

Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2 : Land and Planning Policies Preferred Housing Sites

Response from Nottinghamshire Campaign for Better Transport

27th November 2017

Please contact
Bettina Lange (committee member)

or
David Thornhill (chair)

Question 4: *Do you agree with the Council's proposal that no sites adjacent to Bingham should be allocated for housing development through Local Plan Part 2?*

We agree that additional sites should not be allocated because the existing allocations will already have a significant traffic impact on the A52 corridor and it is unclear how this will be mitigated let alone avoided - see our response to question 5.

Question 5: *Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for housing development at Cotgrave for around 350 homes in total?*

Nottinghamshire Better Transport (NBT) objects to the new housing allocations in Rushcliffe, due to the transport system being unable to cope with the increased demand for travel. Policies would appear to dictate that the already congested road network would be required to take even more cars. Such levels of car use will severely impact on air quality.

In part our concerns are due to events external to Rushcliffe, especially on rail:

- 1) It is vital that there is modal shift towards rail along the A52 corridor. This will not happen with the poor level of service currently offered. The ongoing renewal of the East Midlands Rail Franchise is an opportunity to address this.
- 2) Rushcliffe Borough Council along with communities along the Nottingham – Grantham line have campaigned for a major step change in the local train service. However, the Transport Authority is the County and the Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) submission to

the DfT for the new franchise is limited in its support for the necessary enhancements and could read that it supports a service little different that seen currently.

- 3) Work on the new rail franchise and the Local Plan is progressing in parallel. Decisions on Rushcliffe are likely to be made before we know what the DfT has specified for Nottingham – Grantham and the actual timetable the new operator proposes to deliver. This is unacceptable: one depends on the other.

On residential street parking is a further issue with commuters parking all day on the outskirts of the City, from where they can catch a frequent bus service to their employment. This is especially problematic in West Bridgford, where parked cars are severely restricting the ability of bus services to get through and any further increase could create gridlock. NBT does not believe there are policies to address this.

IF the sites are allocated, it will be critical that sustainable transport options are planned in at Local Plan stage rather than left for negotiation with applicants at planning application stage. Early and ongoing cooperation between Rushcliffe and Nottinghamshire County Council, the support of the County Council for sustainable transport packages, and assessing and addressing the cumulative transport impact of developments along, or affecting, the A52 corridor will be essential. We understand that Nottinghamshire County Council has the facility (through a dedicated post) to monitor cumulative impacts and would urge that this is made use of throughout. It is also our view that the Local Plan Part 2 should set out clearly what will be expected of applicants and that this should include the mechanisms to be used in order to secure the necessary funding for sustainable transport measures such as new or enhanced bus services including feeder services to railway stations. Section 106 agreements are one such mechanism. The larger sites will have to be served by a direct bus service to minimize traffic impact, and this should be also included in the Local Plan Part 2.

Question 10: *Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for housing development at Radcliffe on Trent for around 820 homes in total?*

see our response to question 5

Question 14: *Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for housing development at Cropwell Bishop for around 160 homes in total?*

see our response to question 5

An improvement to the current skeletal bus service will be essential to make these sites viable in transport terms.

Question 16: *Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for housing development at East Bridgford for around 100 homes in total?*

see our response to question 5

An improvement to the current bus service will be essential to make these sites viable in transport terms.