

Background Paper One - Summary of Responses of Gotham Residents to the Consultation on the first draft of the Neighbourhood Plan - October 2017

In all, 81 questionnaires were returned. The team who worked on the Neighbourhood Plan would like to thank one of the respondents for their comments ' Very good presentation. Obviously a lot of hard work has been put into it. Thank you.'

Hopefully now this phase of the development has been completed we have also generated enough interest in the wider community to help with the next steps.

We will continue with work on the plan to incorporate all of your comments and set out any changes to the policies that are necessary. The next steps also include consulting with all relevant bodies on the new draft, this includes landowners for the Housing and Green Network Policies, the Highways Agency etc. on the Transport policy etc.

Specifically we will be commissioning an ecological survey of the land at GOT1 (the brickyards) and engaging with Rushcliffe Borough Council and the Police and Fire Brigade with respect to the parking and congestion issues.

This document is laid out according to the policies in the Plan. The main section is a summary of your responses and the actions we think need taking. The Appendix contains all of the detail of the responses including all of the individual comments and suggestions.

Before going into the detail there were some general comments that are worth re-iterating.

- *(Gotham) 'Needs to remain a 'village''*
- *'I am fairly new to the village and am not familiar enough to have strong comments. But I do like living here and do not want a lot of change.'*
- *'It is essential that we have our own neighbourhood plan'*

All sentiments we're sure everyone would agree with.

The next sections summarise the input we've had through the questionnaire for each of the policy areas.

Policy GS1 Protective and Enhancement Measures for a Green Network

Overall there was agreement with the Green Network policy. Nearly 90% thought that the draft NP had identified all of the Footpaths and Bridleways, and areas of Biodiversity and Green Spaces.

a) Footpaths and Bridleways

Within the Green Network shown on Map Three footpaths and bridleways will be given a high priority for maintenance and enhancement. The bio diversity of hedges and woodlands adjacent to sustainable route-ways will be conserved. Closures and diversions will be resisted unless it can be shown they would result in net gains in terms of amenity and convenience

Map 3 for the Designated Local Green Spaces missed at least one footpath between the recreation ground and the bridleway leading to Gotham Hills, this will be corrected in the next draft.

b) Areas of bio diversity value

Policies and Incentives available under the Planning Act and under grant regimes operated by the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs will be used to conserve and enhance areas of diversity value particularly the Gotham Hill Pasture SSSI and Nature Reserve and the Hill Road

grassland area. Where appropriate the Parish Council will consider limited funding to achieve these policy aims.

No relevant comments

c) Locally designated green-spaces

Within designated green-spaces the protective policies set out in greenbelt policies will be given additional weight to the effect that very exceptional circumstances would need to be demonstrated for non greenbelt uses to be allowed. In the case of any form of housing development it would need to be shown that no alternative sites are or will become available within Rushcliffe and / or the Greater Nottingham Housing Market Area and even where this is the case it will need to be shown that the harm from very marginal under provision of land for housing would be a greater harm than the development of the green space concerned

Additional Designated Local Green Spaces were proposed. These include the land identified in the Housing policy as GOT8, the paddocks to the south of Moor Lane up to Stoney Lane as well as the land to the right of Stoney Lane to the south of Moor Lane.

We will do a thorough review of the justifications behind including all of the areas marked as designated local green spaces during the next stage of developing the plan

d) Recreation uses.

Where development for recreation or other uses acceptable within the greenbelt is proposed; extra weight will be given to attractive and sustainable design of any buildings, hard areas and/or fences.

No relevant comments

Policy H1 Housing

The Neighbourhood Plan will recommend the allocation of land for housing made up of parts or the whole of sites as shown in Map Four

Brown field

The former Royal British Legion Building up to 10 dws
 (Any development must include provision to create viable access to GOT1 and GOT3)

Possible future brown field sites depending on current owners business plans

The Machins Industrial Estate up to 20 dws
NCT Bus Depot up to 15 dws

Green field

Got 1 Land behind the Royal British Legion Building up to 25 dws
Got 3 Land north of Kegworth Road/Home Farm up to 15 dws
Got 8 Land south of Moor Lane up to 15 dws
Got 9 Land at Gladstone Avenue up to 3 dws
Got 11 Orchard east of the Rectory up to 10 dws

Almost 85% agreed that the number of new homes proposed in the NP was about right, i.e. 60 to 70. The remainder thought it was too many and of those that responded too many, three thought about 50 was a better target, 2 thought 40 and one respondent thought the spread should be larger, i.e. 50 to 70. One respondent mentioned that the proposed sites do divide up allocation e.g. not one big housing lump off bus depot. And another mentioned that we need sites which cause least disruption/loss of view to existing houses.

