I attach my comments for consideration by the Inspector in his independent examination of the Rushcliffe BC Local Plan Part 2 Land and Planning Policies (publication version)

I am also making a request to be notified that

- the Local Plan has been submitted for independent examination
- the recommendations have been published; and
- the local Plan Part 2 has been adopted

27/06/2018
Rushcliffe Borough Council

This representation relates to page 33, policy 4.4 Housing Allocation – Hillside Farm
It relates to the soundness of the choice of this site for the following reasons:
   a) Not justified in relation to alternatives
   b) Duty of Rushcliffe BC to co-operate with Keyworth Parish Council’s ‘made’ Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan as part of Rushcliffe BC Planning Policy

Submitted by Linda Abbey, Chairman of Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group 2011-2017

The Local Plan Part 2 has recommended land south of Bunny Lane at Hillside Farm as being suitable for housing development, in spite of this area having been precluded from recommendations in the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan.

In the surveys carried out with the community by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and after subsequent assessments were made, land south of Bunny Lane at Hillside Farm had little support for development compared to other sites.

Equally, in the 6 week formal consultation for the Neighbourhood Plan, support from the community was very limited for housing development at Hillside Farm, south of Bunny Lane.

At the referendum of 30\textsuperscript{th} May 2018, The Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan gained 83.5\% of the referendum votes in favour of it and so, in accordance with the Regulations and the Borough Council’s decision of 16 March 2018 the Neighbourhood Development Plan is ‘made’ and now forms part of the Development Plan for Rushcliffe Borough.

So why should land south of Bunny Lane at Hillside Farm be promoted by Rushcliffe Borough Council?

In the Neighbourhood Plan, the site south of Bunny Lane does not feature, yet it is put forward by Rushcliffe Borough Council, when a site north of Debdale Lane has already been recommended in the Neighbourhood Plan as safeguarded land for development from 2028 onwards or as a site to be brought forward if needed for housing development at some time during the time frame to 2028.

This site, although in the Neighbourhood Plan and offering housing numbers at least compatible with Hillside Farm, has been overlooked in favour of the South of Bunny Lane site to make up the extra housing numbers Rushcliffe requires beyond the 480 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

In the long term, for development to the west of Keyworth the sites south of Debdale Lane and north of Debdale Lane would provide cohesive development as shown in developer’s masterplans already presented as part of the Neighbourhood Plan consultations.

The site south of Bunny Lane has connection to the village only along the main road (Bunny Lane) and would be isolated from the existing neighbouring housing and amenities.

South of Debdale Lane has good connectivity to the neighbouring existing housing and to the village centre and bus route, also providing for pedestrian and cycle links away from the main road, which would serve a development north of Debdale Lane too, along with the planned public space adjacent to Debdale Lane, which would provide good amenity and safe, open natural space on the edge of the settlement for the two sites and the wider population.
During the Neighbourhood Plan consultations with developers, the indicative lay-out provided by developers for land south of Bunny Lane at Hillside Farm was unimaginative, with no regard for the edge of settlement position or due regard for appropriate landscaping to soften its impact on the approach to Keyworth or to try and incorporate other features that were important to the community. These factors were taken into account by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, who were not only looking at sites that would be sustainable and also provide for the needs that were identified by the community in the consultations.

South of Bunny Lane at Hillside Farm was not considered as a housing development site as it did not relate as well as other sites put forward after the extensive work done by the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group in preparation of the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan between 2011 and 2017.

I would like these points of objection to be available for the Planning Inspector as he considers the content of the Local Plan Part 2 Land and Planning Policies (Publication version) when it is submitted for independent examination.

I am also making a request to be notified that
- the Local Plan has been submitted for independent examination
- the recommendations have been published; and
- the local Plan Part 2 has been adopted
Richard

Thank you for your time last week.

I took on board your comments and have relayed them to the various interested parties in the village. The feelings are running high and there will significant upset (& even anger) if Ruddington is used to cover any further shortfall elsewhere in the Borough as a result of the Asher Lane decision........it would be grossly unfair for RBC to use it as a ‘Windfall’ at our expense!!

There is an expectation that you will indeed support maintaining the number of new houses on Green Belt at the 350 level as set out in the Local Plan Stage 2 (which are obviously on top of the significant number of in-fill/brown field dwellings that have been built or are expected to be built) because it is certainly the right thing to do if RBC values the maintenance and development of historic villages in the Borough and are not looking to actively destroy them by way of their planning decisions. An excessive number of houses in the village (which we vehemently believe would be the case if you allowed the Ashers 175 to be extra) on top of the impact of all of the large scale current/planned developments in the surrounding area (by dint of Ruddington being used as a cut-through) will have significant and serious detrimental consequences.

