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To which document does your response relate? Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version
Page number: 16,19,20
Paragraph number: 2.0, 3.3, 3.10
Policy reference: Policy 1: Development Requirements
Site reference: Please select an option
Policies Map: No

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?   Yes

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

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

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.

Aslockton Parish Council (APC) find the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies basically sound, legally compliant and complying with the duty to co-operate. We agree with its policies, however we wish for clarification and clearer definitions on certain parts.

APC question why there is not a condition for affordable housing in any development to be "pepper potted" and not concentrated in one area - a policy that has been adopted by many councils in line with recent Government discussions.

APC have repeatedly raised the question of what is the definition of "small scale infill" and "local need".

On a recent planning committee decision for 9 houses at Aslockton (ref 17/02871/OUT) RBC considered a development of 9 dwellings "small" as the village had about 400 dwellings and a population of 885. So if "small" is a percentage of the village size, shouldn't this be defined?

Similarly it was considered infill despite being a gap of 125 metres, because it was located between two areas of residential development of one depth extending 200m one side, and 500m the other. Again why can't this be a defined criteria? Leaving definitions vague just leads to different interpretations by developers, planning officers and objectors.

Local need - it seems this is most often referred to in relation to the need for affordable housing, applying the need across the borough, but when talking about small infill developments in other villages, these wouldn't qualify for affordable housing. So in this situation what is local need?? Referring to the above planning decision there was no local need, as 75 houses were currently being built and not selling, but this was not addressed in the appraisal by RBC despite being raised by the many objectors.

Additional Comments

Please add any supporting files (if applicable)

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 outline why you consider this to be necessary. Please note: the Planning Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing session of the examination.

Having clearer definitions will hopefully prevent time wasting of developers and objectors fighting their corners because of wooly definitions which are left open to interpretation. Policy should be clear and concise and not open to subjectivity.

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

Page number: 14
Paragraph number: 1.14
Policy reference: Please select an option
Site reference: Please select an option
Policies Map: No

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? Yes

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

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

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.

Aslockton Parish Council (APC) find the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies basically sound, legally compliant and complying with the duty to co-operate. We agree with it's policies.

However we have concerns with reference to the monitoring quote: "The Local Plan Monitoring Report will help identify where policies need to be amended or replaced"

APC ask whether any change to Policy after adoption of the Local Plan Part 2 has to be subjected to public examination and approval by a Planning Inspector.

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 outline why you consider this to be necessary. Please note: the Planning Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing session of the examination.

Aslockton Parish Council question the right to change the adopted Plan without full consultation and approval.

Please indicate if you wish to be notified that: (please tick all that apply)
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To which document does your response relate? Other supporting document

If you answered 'other supporting document' please state which document you refer to Sustainability Appraisal

Page number 76 to 79
Policy reference Please select an option
Site reference Please select an option

Policies Map No

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? Yes

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

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

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.

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

Aslockton Parish Council (APC) can only presume Aslockton was classified as a Third Tier village based either on:

1) It's population being falsely portrayed as being approximately doubled by the inclusion of the population of the prison within it's parish - the true residential population at 2011 being only 885. The inmates at the Prison also clouded the employment figures for Aslockton, as those that were employed in the workshops were included as employees who walked to work. However population alone should not be an indication of sustainability. Larger villages with a few facilities but infrequent public transport services are surely less sustainable than small villages with no facilities other than a frequent public transport service to a key settlement or the city of Nottingham.

2) Or it's close proximity to the adjacent village of Whatton, the two villages being assessed collectively. This would be surprising as recent planning applications have specified the importance of avoidance coalescence of the two villages, a point also made in the Greater Nottingham Sustainable Locations for Growth (2010) Ref 04, quoting “the constraints to growth, including the need to avoid coalescence of Aslockton with Whatton.”

Aslockton does have a railway station and a post office but does not have the basic level of facilities to be ranked as Third Tier. The small paper shop closed in June 2018, so Aslockton now has no retail, and never has had health facilities. With a public transport service that at best is hourly, at worst minimal in the evening and nothing on Sunday, APC wish to see Aslockton's sustainability ranking reviewed. If this is not possible we wish the reduced status, with no retail facilities, to be noted at the public examination. It should also be noted that the primary school (Archbishop Cranmer) now has 178 pupils, increased from 147 in April 2017, and this with only 15 of the 74 new houses being built at Abbey Lane, Aslockton. We expect the full capacity of 210 pupils to be reached within the year with the completion of local developments.