The result for the prioritisation of the proposed plots was as follows (the questionnaire asked respondents to mark the plots with 1, 2, 3 in order of suitability for housing and to put an X on any plot that should not be developed):

	1	2	3	4	5	X	+ve	Nett +ve	ranking
GOT1	36	11	2	3	1	5	53	48	1
GOT3	10	31	7	1	1	7	50	43	2
GOT8	3	7	11	10	2	20	33	13	4=
GOT9	8	3	15	7	4	2	39	37	3
GOT11	0	5	9	8	11	21	33	12	4=

Respondents also put 'X's on some other plots which were not technically part of the consultation. GOT2 (x4), GOT4 (x6), GOT5a (x5), GOT6, GOT9 and the Bus Depot.

Some conclusions on plots:

GOT1, GOT3 and GOT9 were clearly the most preferable sites while GOT8 and GOT11 still had more +ve votes than negative votes they were some way behind the first three sites. Development of GOT8 and potentially GOT11 would impact many more residents than developing GOT1 and GOT3, so the results are to be expected.

GOT11 could only be developed in conjunction with GOT8 (or GOT6). GOT4 and GOT5 should only be developed if better access could be created.

Specifically on GOT1 we asked at the consultation whether this plot should be developed or left as a designated Local Green Space. Of the attendees at the meetings 91 thought it should be developed while 11 believed it should be a designated Local Green Space. So about 90% in favour of this land being developed although there were some comments about keeping the extent of the development in keeping with the lay of the land, i.e. not extending too far to the north.

Also since the first draft was adopted by the Parish Council another plot has been made available by the landowners. This is a plot to the north-east of Grasmere Gardens which is owned by the church and is being put forward for the construction of 10 affordable homes under the rural exception scheme. This not the whole of the plot which may in the future be available for normal development.

The Neighbourhood Plan team will work with the Parish Council to incorporate this recent development into the plan and to revise the proposed locations accordingly.

Policy H2

Development of the sites will be in accordance with development briefs that will be prepared and included in the next draft of the Neighbourhood Plan. The briefs will include

The briefs will cover

- Layout and density**
- Links to the Open Space Network**
- Landscaping and bio diversity**
- Building materials, form and massing**
- Effect on neighbouring properties**

There were some general comments covering the impact on local facilities, i.e. NHS and some on traffic which are covered below. We will add the impact on local facilities to the briefs as well as access and traffic considerations.

A lot of the comments on size, occupancy, form and massing covered aspects like making sure there would be provision for older residents to downsize, the provision for one level living (bungalows) as well as the need for large houses in the mix, up to 5 bedrooms. Also development should be appropriate for a village location, i.e. not 3 storey and should be in keeping with the character of the village and in harmony with the surrounding area. These concepts will be addressed in the development briefs under the existing headings.

There were questions and comments about access and traffic most of which are covered in detail in the appendix but a couple of points were that the development briefs should consider ideas for crossing the main road and traffic on minor roads should also be considered. These will be covered in the Traffic policy.

Parking as can be seen from the responses to the Traffic policy is another key issue. Development briefs should include levels of parking provision suitable for a modern family.

On the question of layout and density it was felt that 100 houses would be too much and that some sites would lead to development of adjoining sites, GOT8 and GOT11 leading to GOT6, any of GOT4, GOT5a and GOT5b leading to the others.

HS 3 Affordable Housing

The priorities for affordable housing are the provision of bungalows and one bed room flats. In the light of the likely mismatch between demand and supply in Gotham priority for allocation of affordable housing in Gotham should be given to Gotham residents.

Some of the comments in this section relate to the previous policy and vice versa. We will make sure both HS2 and HS3 reflect both sections in the next draft of the plan.

There were comments in general about making sure affordable housing was for Gotham residents only (x2), that it should be for young local people should be the priority rather than large executive homes and that there should be a reasonable/high proportion of affordable and supported housing as high as 50%.

There was concern that many smaller plots might not deliver the same level of affordable housing as one large plot could.

The affordable housing policy should ensure sufficient starter homes are constructed, i.e. more first time buyer houses and housing for young families.