To take into account some additional arguments to help persuade you to amend your position, I have attached a revised letter which replaces the one I handed you.

Please could confirm receipt of this email and the attached letter?

Kind regards

Mike

On 18/06/2018 10:30, "Localdevelopment" > wrote:

Dear Mike

That is good with me. I will see you on Friday at 2pm at our offices.

Regards

Richard

Richard Mapleton
Planning Policy Manager

-----Original Message-----
From: Mike Ader (IM) ___________________________
Sent: 15 June 2018 20:35
To: Localdevelopment
Subject: Meeting on 22nd June

Hi Richard
Further to our conversation today I’m pleased to confirm that I’m able to be with you at 2 PM on Friday 22nd June. Is this okay with you?
Kind regards
Mike

Sent from my iPhone

This message and any attachments are for the named person's use only. It may contain information that is commercially sensitive, of a confidential nature or contain protectively marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly. No confidentiality or privilege is waived or lost by any mistransmission. If you receive this message in error, please immediately delete it and all copies of it from your system, destroy any hard copies of it and notify the sender. You must not, directly or indirectly, use, disclose, distribute, print, or copy any part of this message if you are not the intended recipient. Whilst every endeavour is made to ensure that any attached files are virus free, we would advise that a check be performed before opening. Rushcliffe Borough Council and any of its subsidiaries each reserve the right to monitor all e-mail communications through its networks. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender, except where the message states otherwise and the sender is authorized to state them to be the views of any such entity. Rushcliffe Borough Council accepts no liability for any personal views expressed. Senders and Recipients of email should be aware that, under the General Data Protection Regulation and the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the contents of the message and any attachments may have to be disclosed in response to a request made under either piece of legislation. Any personal information that that you provide in response to this email, or in any other communication with the Council, will be processed in accordance with our responsibilities under data protection legislation. All GCSX traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation. For further details please see our website for our Privacy Notice http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/privacy/. Please consider the environment before you print this email.
For the attention of Richard Mapletoft

Ruddington Action Group objection to the allocation of 350 new homes on Green Belt land in Ruddington in the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies Publication Version

Dear Mr Mapletoft

Ruddington Action Group wishes to object to the proposed allocation of land for 350 new homes on Green Belt land in Ruddington in the Publication Version of Part 2 of the Rushcliffe Local Plan (hereafter referred to as simply ‘Part 2 of the Plan’). This objection is primarily informed by the recent inspector’s decision on the Asher Lane application, and the impact that this development is going to have on the village, particularly the village centre.

The Asher Lane appeal decision has granted planning permission for 175 homes on land which Rushcliffe Borough Council has not identified in the Local Plan as an allocated site and the inspector’s decision came too late to be incorporated and taken into account in Part 2 of the Plan. Therefore, as it presently stands and without further amendment to Part 2 of the Plan, Ruddington runs the risk of not 350 new Green Belt homes being built over the plan period, but 525, a figure which RAG believes the village simply cannot sustain.

The sustainability of such a level of housing is also not supported in Part 2 of the Plan itself which, at paragraph 3.69, states:

The Core Strategy sets a target of a minimum of 250 new homes that need to be built on greenfield sites at Ruddington up to 2028. It is considered that Ruddington has scope to sustain around 350 dwellings in total adjacent to the village, based on the capacity of local services and the availability of suitable sites for development.

Under no circumstances can 525 new homes be considered to reflect a ‘scope to sustain around 350 dwellings’ and so, on that basis, the plan must be amended to reflect the Asher Lane decision.

Previous consultation documents prepared as part of the Local Plan have recognised the need to take account of any additional unplanned house building. The Further Options paper (February 2017) includes the following statement:
The Core Strategy sets a target of a minimum 250 new homes that need to be built on greenfield sites at Ruddington up to 2028. There are, as yet, no sites with planning permission which would count against this target.

Now that planning permission has been granted for the Asher Lane site, RAG considers the only reasonable and transparent course of action Rushcliffe can take is to remove these 175 homes from the 350 figure set out in the Local Plan, thereby reducing the target to a maximum of 175.

