From: Sheila <>
Sent: 08 June 2018 17:31
To: Localdevelopment
Subject: Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2

FAO Richard Mapletoft Planning Policy Manager

I would like to voice my concern regarding the housing development for Radcliffe on Trent

Thursday June 07 2018 at 09.45 I tried to go into Radcliffe in my car for a loaf of bread

I couldn’t get out of Cliff Drive onto Shelford Road because of the volume of traffic coming into the village from Newton/ East Bridgford direction Eventually this was achieved but then I could not find a single parking space in any of the car parks

This happens on a regular occurrence so it made me decide to inform you and ask how on earth are we going to sustain all theses hundreds of new homes that you are proposing for Radcliffe. Not even considering the bottleneck on the A52 through Radcliffe, schools, doctors, dentists, police etc
RUSHCLIFFE LOCAL PLAN PART 2
COMMENTS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE PLANNING INSPECTOR.

I am a resident of Aslockton and support the Borough’s proposed policy that there should be no further development in Aslockton further than the 74 houses currently under construction.

However I wish to comment on the Borough`s draft “sustainability appraisal report” where it concerns Aslockton.

I strongly object to Aslockton being placed in the group of “third tier settlements” with villages, (small towns) who have much larger populations and amenities than our small rural village.

In this draft plan Aslockton is a village in its’ own right i.e. not Aslockton with? (any other village) just Aslockton. It is a separate entity with its’ own Parish Council and should and must be considered as such.

Thanks to a mistake being made in the “tribal report” some years ago when the inmates of HMP Whatton were included in the population count for Aslockton the Borough have insisted that Aslockton is a “medium sized settlement”. This is obviously not the case as the 900+ inmates of HMP Whatton are transient, play no part in the community and are entirely separated from the village for obvious reasons. The Borough have refused to rectify this despite numerous representations and it has proved detrimental to Aslockton at the many planning applications submitted recently affecting our village.

Aslockton is a SMALL village with a population of under 1000, no shop, no health centre and a poor transport system which fails to meet the needs of most commuters.
We have a post office, but only because it houses the local sorting office. We have one pub, a church hall and shared playing field. We have an oversubscribed pre-school, a primary school with limited spaces available. The
local secondary schools are oversubscribed meaning that some children are now having to travel to Radcliffe on Trent or beyond. It is totally wrong that Aslockton should be in a group with much larger settlements which all have much better amenities. All these other settlements have either their own, or very easy access to health centres, dentists, leisure centres, cafes, restaurants, large shops and transport links. Aslockton residents have to limit their excursions to Bingham for shopping, the doctors or catching the bus to Nottingham to the mornings as there is no bus service back to the village during the afternoon. There is no bus or train service on Sundays and the services end too early in the evening to make it possible to use either service to undertake any journey for leisure purposes such as a theatre trip.

It is totally incongruous that in the main body of the draft for local plan part 2 the Borough does not consider that Aslockton is sustainable for further development then goes on to put Aslockton in the third tier group all of which will come under consideration for development when the Borough cannot meet its` housing needs.

Aslockton is still a small rural community, it has taken its` share of development to help meet the Boroughs` housing shortfall by the development of land for 74 houses. Two inspectors have refused, on appeal, applications for a further 50 and 70+ houses ruling that Aslockton is unsustainable.

The Borough should remove Aslockton from the group of “third tier settlements” and should at the earliest opportunity, rectify their mistake in qualifying Aslockton as a “medium sized” village which it is patently obviously not.

Mrs. F.J. Barker
13. 6. 2018,
Planning Policy
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rushcliffe Arena
Rugby Road
West Bridgford
NG2 7YG

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]

Jan Barnes
Dear Sir,

I/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]

Stephen Barnes
Richard Mapleton Esq.,
Planning Policy Manager,
Rushcliffe Borough Council,
Rushcliffe Arena,
Rugby Road,
West Bridgford,
Nottingham, NG2 7YG

25 June 2018

Dear Mr. Mapleton,

RUSHCLIFFE LOCAL PLAN, PART Z

We wish to continue our strong objection to the above plan, in particular to RUD05 for 50 houses at the old Eco-Plant site on Flawforth Lane, Ruddington. Our main objections are:

1. Impact of increased traffic flow on Flawforth Lane from the Wheatcroft Island/Sharpe's Hill development, now taking place, including the increased traffic flow resulting from RUD05.
2. Inadequacy of Flawforth Lane to act as a “relief road” under the section of A52 between Wheatcroft Island and the Nottingham Knight Island is closed either for maintenance or accidents (which is fairly often).
3. Flawforth Lane appears to be the main link road (short cut) between the A52, A60, A453 trunk roads and ultimately the M1, via Castle Donington Power Station.
4. Potential hazard to express of RUD05 traffic onto Flawforth Lane.