In addition more OAP bungalows (but not for sale to younger people) should be built, i.e. development for the over 55s and more bungalows for people to move to to free up larger family homes and for older people who want to stay in the village.

Smaller properties are also needed (contrast with the comments to H2) which should include tasteful apartments (not high rise) (RBL site and Machins as they become available?). Any flats for the elderly should have two bedrooms, one to accommodate a carer or visitors. There were several comments on 1 or 2 bed apartments with balconies. If this could be accommodated it may make possible the requirement for smaller bungalows. This will be dealt with in policy H2 in the next draft.

The policy will also be redrafted in light of the more recent developments around the availability of land for the rural exception scheme – see the comments on policy H1.

Policy E1

The expansion and intensification of the British Gypsum site in the south of the village will be supported subject to it being demonstrated that any non B1 business activity is directly related to the operation at of British Gypsum at East Leake and that there are not more sustainable sites available at East Leake

A development brief will be prepared and will be included in a future draft of the Neighbourhood Plan. It will include

- Layout and density**
- Links to the Open Space Network**
- Landscaping and bio diversity**
- Building materials, form and massing**

There were some general comments about only making this policy effective if St. Gobain are prepared to make GOT1 available for affordable housing and/or assisted living. In addition St. Gobain should be prepared to invest in village infrastructure. Additional facilities may also be needed.

There were several comments about any new business activity to provide employment to Gotham residents as a priority and that the activity should not be heavy industry. The brief should include the provision for employment not just the type of business activity. There was concern that warehousing would produce minimal employment and also a note that Machins should be kept as light industrial and business units.

There were concerns about environmental issues for example light and noise pollution and that to minimise this any new business activity should not be near the village.

There were several concerns about increased traffic on the loop road with many comments indicating that there was already too much HGV traffic using Gypsum Way. Any new business activity shouldn't increase traffic through the village.

The topics for the Employment policy brief will be adjusted to reflect the concerns above.

Policy T1

The priority within the village is the safety and convenience of residents. Traffic speed will be restricted to defined limits by traffic calming at such sites as the entrance to the village at Nottingham Road, the Curzon St/Kegworth Rd junction, the Square and the entrance to the village from East Leake"

The amount of traffic passing through the village will be a consideration in assessing not only development proposals within Gotham but also elsewhere such as Clifton South and East Leake.

Traffic Regulation Orders and other means will be used to deal with congestion and parking on Leake Road

The questions on this policy really got the creative juices flowing, there were so many ideas and thoughtful suggestions that it will take some time to work through them in detail and plan what to do in terms of revisions to the policy. In general though, they can be divided into suggestions for behavioural change, e.g. walking children to school, ideas for policing, restrictions and permits etc. and many ideas for locations requiring either some form of parking or traffic calming solutions.

While there was a lot of support for the transport measures, some of the more general suggestions pointed out that traffic calming measures can increase pollution (noise and air) as well as congestion while on conversely, street parking can make high speeds almost impossible hence calming traffic. There were many suggestions that could be supported by better education and finally that we should incentivise others to walk or maybe just put up with it!

Needless to say all the suggestions will be worked through and the policy adapted with some specific actions that can be taken forward.

Policy VC 1

1. Within the whole Village Centre Regeneration Area shown on Map 5 strict design policies will apply including landscaping schemes that will make a positive contribution to the village.
2. The former Royal British Legion site has a negative effect on the street scene and has been identified as a brownfield opportunity for new housing in Policy H1. A development brief will be drawn up in accordance with Policy H3. Should development be delayed then a suitable interim treatment of the site will be sought.
3. Around the Square the emphasis will be on conservation of the existing character but the Parish Council will seek funding for further tree planting and additions to / improvement of street furniture.

There were several useful suggestions about the Village Centre policy, mainly concerning the square. It was felt that the policy should set out to create a genuine square with no increase in traffic and street furniture (benches, cycle racks etc.) to create that effect. Managing parking outside the cemetery and towards the Cuckoo Bush would also help.

The RBL site needs to be developed and the whole impression of the village would be enhanced if the pavements and roads were remade and better maintained in the future. There is a specific problem with the pavement between Bidwell Crescent and the bus shelter which floods.

There was also the suggestion that Foredrift Close should be included in the Village Centre.

The suggestions all support the points in the policy. The point about the pavement flooding on Nottingham Rd will be passed to the PC.

