

## 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) |
|---|---------|----------------------------------|
| Mr. Bev Angell  | Name    |                                  |
| Clerk to the Council<br>Barton in Fabis Parish Council<br>8, The Buildings<br>Church Lane<br>Thrumpton<br>NG110AY | 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.*

The Parish Council believe that it is more sensible to focus development around 'key settlements' rather than around the urban area. This is because it helps to sustain existing communities and facilities in those areas. By contrast, new developments in areas such as Clifton have no link in practice with the existing community and require entirely new infrastructure and facilities.

All of the key settlements have a good range of services which can be improved through increased levels of development. They also have good public transport links to the built up area of Greater Nottingham, including Nottingham City Centre. Subject to sustainability tests it is possible that additional greenfield sites can be identified and it would be wrong to close this option at this stage.

(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 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.

**No comment**

## 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.*

The Parish Council believe that it is more sensible to focus development around 'key settlements' rather than around the urban area. This is because it helps to sustain existing communities and facilities in those areas. By contrast, new developments in areas such as Clifton have no link in practice with the existing community and require entirely new infrastructure and facilities.

Bingham is a key settlement. All of the key settlements have a good range of services which can be improved through increased levels of development. They also have good public transport links to the built up area of Greater Nottingham, including Nottingham City Centre. Subject to sustainability tests it is possible that additional greenfield sites can be identified and it would be wrong to close this option at this stage.

(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.

We believe that it is more sensible to focus development around ‘key settlements’ rather than around the urban area. This is because it helps to sustain existing communities and facilities in those areas. By contrast, new developments in areas such as Clifton have no link in practice with the existing community and require entirely new infrastructure and facilities.

Cotgrave is a key settlement. All of the key settlements have a good range of services which can be improved through increased levels of development. They also have good public transport links to the built up area of Greater Nottingham, including Nottingham City Centre. Subject to sustainability tests it is possible that additional greenfield sites can be identified and it would be wrong to close this option at this stage.

(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.

We believe that it is more sensible to focus development around ‘key settlements’ rather than around the urban area. This is because it helps to sustain existing communities and facilities in those areas. By contrast, new developments in areas such as Clifton have no link in practice with the existing community and require entirely new infrastructure and facilities.

East Leake is a key settlement. All of the key settlements have a good range of services which can be improved through increased levels of development. They also have good public transport links to the built up area of Greater Nottingham, including Nottingham City Centre. Subject to sustainability tests it is possible that additional greenfield sites can be identified and it would be wrong to close this option at this stage.

**However, in the case of East Leake, the impact of resulting traffic on the road through Gotham should preclude some sites being developed.**

(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.

**We believe that it is more sensible to focus development around 'key settlements' rather than around the urban area. This is because it helps to sustain existing communities and facilities in those areas. By contrast, new developments in areas such as Clifton have no link in practice with the existing community and require entirely new infrastructure and facilities.**

**Keyworth is a key settlement. All of the key settlements have a good range of services which can be improved through increased levels of development. They also have good public transport links to the built up area of Greater Nottingham, including Nottingham City Centre. Subject to sustainability tests it is possible that additional greenfield sites can be identified and it would be wrong to close this option at this stage.**

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 checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

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

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

**We believe that it is more sensible to focus development around ‘key settlements’ rather than around the urban area. This is because it helps to sustain existing communities and facilities in those areas. By contrast, new developments in areas such as Clifton have no link in practice with the existing community and require entirely new infrastructure and facilities.**

**Radcliffe on Trent is a key settlement. All of the key settlements have a good range of services which can be improved through increased levels of development. They also have good public transport links to the built up area of Greater Nottingham, including Nottingham City Centre. Subject to sustainability tests it is possible that additional greenfield sites can be identified and it would be wrong to close this option at this stage.**

(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 type="radio"/> |
| Site RAD2 – land adjacent Grooms Cottage (potential capacity around 50 homes)                              | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>       | <input type="radio"/> |
| Site RAD3 – land off Shelford Road (potential capacity around 400 homes)                                   | <input 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 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 type="radio"/>       | <input type="radio"/> |

|   | <b>Yes –<br/>all of<br/>site</b> | <b>Yes –<br/>but<br/>only<br/>part of<br/>site</b> | <b>No</b>             |
|---|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| <i>Site RAD6 – 72 Main Road (potential capacity around 7 homes)</i>   | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/>                              | <input 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 type="radio"/> |
| <i>Site RAD8 – land south of Grantham Road (potential capacity around 20 homes)</i>                               | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/>                              | <input 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 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 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.*

**No comment**

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 type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/>            |
| To the north east of the village | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/>            |
| To the east of the village       | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input 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.

