

	Yes	No
Bingham District Centre	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Yes	No
<i>West Bridgford District Centre</i>		
<i>Cotgrave Local Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>East Leake Local Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Keyworth (The Square) Local Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Keyworth (Wolds Drive) Local Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Radcliffe on Trent Local Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Ruddington Local Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*Please provide comments to support your answers. If you answered NO for any one of the centres, we would be interested to know what alternations you think should be made.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### **Non-retail uses in centres**

**Question 33:** *Do you have any comments to make on what the approach should be towards the proportion of A1 (shops) uses and non-A1 uses within the primary shopping areas of District and Local Centres?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### Allocation of sites within or on the edge of retail centres

**Question 34:** *Should we allocate land for new retail or other commercial development in or around any of Rushcliffe's district or local centres, or elsewhere in the Borough?*

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

*Please provide any comments you wish to make in support of response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know which land should be allocated, what for and why?*

Retail development should be kept within the existing centres to limit the use of cars as far as possible.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### Centres of Neighbourhood Importance

**Question 35:** *Should we designate those 'areas set out at Appendix D as Centres of Neighbourhood Importance (CoNI)? If so, are the boundaries correctly defined?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Question 36:** *Are there any other locations that should be defined as CoNIs?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Question 37:** *Should a mix of Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5 be supported within CoNIs?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### **Retail development in edge-of centre and out-of-town locations**

**Question 38:** *Should we set a local threshold requiring an impact assessment for all retail proposals with a gross floorspace of 500m<sup>2</sup> or more across the whole of Rushcliffe?*

**Yes** .....



No .....



*Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered NO, we would be interested to know what you think the locally set threshold should be.*

Yes, at 500m squared or less. Any such development is likely to have an adverse effect on landscape and biodiversity and should be judged accordingly. As far as possible retail development should be within existing centres to minimise car use as far as possible.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### **Other matters**

**Question 39:** *Please to identify any matters related to retail centres and retail development not covered here or elsewhere.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## **Design and Landscape Character**

### **General Design**

**Question 40:** *Should the LAPP include more detailed policy in relation to the design*



*of new development*

**Yes** – further detailed policy is required .....



**No** – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. Core Strategy Policy 10).....



*Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.*

Unless there is a detailed policy there will be no mechanism for ensuring that new development is designed to the highest standards. In relation to promoting an increase in biodiversity, the policy should refer to:

Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy 2016 – 2020

[http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/media/rushcliffe/media/documents/pdf/environmentandwaste/Rushcliffe%20Nature%20Conservation%20Strategy%202016\\_2020%20final.pdf](http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/media/rushcliffe/media/documents/pdf/environmentandwaste/Rushcliffe%20Nature%20Conservation%20Strategy%202016_2020%20final.pdf)

Designing for Biodiversity: A technical guide for new and existing buildings (2<sup>nd</sup> ed) 2013. Author Brian Murphy et al., published by RIBA Publishing.

The existing Supplementary Planning Document produced by Rushcliffe Borough Council contains only two very brief paragraphs on biodiversity. An example of a much more detailed SPD is that adopted by Exeter City Council in 2010 which includes an 11 page appendix on “Provision for Biodiversity in New Development”.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## **Landscape Character**

**Question 41:** *Please make any comments you have about what should be included in the LAPP in respect of the landscape character, including whether there are any areas of locally valued landscape requiring additional protection.*

The LAPP should refer to the Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment (Nottinghamshire County Council) and to the Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy to ensure that all new development contributes positively to its surrounding landscape.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Other issues

**Question 42:** *Please identify any matters related to design and landscape character that are not covered here or elsewhere.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Historic Environment

**Question 43:** *Please identify any elements of the historic environment of Rushcliffe Borough that should be specifically identified in the LAPP?*

Ancient woodlands, hedgerows, and individual veteran trees.

Old buildings often provide habitat for bats, swifts etc., as well as being of historic interest in themselves.

