



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

Your Details		Agent details (where applicable)
Rod Jones	Name	
110 Repton Rd West Bridgford NG17EL	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.

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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site WB3 – South of Wilford Lane (potential capacity around 200 homes)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site WB4 – land between Lady Bay Bridge and Radcliffe Road (potential capacity around 25 homes)	<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 services and facilities required to support development and the design, mix and layout of development.

The part of the Edwalton/Melton Rd/Sharphill area for dwellings should not intrude on the norther skyline as seen from locations in the Borough and the City. The skyline is one of a green border and wood; these are key landscape feature of the Borough and Conurbation.

South of Wilford Lane must be subject to establishing that flood risk is not present and that the development would not exasperate flood risk from loss of the green areas and another development.

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 Yes

No

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

(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 Yes

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

Depends on issues of viable size and variety of facilities to be

maximised.

(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 Yes

No

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

E Leake has already enough approved growth when it has already more stretched community services (schools and health) than other places in the borough.

(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 Yes

No

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

(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 type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To the south of the village	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To the west of the village	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

It is striking that whilst many planning applications have emerged in East Leake, Radcliffe appears to have been a relative backwater. I do not know the reasons for this but obviously Radcliffe should take its share of new development and particularly provide more social and affordable housing.

(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
<i>Site RAD1 – land north of Nottingham Road (potential capacity around 300 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RAD2 – land adjacent Grooms Cottage (potential capacity around 50 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RAD3 – land off Shelford Road (potential capacity around 400 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RAD4 – land north of Grantham Road to north of railway line (potential capacity around 900 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RAD5 – land north of Grantham Road to south of railway line (1) (potential capacity around 200 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<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"/>

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
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.

(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 checked="" type="radio"/> NO
To the north east of the village	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NO
To the east of the village	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To the south of the village	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/>
To the west of the village	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/>

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

There should significant gaps to differentiate Ruddington from West Bridgford and Clifton.

There should be no building to the north which should continue to present a sylvan interval and provide a pleasant transition to the conservation area.

please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Question 10: Do you support housing development at:

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site RUD1 – land to the west of Wilford Road (south) (potential capacity around 180 homes)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site RUD2 – land to the west of Wilford Road (north) (potential capacity around 440 homes)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site RUD3 – land adjacent to St Peter’s Junior School (potential capacity around 60 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Site RUD4 – Easthorpe House and adjacent land (potential capacity around 15 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Site RUD5 – land south of Flawforth Lane (potential capacity around 40 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site RUD6 – land at Loughborough Road (potential capacity around 30 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site RUD7 – land north west of Asher Lane (potential	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<i>capacity around 250 homes)</i>			
<i>Site RUD8 –land west of Pasture Lane (potential capacity around 370 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RUD9 –land south of Landmere Lane (potential capacity around 10 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
<i>Site RUD10 – land adjacent to Landmere Farm (potential capacity around 5 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.

There should be no building to the north of Ruddington. The Loughborough Rd area should continue to present a sylvan interval between WB/Ring Road and Ruddington and provide a pleasant transition to the conservation area. Therefore sites 3 and 4 should not be included.

Sites 9 and 10 are (as some other nearby properties are) very close to traffic noise and pollution.

In the case of E Leake approved plans for housing are viewed as included in their allocation, whereas some recent house building in Ruddington does not appear to be treated in the same way. There should be even treatment and any documents should show why some are included in allocations and others not.

(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.

(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.

(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 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.

(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 Yes

No

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

The proportion of elderly and persons with disability is more likely to increase than decrease. Longevity and improvements in health care will enable more people to live independently and it is crucial that new housing offers such buildings.

The need for some bungalow provision as part of the mix is similarly important for the same reason. There are too many residents in our older houses who end up installing stair lifts for limited advantage- when there are limited low level dwellings for purchase to move to

The Office for National Statistics reports that in England and Wales, approximately 10 million people were limited in daily activities because of a health problem or disability. This figure is similar to [the number of disabled people in England and Wales reported by the Department for Work and Pensions](#) using information available from the Family Resources Survey (10.1 million) for the period 2010/11, which suggests the question used in the 2011 Census will be a good representation of the prevalence of disability.

In England and Wales, 8.5 per cent of the population reported their daily activities were 'limited a lot'¹, and 9.4 per cent were 'limited a little'; so more than four-fifths of the population were free from activity limitations.

.(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

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.

The Borough must provide at least the target number of sites for Gypsies with good facilities. It is of no advantage to anyone for the Borough to be presented with unplanned haphazard applications which are 'fait accompli' by travellers or wandering intrusions on our fields justified by the lack of provision.

(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?*

Offer one-off sites for people to self-build and make these known to small locally operated builders.
One idea is to offer a small number of sites and invite submissions for innovative self build applications which are of maximum energy efficiency and adjustable for size.

(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.*

(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"/>

	Yes	No
<i>Tollerton</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide any comments in support of your response.

(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
<i>Bradmore</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Bunny</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Cropwell Butler</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Gotham</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Newton</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Plumtree</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Shelford</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Yes	No
Upper Saxondale	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide comments to support your response.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

‘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’.

Given the loss of green belt to the large allocated sites – the replacement area of green belt should match that lost. Ideally it should be designated as favourable to tree planting/forestry use.

(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.

The green belt land to the west of Sharphill Wood and north of the A52 ring road – should be designated for future community park use.

Every conurbation needs its green lungs/space. When decades of expansion of West Bridgford from Compton Acres to Gamston and the next two major expansions is complete, there will be no major natural available countryside accessible to the Public. Hence this area should be designated and provided for this use.

The suggestion that part of the area could be become a green tree burial site should be included as a possibility.

(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.