Please find attached copies of our two letters dated 22 February 2016 and 16 November 2017 that we sent to you giving our objections in more detail and we ask that these also form part of our present objection.

We trust that you will be mindful of our concerns and objections in deciding the Borough’s final housing plans for Ruddington.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

AD & Mr. GMBARTLETT
Dear Sir,

RUDDINGTON LOCAL PLAN PART 2: REFERRED HOUSING SITES CONSULTATION

In support of our objections to Rushcliffe Borough Council’s (RBC) plans for an additional 410 new houses on Green Belt Land in Ruddington, as contained in the attached letter, we wish to highlight certain aspects of our joint objection as follows;

In the Borough’s apparent haste to comply with the Government’s seemingly ever-changing new housing requirements, we are of the opinion that you are not giving due cognisance to the peripheral planning issues such as medical facilities, shops, schools, roads and other services. In particular the road infrastructure in and around the village is in-adequate for the amount of internal and through traffic that we are presently encountering.

For instance Flawforth Lane, which is now becoming the main link road between the A52 at the Wheatcroft Island and the village; including the main A60 (Nottingham – Loughborough) section and the short cut through Ruddington via Clifton onto the main A453 towards the M1, Castle-Donington Airport and the new Parkway railway Station at Ratcliffe-on-Sour. Additionally, when the section of the A52 between the Wheatcroft and Nottingham Knight Islands is closed, for an accident (s) or maintenance, which is becoming more frequent, Flawforth Lane becomes the ‘Relief Road’ for all traffic, which turns into a ‘nightmare’ scenario for both existing residents living on the Lane and surrounding area. We feel that this fact is a most deplorable situation we are faced with, bearing in mind that Flawforth Lane is essentially, an old winding 1900’s style (cart track), with an acute 90deg. bend at Flawforth Farm and with a National speed limit of 60mph for single carriageway’s. This Lane also has a present weight limit of 7.5T that is regularly flouted; together with the speed restriction and these aspects are one of the reasons why we have so many incidents/accidents occurring at its junction with the A60 on Loughborough Road.

We have written to RBC on a number of other occasions with respect to the impact of the increased traffic flow from the Wheatcroft Island/Sharpes Hill/Wood development and we enclose our letter to RBC in this regard dated 22 February 2016. One further point regarding egress from plot RUD 5 onto Flawforth Lane, it would appear that the access to the proposed housing site would be at right angles to the Lane, near to the present entry to ‘Eco-Plants’ which, is sited very close to a sharp bend
from Wheatcroft Island direction. We feel this is potentially hazardous that will result in many accidents, due to the fast speeds that some vehicles negotiate this section of narrow and winding road.

We do appreciate, as mentioned in our previous letter of the 22 February 2016, that the road infrastructure comes within the control of Nottinghamshire County Council’s Roads and Transport Department but, in conclusion, we are in no doubt that the Borough is aware of its obligations to other interested parties, under current legislation; included within the Town and Country Planning Acts, Statutes and other associated Statutory Instruments.

Would you please be mindful of our thoughts and concerns when you are deliberating the Borough’s final plans for Ruddington and, as you can see, we have appended a copy of this letter and attachments to Mr Kenneth Clark MP for information?

Copy to Mr Kenneth Clark MP, House of Commons, Westminster

\[Signature\]
Dear Sirs,

RUDDINGTON DEVELOPMENT CONSULTATION 2016

Further to our Consultation Form posted to you a few days ago, we have a number of associated comments to make on your proposals that may impact on RUD 5 (South of Flawforth Lane) site. Our major concern is centred around increased traffic flow on Flawforth Lane as a direct result of the "Sharpes Hill/Wood" development, situated adjacent to Wheatcroft Island. In our opinion, any further development i.e. RUD 5, however small, would be unfair to local residents on Flawforth Lane/Avenue area who are already inconvenienced by present (and future) traffic congestion.

We also feel sure that you are aware of the weight limit for vehicles using the lane, namely 7.5T. Except for Access, and during the construction period and after, an increasing number of larger vehicles will use this link road, in addition to those who already flaunt this traffic restriction. We have already pointed out in our Consultation Form that Flawforth Lane is originally an "Old Cart Track" that has been upgraded to a narrow winding single-carriageway lane with a UK National Speed Limit of 60mph. We do realise that responsibility for roads comes within Nottinghamshire County Council’s Transport Department remit but, nevertheless, we respectfully suggest that Rushcliffe Borough Council has a moral responsibility and "Duty of Care" to existing residents, when planning new housing developments. The junction of Flawforth Lane and Loughborough Road at the traffic lights is particularly congested at peak times and there are numerous incidents and accidents on this stretch of road, as you will obviously be aware of.