Ridge and furrow pasture.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Locally listed assets

**Question 44:** *Should we identify a local list of heritage assets within Rushcliffe Borough?*

If heritage assets are listed, this list must include natural assets as well as cultural ones. An alternative to listing the assets would be to list the criteria by which they could be identified.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Question 45:** *Please make any comments you have about what a local heritage assets policy should include or any other comments you have about the issue of locally listed heritage assets.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### **Development affecting designated heritage assets**

**Question 46:** *Should we include within the LAPP policies on development affecting designated assets?*

**Yes**– policies are required for designated assets.....

**No** – they have sufficient policy protection already (e.g within the NPPF).....

*Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, please provide information about what such policies should include.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Other issues

**Question 47:** *Please identify any matters related to the Historic Environment which are not covered here or elsewhere.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Climate Change, Flood Risk and Water Use

### Renewable and low carbon energy generation

**Question 48:** *Should we identify areas of the Borough as suitable for renewable and low carbon energy generation?*

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

*Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.*

It would perhaps be more useful to define what makes an area **unsuitable** for particular forms of renewable energy, for example bird migration corridors are not suitable for wind turbines, and hydro-electricity projects need to ensure that fish migration is not impeded. There is also the potential to benefit biodiversity through the sympathetic management of renewable energy sites, and this should be promoted.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### Reducing carbon dioxide emissions

**Question 49:** *Should we introduce further policy in the LAPP on how development should contribute to reducing carbon dioxide emissions?*

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

*Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know what policy should be included in the LAPP.*

The planting of long-term woodland would store carbon and the woods could be managed to enhance biodiversity.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Water efficiency standards

**Question 50:** *Should we introduce further policy in the LAPP to require the lower optional Building Regulations standard of 110 litres per person per day water use.*

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

*Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.*

The less water we use, the lower the abstraction rates from rivers, reservoirs etc., and thus the ecology of the borough's water courses will benefit through increased flow and water quality.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Managing flood risk

**Question 51:** *Please make any comments you have about how we should define areas within Flood Zones 2 and 3 where windfall site development is appropriate in flood risk terms, subject to the application of the exception test.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Question 52:** *Is there a need for any further policy on managing flood risk and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems?*

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

Please provide any information in support of your response.

I would like to see SUDs promoted wherever possible and advantage taken of the opportunities to enhance biodiversity. I would object to development which reduced existing flood plains.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### **Other issues**

**Question 53:** *Please identify any matters related to climate change, flood risk and related issues that are not covered here or elsewhere.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)





## Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity

### Green infrastructure networks

**Question 54:** Which types of land use should also be incorporated into the Green Infrastructure network?

	Yes	No
<i>Parks and County Parks</i>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>School playing fields</i>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Allotments</i>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Sports pitches</i>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Amenity space (e.g. information open space)</i>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Golf courses</i>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Designated and non-designated nature conservation sites</i>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Flood alleviation areas</i>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Other (please specify which)</i>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers.*

Apart from “Designated and non-designated nature conservation sites” all the types of land use included here are man-made and designed for human use. Why are more “natural” and probably more biodiverse types of land use such as woodlands, wetlands, unimproved grassland not included? I think the Natural England definition of Green Infrastructure includes woodlands, and private gardens, so they at least should surely be included. All the corridors which can provide links (disused

railways, road embankments, hedges, rivers, streams, rights of way and so on) as well as cemeteries and orchards should be included. The following documents should be referred to:

Rushcliffe Strategic Green Infrastructure (Existing and Potential), RBC 2015  
Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy 2016 – 2020  
The Rushcliffe Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Report, Jackson & Crouch, NBAG (2015).

