

Dear sir,

Please find attached my comments concerning this policy below.

1. Is this planning!!! Development appears quite random and with little overall policy guidance to help sustain the rural aspect of south Nottinghamshire. In the late 1960s the policy was to expand the villages of the area so that they could individually sustain retail facilities and provide local hubs rather than just sprawling out from West Bridgford. At that time Cotgrave, Bingham, Keyworth and Ruddington were all expanded as part of that policy and have gained a balanced development. **Why change?** Other smaller villages such as Tollerton , Wysall, Widmerpool, Kinoulton, Plumtree, Bradmore, Cropwell Butler, Newton and Stanton would benefit from a expansion of that sensible policy on a limited scale, whilst still retaining the overall rural aspect of south Notts.
2. In respect of the Core strategic Allocations adjacent to Main Urban Areas. **I do not agreed to the allocation of the Melton Road and Tollerton sites and am only marginally in favour of the site at Clifton.** All three areas are effectively just urban sprawl and will each detract from the immediate area. That east of the A52 link road (East of Gamston/north of Tollerton ) breaches the natural barrier of the link road and begins a sprawl eastwards that will eventually enclose Bassingfield and Tollerton themselves. It would be better to expand Tollerton itself, with a limited expansion to the north and east and thereby seek to provide a local hub with additional retail facilities for the village. The Melton Road site is only likely to expand westward, north of the A52 linkroad and thereby detract from the southern approaches to WB and Nottingham itself. Both of these sites would need a significant increase in the carrying capacity of the local roads . The A52 would require flyovers at the Wheatcroft and Nottingham Knight roundabouts to carry through traffic around Nottingham and thereby leave the Melton and Loughborough roads as local under-passing arterial routes feeding into WB and Nottingham. The only site with some merit is that south of Clifton but even here local road infrastructure will need to be upgraded linking Westward (to M1) and eastward (to Ruddington and the A60).
3. **The SHLAA is a flawed policy** as it merely seeks to ratify developers wishes rather than seek policy decisions on the part of Rushcliffe BC. There is too much emphasis on what greenbelt land can be de-restricted. This merely to satisfy the greed of Developers and landowners and destroying the rural aspect of south Notts.
4. In respect of Q2 all of these sites should be developed. Is there more potential for development over flood protected areas adjacent to the Trent between WB and Wilford and further east of Lady Bay area.
5. The Key Settlements policy is only an extension of the policies adopted in the 1960s. All very well you might think with each of the designated areas having been developed to a degree that has enhanced each location. However further expansion would now detract from their rural aspect and merely create small towns where additional pressure will engender 'sprawl' in the longer term beyond 2028. Would a policy of seeking a 'New Town' be preferable based say on the A606/A46 Hub site west of Kinoulton. **I do not agree to allocating further greenbelt land around any of the 'Key Settlements' (Q. 3, 4, 5, 6).**
6. Notwithstanding the above in 5. Specifically in respect of Keyworth (Q.6) the 'identified sites' around the village **only those to the north of the village and adjacent to the old railway line have any merit.** Indeed these sites could be expanded up to the railway itself and the trackway developed as a key tramway link into WB and Nottingham. Rushcliffe should also seek to move the Secondary school from the south-central part of the village onto a site opposite the British Geological Survey. Thereby releasing development land in the core of the village (for small first –time buyer) houses and removing the considerable congestion on the roadways around the current school site. **All of the sites to the west of the village should be removed from the local plan and confirmed as green-belt land.** This would protect the hill-top aspect and views into and out of the village along this

ridge-top Bunny Lane site. **I strongly object to any development to the west of the village.** A number of sites have been proposed over the last 35 years and each has fallen because of numbers of objections (e.g. Green Belt land; unsuitability of Bunny Lane for traffic volumes generated; closeness to the Keyworth Sewage Farm; detracting from the rural views of the Bunny escarpment and views into the village from the escarpment and from Bunny; and SUDs problems). Currently I am most concerned that the landowner is actively creating 'brown-field ' sites throughout his estate on this western side of the village with inappropriate 'dumping' of waste materials from other development sites and from his own agricultural activities. This inappropriate activity seeking to engender a false appreciation of the limited worth of this land for agriculture. **In addition**, these western and southern aspects of the village would make a significant site for solar energy generation in the longer term and should not be threatened by sterilisation with any new proposal for housing development.

7. In respect of Radcliffe on Trent (**Q.7 & 8**) are these potential site merely engendering a ribbon – development problem that beyond 2028 would effectively put pressure on the land between Gamston and RoT and RoT and Bingham. Only those west and south of the village would seem appropriate
8. Expansion of Ruddinton (**Q.9 & 10**) Only limited development is appropriate in this village with proposal to the north and west of the village threatening amalgamation with West Bridgford and Clifton respectively.
9. **Q. 11 (A. No ) Allocation of new Key Settlement sites within the LAPP** . This would be a poor policy to consider. It will encourage immediate development on those sites and only increase the pressure on other sites considered in this document. It would be better to keep all of the sites protected under a 'Green-Belt' policy with a presumption to no development unless a very strong case can be made to make a Green-Belt variation within the lifetime (2028) of the policy document.
10. **Q. 12 & 13** There should be consideration of limited development within all of the small villages within the borough in the hope that this would encourage local retail outlets to revitalise these 'dying' villages. Each should be considered as a basis for increasing the 'affordable housing' stock that is so limited in these usually affluent communities
11. **Green Belt Policy 4 of Core Strategy.** From discussions with RBC representatives at the Keyworth meeting it seems that the considerations being given to a Green Belt policy are for the most part driven by historical applications to develop land in the previous strategic policy documents (1980-2016). In many cases quite significant objections were made and upheld through the courts on many of these sites only for them to reappear in this current LAPP. This is not policy, merely pandering to developers who have kept interests to these refused sites in the hope of a reversal of Policy by RBC. **RBC should ratify the previous decisions of the courts and remove these contentious site from any future consideration.**
12. **Q. 18** "Alterations to Inset boundaries will have to take place" (Page 35) Why. **I do not agree to these alterations if the sites involved have been rejected in the past for quite legitimate reasons.** At the very least these previously rejected site should be regarded as 'Safeguarding Land' only to be utilised in the medium to long term and even then for specific reasons (school sites, community benefit, solar power generation sites etc. This applies to sites around each of the Key Settlements.

Yours faithfully

**Peter and Sue Hopson**  
**19 Roseland Close**  
**Keyworth,**  
**Nottingham**  
**NG12 5LQ**  
**23 March 2016**