Policy F1

In the preparation of development briefs referred to in Policy H2 the risk of flooding to the development and/or to sites elsewhere will be a key criterion in deciding areas to be allocated for housing and the quantity of housing involved

It was noted that the old ridge and furrow land at the end of Hall Drive (GOT4) does flood.

Policy F2

The Parish Council will seek to ensure that the rate of development in the village does not exceed the capacity of the sewerage works.

There were several specific comments relating to sewerage, including making sure design briefs for housing included installation of storm drains and that the capacity of the sewerage system should be verified before any new development.

There were a lot of comments about improving the ditches and drainage channels and keeping them clear with an idea to appoint a 'volunteer' to check and report on overgrown ditches and blocked culverts.

A couple of comments mentioned the gutters and drains on Kegworth Road from the roundabout to Soldiers Lane. These were full of gravel after the storm but have very recently been cleared and made good.

Also residents should be encouraged to keep the gutters free from weeds and debris in front of their properties.

Appendix

Detailed Comments on informal consultation

Question: Are there any areas we have missed from the Footpaths and Bridleways, areas of Biodiversity and Green Spaces? Yes **4** No **31**

Comments:

Add footpath across GOT1 from brickyard path to Recreation Ground

GOT8 and fields south of Moor Lane suggested as green areas (see below)



Housing Policy H1

The Neighbourhood Plan will recommend the allocation of land for housing made up of parts or the whole of sites as shown in Map Four

Brown field

The former Royal British Legion Building up to 10 dws

(Any development must include provision to create viable access to GOT1 and GOT3)

Possible future brown field sites depending on current owners business plans

The Machins Industrial Estate up to 20 dws

NCT Bus Depot up to 15 dws

Green field

Got 1 Land behind the Royal British Legion Building up to 25 dws

Got 3 Land north of Kegworth Road/Home Farm up to 15 dws

Got 8 Land south of Moor Lane up to 15 dws

Got 9 Land at Gladstone Avenue up to 3 dws

Got 11 Orchard east of the Rectory up to 10 dws

Question: Do you agree that the number of houses proposed over the timeline (10 Years).

Is this:

About right **56** Too few **0** Too many **11**

If it is too many , how many do you think is reasonable and sustainable for the village?

50 houses (x3)

50-75 houses

Site scores:

	1	2	3	4	5	X	+ve	nett	ranking
GOT1	33	10	2	3	1	5	53	48	1
GOT3	10	28	7	1	1	6	50	43	2
GOT8	3	7	11	10	2	18	33	13	4=
GOT9	7	3	15	7	4	1	39	37	3
GOT11	0	5	8	8	11	20	33	12	4=

Other Sites that had crosses against them (proposed sites greyed out – see analysis above):

Not GOT1 (x5)

Not GOT2 (x4)

Not GOT3 (x6)

Not GOT4 (x6)

Not GOT5a (x5)

Not GOT6

Not GOT8 (x18)

Not GOT9

Not GOT11 (x20)

Not bus depot

Other comments:

GOT4 & 5 should only be developed if better access was in place

No access through Hall Drive

GOT8 - list of 8 traffic dangers supplied

Develop RBL site.

Right numbers, wrong place.

GOT1 should be left as a wild life area to support existing connected areas, development would spoil the area as a recreational walk and community hub. Low cost housing (housing?) would not enhance the area and would erode a natural border for green space onto buildings and be an eye sore.

Policy H2

Development of the sites will be in accordance with development briefs that will be prepared and included in the next draft of the Neighbourhood Plan. The briefs will include

The briefs will cover

- Layout and density
- Links to the Open Space Network
- Landscaping and bio diversity
- Building materials, form and massing
- Effect on neighbouring properties

Do you have any further points that should be covered in development briefs? Yes **15**

No **42**

Comments:

General

When is the start year?

Doesn't GOT3 have a covenant preventing development?

Impact on local NHS facilities.

Better protection of sites allocated as 'protected' green field medieval ridge and furrow land in plans and policies e.g. ploughing of GOT4.

Size, Occupancy, Form and Massing

Use good design principles and include facilities for elderly supported living.

Small bungalows for downsizing.

If 2 bed housing units were available, older people wishing to downsize could move, making their houses available for larger families.

Large houses would make the village more desirable: there are too many small properties to make for a mixed environment.

There should be a mix of house size up to and including 5 bedroom.

Development should be appropriate for village location i.e. not 3 storey

Houses that are in keeping with the character of the village, in harmony with the surrounding area

Access and Traffic

Access to GOT1 & GOT3?