RAG believes there is an even greater imperative to reduce the number of Green Belt homes allocated in Part 2 of the Plan given the impacts that are going to result from the Asher Lane development, impacts which Rushcliffe acknowledged throughout the planning application process, including the appeal inquiry. As you are aware, Ruddington has no route into the village from the south and so with the Asher Lane site being on the southern edge of the village, all traffic accessing it is going to have to travel through the historic heart of the village. The Highways Authority objected to the Asher Lane application due to the anticipated increase in traffic and despite the mitigation measures which form part of the permission, including traffic lights at the junction of Kirk Lane and High Street, the levels of traffic which would result are going to result in significant levels of congestion in the village centre, thereby making it all the more important to carefully plan for any further housing development in the village.

The centre of the village is also the route that increasing amounts of traffic are using to connect the A4543 with the A60 and/or the A52. This increase has been noticeable since the improvements made to the A453 and has had a significant impact on the vitality of the village centre with a number of retail premises having closed, including the village’s last bank and the long established greengrocers. A number of retail premises remain empty and many retailers and shoppers alike point to the levels of traffic in the village as the reason why the village centre is a less attractive place to shop.

The Asher Lane permission puts the village centre at even greater risk and this should be recognised in Part 2 of the Plan. It would be easy to conclude that more housing is going to improve the vitality of the village centre but Ruddington’s unique road layout in the centre of the village, including key junctions which are difficult for large numbers of vehicles to negotiate, and even more difficult for large vehicles to negotiate, is a severe constraint to any unplanned growth. To leave the number of homes allocated in Part 2 of the Local Plan unchanged despite the Asher Lane decision would represent an unplanned situation which the Local Plan, through Rushcliffe’s objection to the Asher Lane application, did not envisage. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at paragraph 28 requires planning policies to support a prosperous rural economy by “promoting the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages, such as local shops”. The level of house building now at risk of being built in the village is a real threat to any future prosperity in the village.

The NPPF also states, at paragraph 32, that “plans and decisions should take account of whether ..... improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.” The Local Plan has not considered the impact of 525 new Green Belt homes would have on Ruddington’s transport network and without such consideration, the Local Plan does not accord with the NPPF and therefore runs the risk of being found unsound.
The other significant impact that unplanned housing and the resulting traffic is going to have is erode the Conservation Area. Paragraph 126 of the NPPF states:

“Local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. In doing so, they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance. In developing this strategy, local planning authorities should take into account:

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring;
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; and
- opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place.”

Excessive unplanned housing in Ruddington would do nothing to achieve the aims of the NPPF and would more likely be contrary to these aims as the significance of the conservation area, and the benefits it brings to village would be diminished, not enhanced, and there would be a significant impact on the character of the village as it is turned into a thoroughfare for increased levels of traffic.

To conclude, the NPPF, at paragraph 155, states that, in the preparation of local plans:

“Early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses is essential. A wide section of the community should be proactively engaged, so that Local Plans, as far as possible, reflect a collective vision and a set of agreed priorities for the sustainable development of the area.”

By not amending Part 2 of the Local Plan in light of the Asher Lane decision, Rushcliffe Borough Council is failing to set out a collective vision for Ruddington which is supported by local residents. RAG therefore considers that the Green Belt allocations in Part 2 of the Plan should be amended in light of the Asher Lane appeal decision and the number of houses allocated reduced by at least 175 to prevent new house building in the village resulting in significant adverse impacts on the village centre.

Yours sincerely

Mike Ader
Chairman, Ruddington Action Group
Good Morning,

Can you please consider housing for older people when agreeing any planning applications?

At the moment there is a tremendous shortage of housing in Rushcliffe for the ageing population.

There should be provision for affordable sheltered accommodation, retirement complexes and bungalows and houses for residents to be able to downsize to, therefore releasing family houses onto the market.

Please consider this when asking developers to make plans in Rushcliffe for the future.

Yours sincerely
Comment

Consultee Ms Sam Agar (1163126)
Event Name Local Plan Part 2 (Publication Draft)
Comment by Ms Sam Agar (1163126)
Comment ID 8
Response Date 19/05/18 14:26
Status Submitted
Submission Type Web
Version 0.1

To which document does your response relate? Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version

Policy reference Policy 3: Housing Allocation – Land north of Rempstone, Road, East Leake

Site reference Policy 3: Housing Allocation – Land north of Rempstone, Road, East Leake

Policies Map Yes

Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2 to be legally compliant? No

Please give reasons for your answer, where applicable. You may also use this box if you wish to make representations on one of the Local Plan Part 2’s supporting documents (e.g. Sustainability Appraisal, Habitat Regulations Assessment or Equalities Impact Assessment).