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
Sites at Chapel Lane, Bingham	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site at Hollygate Lane, Cotgrave	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site at Hathern Works, Sutton Bonnington	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

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

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

(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?

(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.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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.

The place at Flintham had another use before its most recent one. I suspect it was once a great building but when last seen was an eyesore. This clearly needs developing for some use.

(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
<i>Bingham District Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>West Bridgford District Centre</i>	<input checked="" type="radio"/> YES	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Cotgrave Local Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>East Leake Local Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Yes	No
<i>Keyworth (The Square) Local Centre</i>		
<i>Keyworth (Wolds Drive) Local Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Radcliffe on Trent Local Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Ruddington Local Centre</i>	<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.

There is a case for extending shopping area of West Bridgford on both sides of the eastern stretch to the Test Match Pub and for increasing car parking to reflect the growing population.

(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?*

There should continue to be some proportionality between shops which add to the commercial attraction of centres and other premises for eating and drinking.

Policy SHOP2 of the 2006 Rushcliffe Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan should be restated as it aims to ensure that centres retain a high proportion of shops (within Use Class A1) and limits the proportion of other A Use Classes – A2 (financial and professional services), A3 (restaurants and cafes), A4 (drinking establishments) and A5 (hot food takeaways). Non-A1 uses should not exceed 35% of the whole of the defined retail area.

There should be a policy which promotes the Council taking over shop

fronts which continue to be boarded up and unused in excess of 5 yrs.
(One at the Wolds has been an eyesore for over a decade.)

(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?

(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?*

YES

As far as I can see the diagrams show the extent of the Melton Rd; Boundary Rd, Musters Rd and Loughborough Rd (the Wolds).

(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?*

YES.

These local centres are critical for people and part of their lives. The reasons include social recognition for the lone elderly, supporting local farms and business (Totally Locally) to health benefits of walking and the effect of reducing vehicle journeys – they are all major advantages.

(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 500m² or more across the whole of Rushcliffe?*

Yes

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.

We already have enough supermarket and mini supermarket provision. With Waitrose adding to the out of town shops we do not need more and the potential at the approved site for Sainburys on Wilford Rd., it is not desirable to increase the car journeys to the periphery of the conurbation.

We do not want any more drawn away from the town and local shopping parades.

It should also be borne in mind that there are at least 2 major out of town centres accessible to residents in the City area – the Riverside Retail Park and the Castle Marina Retail Park.

(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.

(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.*

As stated earlier the valuable Landscape character of the Borough includes the ridge line view of Sharphill from the north/ Conurbation. This should be preserved as it is visible from beside the Trent, the Civic

Centre, Mapperley Top, Nottingham Castle etc

(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

(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)

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.

(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.

(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.*

(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.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other issues

Question53: *Please identify any matters related to climate change, flood risk and related issues that are not covered here or elsewhere.*

(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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>School playing fields</i>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Allotments</i>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Sports pitches</i>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Amenity space (e.g. information open space)</i>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Flood alleviation areas</i>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Other (please specify which)</i>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

The green belt land to the west of Sharphill Wood and north of the A52 ring road – should be designated for future community park use.

Every conurbation needs its green lungs/space. When decades of expansion of West Bridgford from Compton Acres to Gamston and the

next two major expansions is complete, there will be no major natural available countryside accessible to the Public. Hence this area should be designated and provided for this use.

It has been suggested that part of the area could be become a green tree burial site

(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 do they relate to the strategic priorities?

There should be corridors inside the ring road which enable wildlife to continue to exist. The local example is that the hedgerow which once linked Sharphill Wood with the Spinney and Cemetery should be reinstated.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

b) What evidence exists to support the identification of existing and proposed Green Infrastructure?

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

c) How should new Green Infrastructure corridors be identified? Does Core Strategy Policy 16 (part 3) provide suitable selection criteria?

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

d) Core Strategy Policy 16 (part 2d) refers to 'areas of identified deficit', where are these and how do they relate to the strategic priorities?

Rushcliffe is low on trees. The Sustainability Report competently lists the

major benefits of increasing woodland. The 2015 Council's policy decision to promote greater tree cover by its own actions and by Planning decisions should be reflected in strong action in these policies. Replacement planting should usually be on a more than one for one basis unless there is good reason that this is impossible and impracticable.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

e) *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?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

f) *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?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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?*

The green belt land to the west of Sharphill Wood and north of the A52 ring road – should be designated for future community park use.

This is in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework view that access to high quality open spaces can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. I understand that Policy 16 of the Core Strategy sets out that a strategic approach to Green Infrastructure will be taken and it looks to protect parks and open space based on criteria in the policy.

This area of land is well walked and occasionally well sledged. Local people use this area for exercise both walking and running. The views across West Bridgford and the City are stupendous.

(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.

(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.*

(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?*

(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. Because Rushcliffe's tree cover is well below all other areas of Nottinghamshire and under the national average. Trees provide health and environmental benefits.

(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

(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.

(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.

(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.

(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
<i>the River Trent</i>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>the River Soar</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>the Grantham Canal</i>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>the Great Central Railway</i>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Yes	No
<i>any other location (please specify which)</i>	<input checked="" 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.

(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.*

(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.

(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.

(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 YES

No – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. within the NPPF).....

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

Light pollution from street lights creates stress and disturbance to wildlife. Policy should require standard of all new street lighting which maximises down light and minimises spillage.

(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.

Other issues

Question 70: Please identify any matters related to contamination and pollution which are not covered here or elsewhere.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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.

(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.

(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.*

(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.

(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.*

(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.

A major areas of concern which may or may not be relevant to this document is the early allocation of land and resources so that appropriate schools (with associated land) and health centres/GP services are planned from the outset. This should be a key requirement on new large developments.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Signed:	<i>Rod Jones</i>	Date:	24.03.16
----------------	------------------	--------------	----------

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

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.