Ideas for crossing on the main road.

Traffic on the minor roads has not been considered.

Try to add some off road parking around the village.

Consideration must be given to traffic access in regard to safety

Too much traffic already down Moor Lane.

Layout and Density

100 houses is too many because it represents an increase of 12.5% which is booming.

Building on GOT6 & GOT11 would pave the way for over development on the land south of GOT11.

Surprised to see RBC seem to have preferred site of GOT5a already. Is this a reasonable option for say 50 houses with access to Gypsum Way?

Site GOT8 would make a huge negative impact on the natural village boundary and the access is on a very dangerous blind bend

GOT 1,8 and 11 all open up the possibility of the village being extended beyond the physical boundaries of the railway line and Leake road in the future.

HS 3 Affordable Housing

The priorities for affordable housing are the provision of bungalows and one bed room flats. In the light of the likely mismatch between demand and supply in Gotham priority for allocation of affordable housing in Gotham should be given to Gotham residents.

Can we improve the affordable housing policy? Yes **16** No **33**

Comments:

For Gotham residents only (x2)

Affordable housing for young local people should be the priority rather than large executive homes

Must be a reasonable / high proportion of affordable and supported housing.

Ensure building is done according to the rules round affordable housing

Higher percentage required, say 50%

Only if you can find a way to restrict demand.

Piecemeal development of the small plots will reduce the potential for affordable housing as some plots will fall below the threshold. A single large development would therefore be preferable.

Ensure sufficient starter homes are constructed

Housing for young families

More first time buyer houses.

Build more OAP bungalows (but not for sale to younger people)

We require development for the over 55s

More bungalows for people to move to to free up larger family homes.

It would be nice if some bungalows could be included in the plan for older people who want to stay in the village.

Smaller properties needed

Build some tasteful apartments (not high rise) on the RBL site and Machins as it becomes available.

Flats for the elderly should have two bedrooms, one to accommodate a carer or visitors

Low rise 2 bed flats with balconies.

Provide 1 or 2 bed apartments

Get parking for Leake Road

Policy E1

The expansion and intensification of the British Gypsum site in the south of the village will be supported subject to it being demonstrated that any non B1 business activity is directly related to the operation at of British Gypsum at East Leake and that there are not more sustainable sites available at East Leake

A development brief will be prepared and will be included in a future draft of the Neighbourhood Plan. It will include

- Layout and density**
- Links to the Open Space Network**
- Landscaping and bio diversity**
- Building materials, form and massing**

Do you agree with the policy to support St Gobain in the expansion and intensification of their site to the south of the village? Yes **40** No **20**

Are there specific aspects that should be included in any development brief?
Yes **20** No **25**

Comments:

General

If they give up GOT1 site

The village backs St Gobain with the south site and St Gobain give the village backing on GOT1 for affordable housing. (x2)

Assisted living

Business Activity and Local Nature

Employment for Gotham residents as a priority (x2)

It should possible local employment

Not to be heavy industry

The brief to include the provision of employment not just warehousing

Any development of the St Gobain site is likely to be warehousing and will produce minimal employment.

The Machins site should be kept as light industrial and business units

Small units for 'start-ups' and small scale businesses would be beneficial.

Environmental Issues

Lights and noise restrictions.

Not to be nearer the village (x2)

If St Gobain are prepared to invest in village infrastructure

Additional facilities

Traffic Issues

Problem of increased traffic on loop road, the surface of which is already poor.

Effects on traffic.

Extra traffic likely?

No increase in car or lorry traffic through Gotham

Number of lorries taking A453 & then narrow lanes to Gotham not suitable

Too many lorries

Policy T1

The priority within the village is the safety and convenience of residents. Traffic speed will be restricted to defined limits by traffic calming at such sites as the entrance to the village at Nottingham Road, the Curzon St/Kegworth Rd junction, the Square and the entrance to the village from East Leake"

The amount of traffic passing through the village will be a consideration in assessing not only development proposals within Gotham but also elsewhere such as Clifton South and East Leake.

Traffic Regulation Orders and other means will be used to deal with congestion and parking on Leake Road

Do you agree that there should be traffic calming measures introduced among the lines proposed in the policy? Yes **51** No **14**

Are there other locations where traffic calming is needed?

What are your ideas to deal with the congestion and parking issues on Leake Road and Kegworth Road/Hall Drive at school arrival and departure time?