It states that in East leake we are only meant to have 400 more houses alocated but we have 1000 in the application stage

What makes a Local Plan “sound”?

1. Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared in a way that meets the need for housing and other development, including infrastructure and business development.
. Justified – the plan should be based on evidence, and be the most appropriate strategy for the district when considered against other reasonable alternatives.
. Effective – the plan should be deliverable; the housing and other development should be capable of being carried out.
. Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable sustainable development and be consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2 to be sound? No

Do you consider this to be because it is NOT: (please tick all that apply)
. Justified
. Effective
. Consistent with national policy

Please give reasons for your answer, where applicable. You may also use this box if you wish to make representations on one of the Local Plan Part 2’s supporting documents (e.g. Sustainability Appraisal, Habitat Regulations Assessment or Equalities Impact Assessment).

These plans are simply redicoulois, the sire is too far away from the schools to encourage people to walk/bike into the village for school etc therefore people will drive most of the time, increasing the traffic load that is already busting also school are full to bursting, there is y’all of primary school help, we’ll is hing to happen when those extra children go to high school after primary school, doctors are deemed useless as it take 3 weeks to see/hear someone

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing sessions of the Public Examination? Please note: if you select NO, your representation(s) will still be considered by the independent Planning Inspector by way of written representations.

Yes, I wish to appear at the examination

Please indicate if you wish to be notified that: (please tick all that apply)
. The recommendations of the Planning Inspector appointed to carry out the independent examination have been published.
. The Local Plan Part 2 has been adopted
RE: PROPOSAL FOR 80 HOUSES
ON LAND ADJ. TO PARK LANE
AND ROAD A 6006. SUTTON, BON.

Sirs.

I wish to register my objection to the above proposal in the strongest of terms.

Viz.

1. Access to the site would be dangerous due to the bend in the road.
2. If this site was built on it would virtually join Sutton Bonnington to Normanton-on-Sowe - NOT wanted.
3. Extra pressure would be caused to services e.g. Sewers, Drainage, Schools and Doctors already overstretched.

Yours,
Good Evening

I hereby state my representation against the proposed local plan part 2 proposal for housing for Sutton Bonington, adjacent to the A6006. I object to the policy 10 housing - land north of Park Lane, and my objection relates to pages 55-57 of the plan. Reason for objection is that the proposal is just not a sound plan on various levels - of which I have noted below.

Firstly the initial proposal was for 140 houses, across the field - now the proposal is for 80 houses but just over half the field, which suggests once building gets started, a second phase of housing will suddenly be needed, to increase the coverage of the whole field and the capacity of housing to the original 140 or even more.

80 houses would only add approx 0.6% to the current Rushcliffe target, sure this is not a significant enough amount to have any impact on that, whilst having a devastating impact on the village. There are currently only 800 houses in the village adding such a development will initially increase the houses by 10% or more if a second phase goes ahead, possibly up to 20% more houses, This WILL affect services and accessibility.

On the list of the local plan, there are more suitable, larger settlements where such a development wouldnt impact on the community as much, these would be Cotgrave, Bingham, Clifton or Gamston - even a combination of two larger villages would be able to support and sustain a development of this size.

Sutton Bonington and Normanton on Soar currently sit approximately 200m apart, so the proposed site currently acts as a strategic gap between the 2 villages and is also an important part of the countryside between them. Accepting the proposed development would essentially merge the two villages in to one settlement which cannot happen.

A major issue with the development would be the transport and access, if every household owned 1-2 cars (which is more than likely being situated in a village) you are adding an extra 160 (to potentially 300 cars) to village. As it stands traffic can be horrendous through the village and trying to access the A6006 during peak times is incredibly difficult. The village often ends up as a rat run for cars when roadworks or issues arise in the vicinity of the M1 or A453 areas.

The proposed location also represents poor access to the site itself whether that be from the busy A6006 or Park Lane, when motorists are often exceeding the speed limit on entering or leaving the village.

The small village schools of Normanton on Soar and Sutton Bonington would also be massive affected, 80 plus houses would add a minimum of 30+ pupils, if not more. The reality is Sutton Bonington school currently operates out of porta cabins as well as the main building, and there is currently no space to develop the school in terms of capacity. This would also have a knock on effect at the secondary school in East Leake which is already over populated. With Normanton school having a capacity of around 60 pupils, any extra intake of pupils would have a detrimental effect of the children's education. Not only would education be affected but their safety too as the A6006 is an extremely busy road, so crossing this road at peak times to attend school could have devastating effects.