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Question 55:** *What are your views on the following:*

*a) Where are Rushcliffe’s existing local Green Infrastructure corridors and how do they relate to the strategic priorities?*

They are identified in:

Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy 2016 – 2020  
Rushcliffe Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Report, NBAG (2015)  
Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

*b) What evidence exists to support the identification of existing and proposed Green Infrastructure?*

The evidence is provided in the documents quoted above at Question 55a.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

*c) How should new Green Infrastructure corridors be identified? Does Core Strategy Policy 16 (part 3) provide suitable selection criteria?*

Yes, so long as “biodiversity” is included on an equal footing with the other criteria. It needs to be recognised that in some instances the value to human beings will be much greater than that to biodiversity, but equally that in some instances the value to biodiversity will take priority.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

*d) Core Strategy Policy 16 (part 2d) refers to 'areas of identified deficit', where are these and how do they relate to the strategic priorities?*

These areas can be identified by reference to:

Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Implementation Group Annual Reports

Rushcliffe Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Report NBAG (2015)

Reference should be made here to recommended national standards:

Natural England's Accessible Natural Green Space Standard (ANGSt)

Woodland Trust's The Woodland Access Standard.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

*e) Once an identified network is established, does the Core Strategy provide sufficient policy guidance to ensure multi-functional Green Infrastructure is delivered, protected and enhanced?*

Yes.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

*f) How should the network be recognised within the Local Plan, for example should it be identified within the proposals map and supported by a detailed policy, or within a stand-alone Green Infrastructure Strategy?*

It should definitely be identified within the proposals map but there needs to be a mechanism to keep this up to date over the plan period. Probably best to have a detailed policy within the LAPP as there is a danger of a stand-alone GI Strategy being overlooked.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## **Local Green Spaces**

**Question 56:** *Are there any spaces in Rushcliffe that should be designed as a Local Green Space and what should a policy within the LAPP to ensure their protection from development include?*

Local communities should be given the opportunity to suggest potential Local Green Spaces within their own area – this could be done through Parish Councils etc. A policy to protect them should state that they must remain open, accessible and be managed to be as wildlife-friendly as possible.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### Protection of Parks and open space

**Question 57:** *Should the LAPP include further policy to protect parks and open space?*

**Yes** – further detailed policy is required .....

**No** – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. Core Strategy Policy 16).....

*Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know what policy should be included in the LAPP.*

If Parks and Open Spaces are included in Green Infrastructure, they should be protected along with all the other habitats and I don't see why they would need a separate policy. However, I am concerned by the statement in the Core Strategy that they may be redeveloped if they are "underused or undervalued". How is this to be judged? A space which is little used by human beings is actually more likely to be well-used by wildlife. Para 3.16.6 of the Core Strategy suggests that an open space which is not well-used can become threatening for people, and this would justify re-development, but it might well be a refuge for wildlife in an urban setting. As worded, the policy seems to assume that to have any area which is not well-used by human beings is to be avoided, in which case there will be no space for other species apart from those which are extremely tolerant of contact with humanity. Open space needs to be protected for its biodiversity as well as its usefulness to humanity.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Open space, sports and recreation standards

**Question 58:** *Please make any comments you have about what the LAPP should include in respect of open space, sports or recreation space standards.*

The Rushcliffe Leisure Facilities Strategy which is referred to appears to deal exclusively with “built” facilities: leisure centres, sports pitches etc. There is no mention of less formal open space or of parks, which need to be included here.

Reference should be made to the:

Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy  
Natural England’s Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt)  
Woodland Trust’s Access to Woodland Standard.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Biodiversity

**Question 59:** *In relation to improving the Biodiversity Network, what are your views on the following:*

- a) *Where are Rushcliffe’s existing biodiversity networks, what habitats do they consist of and where do opportunities to enhance the network exist?*

Both the existing networks and opportunities to enhance them are defined and described in the following:

Rushcliffe Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Report NBAG (2015)  
Nottinghamshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan  
Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy 2016 – 2020, and all the Annual Reports of the RNCSIG  
Rushcliffe Strategic Green Infrastructure (Existing and Potential), RBC (2015)  
Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment

Links to all of the above are available at:

<http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/environmentandwaste/countryside/natureconservation/>

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**b) *What evidence exists to support the identification of existing and proposed biodiversity networks?***

Criteria for the Designation of Local Wildlife Sites is available from the Nottinghamshire Biological and Geological Records Centre at:  
<http://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=1047>

Rushcliffe Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Report NBAG (2015)  
Nottinghamshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan  
Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy 2016 – 2020, and all the Annual Reports of the RNCSIG  
Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment  
Rushcliffe Strategic Green Infrastructure (Existing and Potential) RBC (2015)

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**c) *How should the networks be recognised in the LAPP?***

Local Wildlife Sites can be identified via Nottingham City Council's Insight Mapping at: <http://info.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/insightmapping/> so this link could be referred to.