Comments:

Full support for calming measures
traffic calming increases congestion and pollution.
Educate the parents.
Much on street parking makes high speeds virtually impossible
Put up with it
Incentivise others to walk

Behaviour

Set up a parent car share rota or organise a village crocodile
Make every effort to persuade car sharing to cut down the total number of vehicles coming to school.
Walk children to school where possible. More dropped kerbs on Leake Road allowing parking where front gardens are now. (x2)
Stop pupils being transported by personal transport - use the school buses.
Car sharing
Walking is good for all!
Dangerous for people in cars with health issues.
Encourage people to walk.
Educate the parents and persuade them that children can walk.

Policing/Restrictions/Permits

Parking restrictions at school drop off/pick up times
More permanent speed signs.
The speed bumps on Kegworth Road are useless - substantial noise is caused by lorries rattling and thumping up and down. Speed is not necessarily reduced.
Electric 30 mph sign on entry to village.
Get speed cameras
Speed cameras on all arterial roads.
Double yellow lines should be marked on these roads and junctions to discourage parking.
Sleeping policemen are not a suitable measure, any other type should be considered.
No parking on traffic calming schemes should be enforced.

Zebra crossings.

Not speed bumps, speed limit OK

A few parking tickets for those who do not abide by restrictions.

Police to enforce law on parking outside school.

Free permit parking only.

Speed cameras that work

Not speed bumps (x3)

Speed limit enforcement much preferable

Yellow lines at school times only

Yes to Speed bumps (x2)

Sign at the Nottingham Road end that flashes is effective.

If it is a perceived problem put in enforcement.

Apply the laws on parking and cars on the pavement.

A police presence now and then

Parking warden to visit periodically and issue tickets to anyone illegally parked

Issue permits to those with special case to parking (disability, long commute etc).

Locations

Widen the road and get off street parking

Do not put access down Hall Drive i.e. do not allow any future proposals for housing off Hall Drive.

Widen Leake Road by filling in the drainage ditch to facilitate parking as present situation is a nightmare.

Already have traffic congestion at school twice a day, parking issues.

Great (Create?) parking areas on Leake Road and outside school

Due to the amount of traffic coming through the village north/south consideration should be given to extending the loop road to the north of the village.

Traffic calming outside RBL (x4)

Buses should be made to go into the depot instead of waiting on the road before proceeding on journey.

Traffic calming at start of Nottingham Road near the Star.

Only a dedicated car park for the school would solve the problem: seems rather unfeasible though.

Double yellow lines including Hall Drive, Tomlinson and Pygall Avenues.

Resident permits on Kegworth Road.

A designated parking area perhaps the bus depot, RBL, part of GOT1

Double yellows on Kegworth Road

Permits for parking on Hall Drive

Double yellows on blind corner into Moor Lane.

Double yellow lines (no parking at any time) on church/cemetery side of Moor Lane on the corner where it exits the Square.

People drive fast down Leake Road

If it is developed traffic needs to be diverted off Leake Road, too busy now and nowhere to park

Parking bays on Leake Road opposite along hedge line.

Traffic calming needed on Kegworth Road (x2)

No more housing near school or exiting near school (x2)

Provide a parking area opposite houses on Leake Road

Parking areas should be maximised note parking in Windmill Close is totally inadequate.

Restrict parking on Leake Road and create parking areas on open land opposite.

Traffic calming on Nottingham Road outside the shop (x2)

Traffic calming needed on Moor Lane

Already substantial traffic down Moor Lane, would not like to see increased amount of traffic

Traffic sometimes speeds down Moor Lane dangerously (x2)

Cars sometimes speed down St Lawrence Close - potentially dangerous (x2)

Do not allow development at the end of Hall Drive as this would make things worse.

Calming needed between the church and the church hall

Could Leake Road be widened by taking some land from the field and also providing parking spaces for the houses?

Traffic calming needed at Memorial Hall and Meadow End

Provide a parking area at school if possible

Traffic calming by adding single lane restriction (like outside school on Kegworth Road), both ends of Nottingham Road & Leake Road. Very successful in Derbyshire villages.

Policy VC 1

4. Within the whole Village Centre Regeneration Area shown on Map 5 strict design policies will apply including landscaping schemes that will make a positive contribution to the village.
5. The former Royal British Legion site has a negative effect on the street scene and has been identified as a brownfield opportunity for new housing in Policy H1. A development brief will be drawn up in accordance with Policy H3. Should development be delayed then a suitable interim treatment of the site will be sought.
6. Around the Square the emphasis will be on conservation of the existing character but the Parish Council will seek funding for further tree planting and additions to / improvement of street furniture.