Increased traffic with the DNRC or the East midlands gateway, could also cause a massive issue with the use of the A6006, safety and road conditons will be massively effected.
Another issue would be the serious flooding issues we have in the village, not only on the proposed field currently, but also throughout large sections of the village. If the field is built on, and the majority of the surface covered over with asphalt, driveways and houses there just wouldn't be enough drainage to deal with the amount of water currently that stands in the field and surrounding roads. Residents of Charnwood Fields and Charnwood Avenue whose house back on to the proposed site have all experienced flooding recently.

Kind Regards

Craig Allison

Resident of Sutton Bonington.
Comment

Consultee: mr kevin allsopp (1143945)
Event Name: Local Plan Part 2 (Publication Draft)
Comment by: mr kevin allsopp (1143945)
Comment ID: 13
Response Date: 04/06/18 15:46
Status: Submitted
Submission Type: Web
Version: 0.1

To which document does your response relate? Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version

Policy reference: Policy 6.1: Housing Allocation – Land west of Wilford Road, Ruddington
Site reference: Policy 6.1: Housing Allocation – Land west of Wilford Road, Ruddington

Policies Map: Yes

Please give reasons for your answer, where applicable. You may also use this box if you wish to make representations on one of the Local Plan Part 2’s supporting documents (e.g. Sustainability Appraisal, Habitat Regulations Assessment or Equalities Impact Assessment).

1 Rural view– The rural views and last remaining green fields on the edge of the village would be lost to this inappropriate development
2 Access and traffic– Increased traffic from additional housing would affect Wilford Road and other congested routes through the village
3 Flooding– The area has a history of flooding. There are concerns that development could increase the risk of flooding for nearby properties
4 Coalescence– The development of this Green Belt land would reduce the open space between the village and the City of Nottingham. This increases the risk of the two merging in the future
5 Wildlife and Nature– An important wildlife habitat would be lost
Do you consider this to be because it is NOT: . Positively Prepared
(please tick all that apply) . Justified

Please give reasons for your answer, where applicable. You may also use this box if you wish to make representations on one of the Local Plan Part 2’s supporting documents (e.g. Sustainability Appraisal, Habitat Regulations Assessment or Equalities Impact Assessment).

1 Rural view– The rural views and last remaining green fields on the edge of the village would be lost to this inappropriate development
2 Access and traffic– Increased traffic from additional housing would affect Wilford Road and other congested routes through the village
3 Flooding– The area has a history of flooding. There are concerns that development could increase the risk of flooding for nearby properties
4 Coalescence– The development of this Green Belt land would reduce the open space between the village and the City of Nottingham. This increases the risk of the two merging in the future
5 Wildlife and Nature– An important wildlife habitat would be lost

Do you consider that the Local Plan Part 2 complies with the Duty to Co-operate? No

Please give reasons for your answer, where applicable. You may also use this box if you wish to make representations on one of the Local Plan Part 2’s supporting documents (e.g. Sustainability Appraisal, Habitat Regulations Assessment or Equalities Impact Assessment).

1 Rural view– The rural views and last remaining green fields on the edge of the village would be lost to this inappropriate development
2 Access and traffic– Increased traffic from additional housing would affect Wilford Road and other congested routes through the village
3 Flooding– The area has a history of flooding. There are concerns that development could increase the risk of flooding for nearby properties
4 Coalescence– The development of this Green Belt land would reduce the open space between the village and the City of Nottingham. This increases the risk of the two merging in the future
5 Wildlife and Nature– An important wildlife habitat would be lost

Please indicate if you wish to be notified that:
(please tick all that apply)
Planning Policy
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rushcliffe Arena
Rugby Road
West BridgfORD
NG2 7YG

Dear Sir,

We find that the draft LAPP published by Rushcliffe Borough Council,

• is non-compliant in its duty to cooperate with the emerging Gotham Neighbourhood Plan and with existing and planned national policy

• is unsound as it has not followed existing and proposed national policy on use of smaller sites and housing numbers

• is unsound in that it is not effectively evaluated alternative sites

• is unsound in that it unnecessarily removes land from the green belt.

• is non-compliant in that nothing has been mentioned in the Plan of the proposed access to the GOT5a site which we understand is to come off Leake Road. This should be consulted upon before the land is allocated from the green belt.

