

John King

From: Phil Marshall
Sent: 03 January 2019 16:06
To: Localdevelopment
Subject: FW: RBC consultation on GPC Neighbourhood Plan
Attachments: RBC consultation on Gotham Neighbourhood Plan 4 January 2019.docx

Categories: repetition

Principal Policy Planner
Rushcliffe Borough Council
0115 9148568

From: Cllr RWalker
Sent: 03 January 2019 15:06
To: Phil Marshall
Subject: FW: RBC consultation on GPC Neighbourhood Plan

Hi Phil,

Please see below and attached as discussed.

Yours sincerely,

Rex

Rex Walker
Borough Councillor for Gotham Ward

From: Thirdman
Sent: 03 January 2019 13:52
To: Customerservices; Cllr RWalker
Cc:
Subject: RBC consultation on GPC Neighbourhood Plan

Sorry but could you please acknowledge receipt and pass this and the attachment on to the relevant part of RBC as consultation ends tomorrow. The version sent a couple of minutes ago had a daft typing error in the title of the attachment so needs to be replaced! Many thanks. Colin

RBC consultation on Gotham Neighbourhood Plan

We recommend that RBC reject the GPC plan on the following grounds:

- The GPC plan is not consistent with the latest version of RBC's Local Plan Part 2 or the professional assessment underpinning RBC's Local Plan. Rather, the GPC plan seeks to challenge RBC's plan. This is wrong. GPC had plenty of opportunity to input meaningfully to the Local Plan at the early stages but chose not to.
- There has not been a proper environment impact assessment of the proposals made in the GPC plan. Furthermore, the GPC team has not properly acknowledged the expert work of Nottinghamshire's Biodiversity Action Group. It needs to get explicitly behind the Action Group's recommendations.
- In our opinion, the GPC plan has not had the required professional input needed to produce a decent neighbourhood plan. This is most obvious in the lack of evident environmental expertise [Note that GPC has confirmed to us that due diligence has not been carried out on those appointed to assist in the production of its plan. Due diligence is required to assess, *inter alia*, relevant qualifications, expertise and up-to-date experience including references and examples of similar work etc.].
- In our opinion, too much personal bias is reflected in the GPC plan. The views expressed in the plan are not those of the majority. Having lived in the village for nearly 40 years, most of the villagers we know are in favour of the proposal made in RBC's Local Plan for a single site mixed housing development.
- The GPC team has dismissed Government and 'all party' agreement that mixed developments of low cost housing, housing for the elderly and family housing are the preferred option for new developments. GPC knows by experience that the likelihood of this being achieved in the type of small scale developments as those proposed by GPC is low or nonexistent.
- In connection with the two earlier points, the post-SHLAA proposal in GPC's plan to build on Glebe land is justified by a 'housing needs assessment' carried out by 'Midland Rural Housing'. However, in our opinion, this 'needs assessment' confirmed that there is **NOT** an immediate or material demand for affordable housing over and above that arising from normal patterns of forecast population and household growth that can be catered for by the mixed housing development proposed in RBC's Local Plan. To quote the salient points from the 'housing needs assessment': "Gotham has a population of approximately 2,000 people and 750 households...of the 240 returns, 226 were considered as adequately housed. 12 returns detailed a housing need. Some of these may not be eligible for affordable housing". GPC's decision to support an unsolicited request from a 'site finder' -that a beautiful piece of our greenbelt be surrendered as building land to met the immediate needs of 0.06% of the population - some of whom may not even be eligible for the housing when built – simply cannot be justified. And what happened to the required environmental impact appraisal? If such a decision was taken in central government, the opposition parties and the press would be calling for a public enquiry. Promoting a small enclave of social housing of this nature is also seen by most as divisive nowadays

Valerie and Colin Raynor

3rd January 2019