Do you agree with the policy for enhancing the village centre? Yes **66** No **1**

Comments:

The Square and immediate surroundings

It should be policy to ensure no increased traffic in the Square so walking groups and villagers can enjoy it as a quiet area.

Create a genuine 'square' by adding more seating: bicycle racks, corner of church and Manor House, on grass at top of Moor Lane

Visitors to the Cuckoo Bush Pub need to be encouraged to park in the car park and not on the road specifically on the graveyard bend. This is getting very dangerous.

Parking to be banned on the corner of the cemetery. Double yellow lines on the corner at least.

RBL site

Develop the RBL site.

Something useful on the RBL site and area to the north of it: off site warden aided housing.

Area covered

Foredrift Close an extension of Church St has only an exit road to the village centre and should be included in the centre.

Look and Feel and specific issues

The village would look much less 'scruffy' if pavements were remade and roads resurfaced.

The line on the map 1: ignores the worst side of Nottingham Road pavement

2: ignores area of under water pavement access from Bidwell Crescent to bus shelter. (lots of comments on this from Margaret Scott)

Policy F1

In the preparation of development briefs referred to in Policy H2 the risk of flooding to the development and / or to sites elsewhere will be a key criterion in deciding areas to be allocated for housing and the quantity of housing involved

Policy F2

The Parish Council will seek to ensure that the rate of development in the village does not exceed the capacity of the sewerage works.

Do you have any further ideas with regard to flooding and sewerage over and above those rated in the policy? yes **14** No **45**

Comments:

Housing Policy related

Housing policy should include policy for new storm drains

It is essential that the capacity of the sewage works is verified

Sewerage capacity must be OK before the building.

Avoid cess pits.

Keep development to a minimum and keep water courses properly serviced.

Maintenance

Clean grates and ditches on Kegworth Road, past the roundabout.

The gutters and drains on Kegworth Road are not kept clear and are frequently choked with gravel etc.

Encourage farmers etc to clean out ditches and council to clear weeds from around drains

Could the Parish 'appoint' a volunteer to check and report back on overgrown ditches, blocked culverts etc.

Improve culverts, drains and dykes.

Could residents be encouraged to keep roadside verges outside their houses clear of debris?

Too often cars are parked, preventing cleaning by the (rare) road sweeping vehicle.

Specific areas that flood

The old ridge and furrow land at the end of Hall Drive does flood but the water does go in a day or two. This probably indicates an old drainage system in the furrows. As the land falls west to east these drains probably go further west.

Clear all existing ditches and drainage channels. on a regular basis (x3)

Areas near GOT4 do flood.

Further General Comments:

I feel that GOT1 could be shortened to the area near the Legion leaving the area further down the lane as green to complement the Nature Reserve.

The GP surgery has recently been refurbished and increased number of consulting rooms so has capacity to cope with proposed extra patients.

Allow building on land where the owners wish to sell. (x2)

The derelict RBL building should be dismantled and removed immediately as in my opinion it is an eyesore

Need sites which cause least disruption/loss of view to existing houses.

Needs to remain a 'village'

Increase in community facilities if more houses required.

Sites proposed here do divide up allocation e.g. not one big housing lump off bus depot.

It is essential that we have our own neighbourhood plan

Something that concerns me is the level of damp in some houses in the village and I hope that any building developments would take this into account, in respect of displacement of water in the area. Additionally would this flag up any issues regarding flooding in the village?

GOT1 should not be included in the green / wildlife corridor. This is a brown field, ideal for building.

As a trustee for the GNR I do not see the brickyards as a wildlife corridor. The wildlife has the hills, the SSSIs and the old railway track which is not part of the area being considered for development. Development on that area is beneficial for the village and will not cause problems for wildlife as it will not block a corridor.

I am fairly new to the village and am not familiar enough to have strong comments. But I do like living here and do not want a lot of change.

GOT1 build only on the lower half i.e. RBL to footpath across GOT1. This would preserve some greenery.

Whether or not the bus depot is built on, it would be great if the Grade II listed tithe barn could be refurbished and given to the village for a badly needed museum.

Very good presentation. Obviously a lot of hard work has been put into it. Thank you.