National policy has indicated that Rushcliffe housing targets are 30% higher than they should be according to the formula set out in the 'Planning for the right homes in the right places' which sets the housing targets for Rushcliffe at 600 per year, i.e. 10,200. Also Rushcliffe's own Core Strategy states that housing allocations in villages like Gotham should be for local needs only.

The LAPP Policies Map for Gotham should be redrawn to ensure that GOT4 remains in the Green Belt, i.e. outside the new inset line. National policy for the Green Belt says that land should only be removed from the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances. The LAPP Policies Map shows GOT4 removed from the Green Belt without any exceptional circumstances.

Rushcliffe should have taken note of the Housing Policy and Green Network policies in the Gotham Neighbourhood Plan and set out their plan to accommodate these.

• The LAPP Policies Map for Gotham should be redrawn to include sites GOT1 and GOT3 within the inset boundary

• The LAPP Policies Map for Gotham should be redrawn to remove GOT5a and GOT4 from the inset boundary

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]

[Stamp]
Dear Sir,

I find that the draft LAPP published by Rushcliffe Borough Council,

• is non compliant in its duty to cooperate with the emerging Gotham Neighbourhood Plan and with existing and planned national policy

• is unsound as it has not followed existing and proposed national policy on use of smaller sites and housing numbers

• is unsound in that it is not effectively evaluated alternative sites

• is unsound in that it unnecessarily removes land from the green belt.

• is non compliant in that nothing has been mentioned in the Plan of the proposed access to the GOT5a site which we understand is to come off Leake Road. This should be consulted upon before the land is allocated from the green belt.

National policy has indicated that Rushcliffe housing targets are 30% higher than they should be according to the formula set out in the 'Planning for the right homes in the right places' which sets the housing targets for Rushcliffe at 600 per year, i.e. 10,200. Also Rushcliffe’s own Core Strategy states that housing allocations in villages like Gotham should be for local needs only.

The LAPP Policies Map for Gotham should be redrawn to ensure that GOT4 remains in the Green Belt, i.e. outside the new inset line. National policy for the Green Belt says that land should only be removed from the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances. The LAPP Policies Map shows GOT4 removed from the Green Belt without any exceptional circumstances.

Rushcliffe should have taken note of the Housing Policy and Green Network policies in the Gotham Neighbourhood Plan and set out their plan to accommodate these.

• The LAPP Policies Map for Gotham should be redrawn to include sites GOT1 and GOT3 within the inset boundary

• The LAPP Policies Map for Gotham should be redrawn to remove GOT5a and GOT4 from the inset boundary

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

John Anderson

Dear Sir / Madam,

My mother Mrs Pauline Butler lives at 94 Leake Road, Gotham and will be directly affected by this plan. I feel if this is to go ahead she needs compensation. Kerb dropping for off road parking. Suitable fencing and subsidence damage for large garden shed near her property. As you can understand she is very concerned about the prospect of this development as am I for the well being of my mother. Yours sincerely.

Mrs Kerrie Wynn O'Connor.
**Comment**
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**To which document does your response relate?**

Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version

**Policy reference**

Policy 6.1: Housing Allocation – Land west of Wilford Road, Ruddington

**Site reference**

Policy 6.1: Housing Allocation – Land west of Wilford Road, Ruddington

**What makes a Local Plan “sound”?**

- **Positively prepared** - the plan should be prepared in a way that meets the need for housing and other development, including infrastructure and business development.
- **Justified** – the plan should be based on evidence, and be the most appropriate strategy for the district when considered against other reasonable alternatives.
- **Effective** – the plan should be deliverable; the housing and other development should be capable of being carried out.
- **Consistent with national policy** – the plan should enable sustainable development and be consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

**Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2 to be sound?**

No

**Do you consider this to be because it is NOT:**

- Justified
- Consistent with national policy
The inclusion of RUD01 in the housing allocation is based on out of date information. On 23rd May the Planning Inspectorate granted planning permission for 175 houses on Asher Lane RUD07. The Planning Inspectorate disagreed with the RUD01 allocation stating "Although the Council has carried out a sequential test, its decision to prioritise RUD01 above the appeal site [RUD07] is in essence based on the latter’s highway constraints. National policy does not favour development on sites in Flood Zones (FZ) 2 and 3 where land in FZ 1 like the appeal site is available."