Networks are identified and updated annually in the Annual Report of the Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group which is available at:  
<http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/environmentandwaste/countryside/natureconservation/>

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**d) *Does Core Strategy Policy 17 sufficiently protect, restore and expand the biodiversity network without the need for further policy in the LAPP?***

The wording is strong and I very much welcome the commitment in Policy 17 that "The biodiversity of Rushcliffe will be increased over the Core Strategy period...." but I fear that this will only happen if the LAPP includes all the detail and reference to existing documents which I and others have suggested, and if the policies are implemented rigorously.

It is generally accepted that biodiversity has declined considerably over the past few decades even though previous Local Plans have all included policies to protect wildlife and countryside. Pressures for development now are even greater than they were, so both the detail of the policies and the mechanisms for their implementation need to be correspondingly more robust.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Question 60:** *In relation to the protection of designated and non-designated nature conservation interests, what are your views on the following:*

- a) *Does Core Strategy Policy 17 sufficiently cover the level of protection necessary for designated and non-designated sites or is further policy required in the LAPP?*

Yes, I think so. As stated at Question 59 above, the policies need to be implemented rigorously to have the desired effect.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

- b) *Should the LAPP have a specific policy to protect and enhance ancient woodland and veteran trees and, if so, why?*

So long as woodland and veteran trees are specifically included within the definition of Green Infrastructure they will receive the same protection as other valuable habitats, and so long as reference is made wherever necessary to the Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy, which mentions woodlands and veteran trees, there should be no need for a specific policy.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

- c) *Should the LAPP include a policy on biodiversity off-setting, to ensure compensation is delivered and, if so, why?*

I don't know enough about this to be sure. However, the accepted hierarchy of finding solutions which do not damage biodiversity, followed by appropriate mitigation, should always be chosen first, with "off-setting" used only as a last resort.

There could be gains to biodiversity if "off-setting schemes" were sufficiently flexible for several small "off-sets" to be combined into one larger scheme.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)



## Other issues

**Question 61:** Please identify any matters related to Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity and recreation space which are not covered here or elsewhere.

I welcome the statement at Policy 17(c) about new development providing new biodiversity features but I can see no mechanism for making this happen. The RIBA publication "Designing for Biodiversity: a technical guide for new and existing buildings" (2<sup>nd</sup> ed) 2013 provides much detail of what can be done, and the Exeter City Council SPD "Residential Design: Appendix 2 Provision for Biodiversity in New Development provides an example of a supplementary planning document. I hope that RBC will use these examples to provide the necessary information for developers, and will insist upon each new development including a reasonable number of measures to provide opportunities for wildlife to flourish.

There has been no mention of the National Pollinator Strategy published by DEFRA in 2014, but this is presumably a strategy which the LAPP should be trying to implement?

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Culture, Tourism and Sports Facilities

**Question 62:** Should we allocate any new sites for cultural, tourism or sports development in Rushcliffe?

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, please could you identify which site(s) should be allocated for development.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Question 63:** *Should the LAPP include further policy to determine proposals for new cultural and sporting facilities and/or to protect existing facilities?*

**Yes** – further detailed policy is required .....

**No** – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. Core Strategy Policy 13).....

*Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know what policy should be included in the LAPP.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### **Safeguarded recreational facilities**

**Question 64:** *Should the LAPP also include policy to safeguard the following locations from development which would prejudice the ecological, recreational, tourism and commercial potential?*

	Yes	No
<i>the River Trent</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>the River Soar</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>the Grantham Canal</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>the Great Central Railway</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Yes	No
<i>any other location (please specify which)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know what policy should be included in the LAPP.*

*If you answered YES in relation to the Grantham Canal, we would be interested to know whether you think a route should also be safeguarded for a new canal link between the existing canal and the River Trent.*

I agree that these locations need protection but as they are part of the Green Infrastructure network (because of their ecological and recreational value), they should presumably be protected under Policy 16, so would another policy here simply duplicate that?