**We believe that it is more sensible to focus development around ‘key settlements’ rather than around the urban area. This is because it helps to sustain existing communities and facilities in those areas. By contrast, new developments in areas such as Clifton have no link in practice with the existing community and require entirely new infrastructure and facilities.**

**Ruddington is a key settlement. All of the key settlements have a good range of services which can be improved through increased levels of development. They also have good public transport links to the built up area of Greater Nottingham, including Nottingham City Centre. Subject to sustainability tests it is possible that additional greenfield sites can be identified and it would be wrong to close this option at this stage.**

**Development to the West / North West risks coalescence of settlements with proposed development at Clifton Pastures.**

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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

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

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

**Development to the West / North West risks coalescence of settlements with proposed development at Clifton Pastures.**

(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.

**We believe that it is more sensible to focus development in and around 'key settlements' rather than around the urban area. This is because it helps to sustain existing communities and facilities in those areas. By contrast, new developments in areas such as Clifton have no link in practice with the existing community and require entirely new infrastructure and facilities**

(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.*

**Yes. We agree with the policy in the Core Strategy that housing in other settlements should be for local needs only and in Gotham for example there is capacity for that scale of housing within the proposed village envelope and through rural exception sites  
Barton Parish Council fully supports the submission by Gotham Parish Council regarding development within their village.**

(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.*

**See our response to Question 12. Rural exception sites can provide affordable housing purely for local needs.  
Barton Parish Council fully supports submission by Gotham Parish Council regarding development within their village.**

(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.*

**No comment**

(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.*

**There has been no evidence presented for such a requirement.  
Due note should be made of the extent of provision already made in the North West sector of the Borough.**

(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?*

**No comment**

(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 issue of and importance / weight that RBC intends to give to Neighbourhood Plans has not been sufficiently covered. We would ask that this is set out in detail.

(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                    |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Cotgrave</i>           | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Cropwell Bishop</i>    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <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.

**No comment**

(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                    |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Bradmore        | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/> |
| Bunny           | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/> |
| Cropwell Butler | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/> |
| Gotham          | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Newton          | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/> |
| Plumtree        | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/> |
| Shelford        | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/> |
| Upper Saxondale | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/> |

Please provide comments to support your response.

**We agree with the policy in the Core Strategy that housing in other settlements should be for local needs only and in Gotham for example there is capacity for that scale of housing within the proposed village envelope and through rural exception sites**

**Barton Parish Council fully supports submission by Gotham Parish Council regarding development within their village.**



### **‘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’.*

**If land is safeguarded, this pre-empts the appropriate review of and decisions on future land allocation in any new Local Plan**

(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.*

**Clear defensible boundaries should be agreed in all cases. For any development within the green belt there must be a detailed development masterplan led by the Borough Council (not developer led) formulated in co-operation with local communities**

(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.*

**Sufficient sites have been identified already. Such development is more appropriate along the M1 corridor and new freight hub at Junction 24 in order to minimise goods traffic on roads across Rushcliffe. Development of B2 / B8 warehousing at Clifton Pastures should be scrapped.**

(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 checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Site at Hollygate Lane, Cotgrave</i>         | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Site at Hathern Works, Sutton Bonnington</i> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

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

**These are further developments of existing employment development sites or brownfield sites and should be prioritised over new developments such as at Clifton Pastures subject to safeguards regarding landscaping, noise and traffic which can be set out in Neighbourhood Plans. The aim should be that any**

**development should result in a net gain so far as environmental impact is concerned.**

(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 checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| British Gypsum Works, Gotham | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

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

**These are further developments of existing employment development sites or brownfield sites and should be prioritised over new developments such as at Clifton Pastures.**

**The policy suggested for British Gypsum Works Gotham is supported subject to safeguards regarding landscaping, noise and traffic which can be set out in the Neighbourhood Plan. The aim should be that any development should result in a net gain so far as environmental impact is concerned.**

(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 are further developments of existing employment development sites or brownfield sites and should be prioritised over new developments such as at Clifton Pastures.**

**The aim should be that any development should result in a net gain so far as**

**environmental impact is concerned.**

(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.

(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.

## Regeneration

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

|  | Yes                              | No                    |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Bunny Brickworks                             | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Former Islamic Institute, Flintham           | <input checked="" 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 design, mix and layout of development and any services and facilities required to support development.

**These are further developments of existing employment development sites or brownfield sites and should be prioritised over new developments such as at Clifton Pastures.**

**The aim should be that any development should result in a net gain so far as environmental impact is concerned.**

(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"/> |
| West Bridgford District Centre      | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Cotgrave Local Centre               | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| East Leake Local Centre             | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Keyworth (The Square) Local Centre  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Keyworth (Wolds Drive) Local Centre | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Radcliffe on Trent Local Centre     | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Ruddington Local Centre             | <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?*

**Potential to be considered in Gotham in conjunction with Parish Council and local community.**

(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?*

**The definition provided is particularly vague and provides insufficient detail on what is being protected and from whom and in what way. As such it has no value.**

(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.*

**It seems sensible to assess the impact of such larger developments. The same should apply to any employment site.** (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.*

**The design of new development is a crucial factor in whether new**

development is acceptable to local people. Government ministers have rightly pointed out that even large developments can more readily be accepted if designed 'in sympathy with' both the natural environment and the existing architectural style in a given area and in consultation with local people. The Borough Council have demonstrated an entirely 'developer led' approach which results in unsightly development which destroys the cohesion of local communities. A detailed review of best practice and clear assessment of what constitutes acceptable standards is required, which leads to a development masterplan, rigorously enforced, for all significant proposed developments.