Having already acknowledged the highway constraints of RUD07, and having had that inappropriate development imposed by the planning inspectorate, to then include RUD01 would not be justified as it would further exacerbate the highway problems already acknowledged in the exclusion of RUD07. It cannot be considered the most appropriate strategy for the district to include RUD07 with its inherent traffic issues and RUD01 which is in a Flood Zone and not supported by the Planning Inspectorate and which will only add to the traffic volumes.

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan Part 2 legally compliant or sound, having regard to your previous responses. You will need to say why this change will make the Local Plan Part 2 legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you could put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Policy 6.1 should be removed from the Local Plan Part 2

In the publication version of the Local Plan Part 2 paragraph 3.69 states "The Core Strategy sets a target of a minimum of 250 new homes that need to be built on greenfield sites at Ruddington up to 2028. It is considered that Ruddington has scope to sustain around 350 dwellings in total adjacent to the village, based on the capacity of local services and the availability of suitable sites for development."

ie the plan itself acknowledges that local services could not cope with all the allocations in the plan in addition to the 175 dwellings at RUD07 Asher lane as this would take the number of new dwellings up to 525 - well above what the plan says Ruddington has scope for.

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing sessions of the Public Examination? Please note: if you select NO, your representation(s) will still be considered by the independent Planning Inspector by way of written representations.

No, I do not wish to participate at the hearing session at the examination. I would like my representation to be dealt with by written representation

Please indicate if you wish to be notified that: (please tick all that apply)

- The Local Plan Part 2 has been submitted for independent examination.
- The recommendations of the Planning Inspector appointed to carry out the independent examination have been published.
- The Local Plan Part 2 has been adopted
Dear Sir,

I have found that the draft LAPP published by Rushcliffe Borough Council,

- is non compliant in its duty to cooperate with the emerging Gotham Neighbourhood Plan and with existing and planned national policy
- is unsound as it has not followed existing and proposed national policy on use of smaller sites and housing numbers
- is unsound in that it is not effectively evaluated alternative sites
- is unsound in that it unnecessarily removes land from the green belt.
- is non compliant in that nothing has been mentioned in the Plan of the proposed access to the GOT5a site which we understand is to come off Leake Road. This should be consulted upon before the land is allocated from the green belt.

National policy has indicated that Rushcliffe housing targets are 30% higher than they should be according to the formula set out in the 'Planning for the right homes in the right places' which sets the housing targets for Rushcliffe at 600 per year, i.e. 10,200. Also Rushcliffe's own Core Strategy states that housing allocations in villages like Gotham should be for local needs only.

The LAPP Policies Map for Gotham should be redrawn to ensure that GOT4 remains in the Green Belt, i.e. outside the new inset line. National policy for the Green Belt says that land should only be removed from the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances. The LAPP Policies Map shows GOT4 removed from the Green Belt without any exceptional circumstances.

Rushcliffe should have taken note of the Housing Policy and Green Network policies in the Gotham Neighbourhood Plan and set out their plan to accommodate these.

- The LAPP Policies Map for Gotham should be redrawn to include sites GOT1 and GOT3 within the inset boundary
- The LAPP Policies Map for Gotham should be redrawn to remove GOT5a and GOT4 from the inset boundary

Yours sincerely

Judith Arris
From: Lottie Ashby
Sent: 26 June 2018 20:04
To: Localdevelopment
Subject: Local Plan Part 2 Representation from Resident

R.e. Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2 - site RUD01 (Land west of Wilford Road)

FAO Richard Mapleton - Planning Policy Manager
FAO The Planning Inspector

Dear Sir/Madam

I have recently received a letter from you regarding Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2. Here are my comments to be submitted to the Planning Inspector.

I write to strongly object to the proposed development on site RUD01 for the following reasons:

The site was originally rejected by the parish council and only eventually selected because of a sequential test, rather than because it had any clear merit as a site for new housing. It was selected by default at a time when the options were already limited and I believe that had all potential sites had been compared at the same time then it never would have been selected at all.

Any building on RUD01 would be inappropriate as it would spoil the rural views. I think the area is green belt for a good reason - it must stay open as it is to maintain the village character. These are the last remaining green fields on the edge of the village.

Access and traffic - Increased traffic from additional housing would affect Wilford Road and other congested routes through the village.

The RUD01 area has a history of flooding. I am very concerned that any development on it would increase the risk of flooding to properties nearby.

Coalescence – The development of this Green Belt land would reduce the open space between the village and the City of Nottingham. This increases the risk of the two merging in the future.