APC would also like to comment on some specific points on the Sustainability appraisal:

Page 76, Para 6.72, 6.76

With the closure of Aslockton's small shop, and therefore with no retail facilities, any growth cannot support something not there so should the social score be 0, not green +

Page 78 to 79 , Available site options - Aslockton. Paras 6.79 to 6.82

APC feel there is an over simplification with the colour coding that can lead to misleading interpretation. For example site WHA01 has flooding as a red negative, but on the planning application the area of flooding was for recreational use only - the part for houses was zone 1. Also both Whatton sites have a red negative for Transport - different to Aslockton sites of amber negative but both villages are on the same bus route and the railway station is at the edge of both villages. Shouldn't both villages have the same rating?
APC may have issues with the methodology but do support conclusions of the Sustainability Appraisal.

As a final point APC note, and agree, with the findings on the Background Paper - Land and Policies Identification of Additional Settlements. Having repeatedly questioned the limitations of the Accessible Settlements Study for Greater Nottingham report of 2010, we are pleased that a further assessment of existing community services and access to these services elsewhere by non motorised or public transport in 2017, resulted in Aslockton failing at the first hurdle - point 5 concluding Cropwell Bishop, East Bridgford, Gotham, Sutton Bonington and Tollerton may be able to accommodate some additional development.

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.

Please outline why you consider this to be necessary. Please note: the Planning Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the hearing session of the examination.

With the recent closure of our small village shop, Aslockton now has no retail facilities and this fully supports the decision of RBC finding Aslockton unsustainable.

Please indicate if you wish to be notified that:
(please tick all that apply)
RUSHCLIFFE LOCAL PLAN PART 2: LAND AND PLANNING POLICIES

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM ASLOCKTON PARISH COUNCIL

Aslockton Parish Council (APC) find the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies basically sound, legally compliant and complying with the duty to co-operate. We agree with it's policies, however we wish for clarification and clearer definitions which have been submitted on the survey form under specified policy references.

For the purpose of comment we would also like to add the following:

Page 20, Policy 1 para 3.8

APC understood from the consultation on Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies Further Options that Bingham could have expanded the existing housing allocation to the north of the town, but this wouldn't help the immediate shortfall.

APC wish to stress the frustration when housing is allocated to villages due to the failure of delivering housing targets on 5 out of the 6 larger sites allocated in the Core Strategy. It seems to be against the fundamental national principles of reducing the need to travel by car.

Page 20, Policy 1, para 3.9 and page 145, Glossary para, Rural Area

This Plan allocates land for new housing at Cropwell Bishop, East Bridgford, Gotham and Sutton Bonington as these villages have a basic level of facilities. Referred to as "medium" sized villages in supporting documents, but according to this Plan's Glossary they are, by population, small:

"Rural areas include small rural settlements. These are defined as villages/parishes with a population of 3000 or less and are specifically classified under Section 17 of the Housing Act"

All 5 "other" villages considered have populations of under 2000 and are therefore "small" by your definition.

Page 60, Policy 11, para3.115

APC wish to comment on the significant adverse effect upon the amenity of nearby residents during construction of a development. With first hand experience of the dust and noise of 75 houses currently under construction, the Construction Method Statement has NOT been satisfactory in protecting the nearby properties from dust, traffic and noise. In the Reserved Matters Application there was a condition included in the permission that a Construction Method Statement covering dust mitigation, noise and traffic etc. should be submitted and agreed in writing by Rushcliffe before the development commenced. This did not happen and as a result neighbouring residents suffered. It was weeks before the CMS was submitted. Surely conditions including in permissions are for a purpose and they should be adhered to to protect existing residents.

Pages 88 and 89, Policy 22, para 6.10

APC are in full agreement with Policy 22 - Development Within The Countryside, but find it confusing to find Bingham listed with the small rural villages, as settlements outside the green belt. This surely implies that policy 22 is applicable to Bingham in the same way as the small villages. As a key settlement outside the green belt, allocated as a strategic location under the Core Strategy, should Bingham be included on the list, or at least marked as a key settlement?
Adding if do form:

Having clearer definitions will hopefully prevent time wasting of developers and objectors fighting their corners because of wooly definitions which are left open to interpretation.