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### **Other issues**

**Question 65:** *Please identify any matters related to culture, tourism and sports facilities which are not covered here or elsewhere.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Contamination and Pollution

### Contamination and land instability

**Question 66:** *Should we include more detailed policy in the LAPP in relation to the contamination and land instability.*

**Yes** – further detailed policy is required .....

**No** – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. within the NPPF).....

*Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### Noise pollution

**Question 67:** *Should we include more detailed policy in the LAPP in relation to the noise pollution:*

**Yes** – further detailed policy is required .....

**No** – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. within the NPPF).....

*Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.*

Tranquil areas are becoming more and more scarce and it is often noise rather than visual disturbance which is the problem. Road traffic in particular can often be heard from a long way off even when the road is not visible, and may make an otherwise pleasant recreational area much less pleasant. Noise also has a detrimental effect on wildlife, especially on birds if they are unable to communicate through songs and calls. It is therefore important that the detrimental effects of increased noise levels are taken into account when development is considered, and mitigated against as far as possible.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Light pollution

**Question 68:** *Should we include more detailed policy in the LAPP in relation to light pollution:*

**Yes** – further detailed policy is required .....

**No** – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. within the NPPF).....

*Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.*

As well as being a waste of energy, light pollution has a hugely detrimental effect on wildlife, especially nocturnal species, including bats, which require darkness to function normally. Ill-designed lighting also has the effect of preventing us from the enjoyment and interest of seeing the night sky, and thus diminishes the quality of our environment.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Air quality

**Question 69:** *Should we include more detailed policy in the LAPP in relation to the air pollution:*

**Yes** – further detailed policy is required .....

**No** – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. within the NPPF).....

*Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Other issues

**Question 70:** Please identify any matters related to contamination and pollution which are not covered here or elsewhere.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Transport

### General transport policy

**Question 71:** Do you agree that no further local transport policy is required in the LAPP?

**Yes**—additional local policy is not needed.....

**No** – further local policy is needed (please identify what policy).....

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered NO, please provide information about what policy is needed.



(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Highway design and parking standards

**Question 72:** *Should we (please tick one):*

*Continue to use the guidance in the 6Cs Highway Design Guide? .....*

*Set out and adopt an approach through the LAPP?.....*

*Adopt another approach (please set out what)?.....*

*Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Other issues

**Question 73:** *Please identify any matters related to transport which are not covered here or elsewhere.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Telecommunication Infrastructure

**Question 74:** *Should we include more detailed policy in the LAPP in relation to telecommunications:*

**Yes** – further detailed policy is required .....

**No** – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. within the NPPF).....

*Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### Other issues

**Question 75:** *Please identify any matters related to telecommunications which are not covered here or elsewhere.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Question 76:** Please identify any topics or issues which you consider need to be covered by the LAPP which are not addressed elsewhere in this document.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Signed:**

Carol W. Collins

**Date:**

20<sup>th</sup> March 2016

Please return by **5pm on Thursday 24 March 2016** to:

Planning Policy  
Rushcliffe Borough Council  
Civic Centre, Pavilion Road  
West Bridgford  
Nottingham. NG2 5FE

Or to: [localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk](mailto:localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk)

Please note that your comments can be directly entered through the Borough Council's online consultation system: <http://rushcliffe-consult.objective.co.uk/portal>

**Data protection:** The details you submit to the Borough Council will be used in the Local Plan preparation and associated processes. Please note that comments and personal details cannot be treated as confidential and may be made available for public inspection both physically and/or through the Borough Council's website. We may publish all names, addresses and comments received, including on our website. We will use our best endeavours to not publish signatures, personal telephone numbers or email addresses.