Wildlife and Nature – An important wildlife habitat would be lost.

There is now approval for 175 new homes on Asher Lane - these surely must count towards the quota for Ruddington and therefore site RUD01 should be removed from consideration. The governments own Planning Inspectorate had these comments in his recent report about the land at Asher Lane:

“Whilst RUD01 is also urban fringe it is, in my judgement, far more prominent than the appeal site especially when viewed approaching the village on the south sloping Wilford Road next to the golf club. Its northern boundary is only a field ditch and this offers no screening to any new development, albeit that landscaping could be provided. Nonetheless, this boundary cannot realistically be termed strong or defensible. The green gap between West Bridgford and Ruddington is relatively narrow and development at RUD01 would narrow it even more. The majority of RUD01 is also in Flood Zone 2. Although the Council has carried out a sequential test22 its decision to prioritise RUD01 above the appeal site is in essence based on the latter’s highway constraints. National policy does not favour development on sites in Flood Zones (FZ) 2 and 3 where land in FZ 1 like the appeal site is available.”

I hope the council and the Planning Inspectorate will take these objections seriously and remove site RUD01 from consideration.
Thank you
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2. –
3.
4.
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### Policies Map

### Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2 to be legally compliant?
Yes

### What makes a Local Plan “sound”?

- **Positively prepared** - the plan should be prepared in a way that meets the need for housing and other development, including infrastructure and business development.
- **Justified** – the plan should be based on evidence, and be the most appropriate strategy for the district when considered against other reasonable alternatives.
- **Effective** – the plan should be deliverable; the housing and other development should be capable of being carried out.
Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable sustainable development and be consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2 to be sound?  No

Do you consider this to be because it is NOT: Positively Prepared
(please tick all that apply) Justified

Please give reasons for your answer, where applicable. You may also use this box if you wish to make representations on one of the Local Plan Part 2’s supporting documents (e.g. Sustainability Appraisal, Habitat Regulations Assessment or Equalities Impact Assessment).

The site was originally rejected by the parish council and only eventually selected because of a sequential test, rather than because it had any clear merit as a site for new housing. It was selected by default at a time when the options were already limited and I believe that had all potential sites had been compared at the same time then it never would have been selected at all.

Any building on RUD01 would be inappropriate as it would spoil the rural views. I think the area is green belt for a good reason - it must stay open as it is to maintain the village character. These are the last remaining green fields on the edge of the village.

Access and traffic - Increased traffic from additional housing would affect Wilford Road and other congested routes through the village.

The RUD01 area has a history of flooding. I am very concerned that any development on it would increase the risk of flooding to properties nearby.

Coalescence – The development of this Green Belt land would reduce the open space between the village and the City of Nottingham. This increases the risk of the two merging in the future.

Wildlife and Nature – An important wildlife habitat would be lost.

There is now approval for 175 new homes on Asher Lane - these will count towards the quota for Ruddington and therefore site RUD01 should be removed from consideration. The government’s own Planning Inspectorate had these comments in his recent report about the land at Asher Lane: “Whilst RUD01 is also urban fringe it is, in my judgement, far more prominent than the appeal site especially when viewed approaching the village on the south sloping Wilford Road next to the golf club. Its northern boundary is only a field ditch and this offers no screening to any new development, albeit that landscaping could be provided. Nonetheless, this boundary cannot realistically be termed strong or defensible. The green gap between West Bridgford and Ruddington is relatively narrow and development at RUD01 would narrow it even more. The majority of RUD01 is also in Flood Zone 2. Although the Council has carried out a sequential test its decision to prioritise RUD01 above the appeal site is in essence based on the latter’s highway constraints. National policy does not favour development on sites in Flood Zones (FZ) 2 and 3 where land in FZ 1 like the appeal site is available.”

I hope the council and the Planning Inspectorate will take these objections seriously and remove site RUD01 from consideration.

Do you consider that the Local Plan Part 2 complies with the Duty to Co-operate?  Yes

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing sessions of the Public Examination? Please note: if you select NO, your representation(s) will still be considered by the independent Planning Inspector by way of written representations.

No, I do not wish to participate at the hearing session at the examination. I would like my representation to be dealt with by written representation.
Please indicate if you wish to be notified that:
(please tick all that apply)

. The Local Plan Part 2 has been submitted for independent examination.
. The recommendations of the Planning Inspector appointed to carry out the independent examination have been published.
. The Local Plan Part 2 has been adopted