(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.*

**There should be a clear presumption against development in areas of high visibility e.g. prominent ridge lines. These act as clearly designated boundaries and should be separately identified.**

(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?*

?(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?*

**Yes. It would be impossible to have proper safeguards without a proper assessment of what currently exists.**

(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.*

**This could help to prevent unsuitable or speculative development proposals.** (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.*

(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.*

**Villages such as Barton in Fabis have no mains drainage and water conservation is already an important issue as residents pay for disposal. There is no need for further regulation.**

(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.*

**No comment**

(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.

**Policy required to prevent any further development on land alongside River Trent where such land is used as floodplain. Clear flood plans for all communities potentially affected by flooding to be developed in conjunction with Parish Council and local community groups.**

(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.*

**No comment**

(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 type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>School playing fields</i>                                   | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Allotments</i>  | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Sports pitches</i>  | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Amenity space (e.g. information open space)</i>             | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Golf courses</i>  | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Designated and non-designated nature conservation sites</i> | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Flood alleviation areas</i>                                 | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Other (please specify which)</i>                            | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/> |

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

**Vital that these areas are safeguarded and designated accordingly**

(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



|  |
|--|
| <i>do they relate to the strategic priorities?</i>   |
| <i>(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)</i>  |
| <b>b) <i>What evidence exists to support the identification of existing and proposed Green Infrastructure?</i></b>   |
| <i>(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)</i>  |
| <b>c) <i>How should new Green Infrastructure corridors be identified? Does Core Strategy Policy 16 (part 3) provide suitable selection criteria?</i></b>   |
| <i>(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)</i>  |
| <b>d) <i>Core Strategy Policy 16 (part 2d) refers to 'areas of identified deficit', where are these and how do they relate to the strategic priorities?</i></b>  |
| <i>(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)</i>  |
| <b>e) <i>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?</i></b>                          |
| <i>(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)</i>  |
| <b>f) <i>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?</i></b> |
| <i>(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)</i>  |

### **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?*

**No comment**

*(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.

No comment

(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.

No comment

(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?

**The LAPP should identify land where it is possible to extend and link between existing conservation sites to promote further diversity and protection e.g. link Holme Pit SSSI to Attenborough Nature Reserve SSSI**

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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

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?

(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?

(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?*

**Yes – these are often a key part of local heritage and character and recognised ‘landmarks’**

(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?*

**Yes – this would provide at least some compensation, but must be identified for larger developments before any application is approved and include specifics on how such offset will be financed and managed.**

(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.

**No comment**

(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.*

**No comment**

(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.

**No comment**

(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                    |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| the River Trent                           | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| the River Soar                            | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/> |
| the Grantham Canal                        | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| the Great Central Railway                 | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/> |
| any other location (please specify which) | <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.*

**Land should be safeguarded along the River Trent – specifically south of the City**  
**Yes, land should be safeguarded for a new canal link**

(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.*

**No comment**

(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.*

**No comment**

(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.*

**The NPPF does not outline in sufficient detail the potential sources of noise pollution, particularly in local communities.**

**These should specify:**

- **Off road vehicles and motorcycles particularly where these are used, often illegally on bridleways**
- **The use of model aircraft**

(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.*

**This is becoming a major issue in rural areas. Policies outlining best practice in reducing light pollution and identifying and reducing / eliminating the major sources should be included. This area should be specifically covered in planning applications for major developments and be part of RBC's Development Masterplan specification**

(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.*

**This is becoming a major issue in rural areas. Policies outlining best practice in reducing noise pollution and identifying and reducing / eliminating the major sources should be included. This area should be specifically covered in planning applications for major developments and be part of RBC's Development Masterplan specification.**

(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.*

**No comment**



## 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.*

**Further policies required on maintaining local bus services and specifying requirements in relation to new developments.**

(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.*

**No comment**

(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.*

**No comment**

(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.*

**No comment**

(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.*

**No comment**

(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.

**The LAPP is too narrowly focused on housing issues. There is insufficient coverage of and the identification of the need for social and community facilities e.g:**

- Sheltered accommodation
- Community Halls
- Playing fields

**There appears to be no update / confirmation of the information in the Supplementary Planning Documents – why is this?**

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

|                |                   |              |                   |
|----------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| <b>Signed:</b> | <i>Bev Angell</i> | <b>Date:</b> | <i>08/03/2016</i> |
|----------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|

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.