A further point we would like to bring to your attention to is concerning plot RUD 5 and the large trees in the south west of the plot, adjacent to the rear of the houses in Flawforth Avenue. We believe that they could be subject to a Tree Preservation Order and, as such, could limit the layout of any future housing development.

We would like to thank you for taking the time and trouble to invite resident’s observations and comments to the Ruddington Development proposals and look forward to receiving any further relevant information and comments to this scheme, as they arise.

Yours faithfully

A D and Mrs G M Bartlett
I agree completely with the Borough Councils stand on further development in Aslockton
We already have a large development taking place which is totally out of character with the rest of the village and was passed in my opinion on a political decision from national government.
The houses on this development are not what is wanted in the area, being 3 & 4 bedroom, unsuitable for first time buyers or for pensioners wishing to downsize to single storey accommodation
The local services are inadequate:-
   The bus service at long intervals
   Whilst we have a station, the number of trains stopping is very small
   In other words, if you live in Aslockton you must have least one and possibly two cars
   The village shop has now closed, leaving the post office open, as the premises are also used for sorting mail for the surrounding villages, the continuation of this arrangement would seem to be rather tenuous
   The nearest Doctors surgeries are in Bingham 2.1/2 miles and East Bridgford 6 Miles
   We are assured that the school could cope with additional pupils, but as a large number of pupils are brought in and collected every day by car, this would only add to the confusion on Abbey Lane at these times
   There is no work available in the immediate area, meaning any new residents must travel by car, due to the inadequacy of public transport

David Bastable
Dear Sirs,

I wish to support the Rushcliffe Plan. Aslockton is a village and does not have sufficient facilities for huge developments. The roads are only tarmac on old farm roads and most of those surrounding the villages are single track. Although there is a station, it has an very infrequent service - Trains often don't stop! The small shop attached to the Aslockton sorting office has closed indefinitely, The doctors surgeries are at either Bingham, Bottesford or East Bridgford The bus service is I believe hourly but not necessarily directly to Bingham and has been stopped due to the difficulty of making it pay on at least two occasions. Although we are about 1 to 2 miles from Bingham once you leave the A52 there is no footpath and no street lighting so walking is difficult. Many of the sites that have recently been considered for building are heavily waterlogged and on the flood plain. Builders may be able to build houses that are safe from flooding but they rarely consider the effect that all the concrete and gravel are having on the safety of nearby housing. The recent proposals that have been refused were not for the type of housing that is required in the village. ie two bed affordable homes and bungalows that would be welcome for pensioners and those wishing to downsize.

Yours faithfully

Mrs Gill Bastable
Comment

Consultee: Mr Craig Baum (969011)
Event Name: Local Plan Part 2 (Publication Draft)
Comment by: Mr Craig Baum (969011)
Comment ID: 4
Response Date: 16/05/18 18:28
Status: Submitted
Submission Type: Web
Version: 0.1

To which document does your response relate? Local Plan Part 2 Policies Map

Policy reference: Please select an option

Policies Map: Yes

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) . Justified . Effective

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

Please indicate if you wish to be notified that: (please tick all that apply) . The Local Plan Part 2 has been adopted
25th June 2018

Planning Policy
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road,
West Bridgford,
Nottingham NG2 7YG

Dear Sirs

We wish to refer to your recent addition of Hillside Farm (Key 13) to the list of proposed sites for additional homes in Keyworth.

We totally object to this land being included for consultation as this is completely against the wishes of the general population of Keyworth and we feel you should be respecting their views as listed in the Neighbourhood Plan and agreed in the overwhelming vote at the recent election.

The area to the South of Bunny Lane is now very unsuitable for housing (as legally agreed many years ago) mainly due to poor and unsafe access for vehicles (domestic and emergency) to Bunny Lane. In addition there has recently been erected a massive agricultural barn which will come with its own share of associated waste and smells.

Prospective buyers would also be likely to resist buying homes so close to the sewage plant.

We strongly urge you to delete this additional area (Hillside Farm Key13) from your proposed plans.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

[Stamp: Rushcliffe Borough Council Business Support Unit, RECEIVED 27 JUN 2018]
Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies Publication Version

Representation Form

Please return by 5pm on Thursday 28 June 2018 to:
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road
Nottingham
NG2 7YG

27 JUN 2018

This form has two parts:

Part A – Personal details
Copies sent to

Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate part B for each issue/representation you wish to make.

Please read the Representation Guidance Notes (available separately) and the Data Protection Notice (see below) before completing the form.

Part A (Please complete in full; in order for the inspector to consider your representations you must provide your name and postal address).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent’s Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>DR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>MATTHEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title (where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Part B (please use a separate Part B form for each representation)

Name/Organisation:

3a. To which document does your response relate? (please tick one)

Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version

Local Plan Part 2 Policies Map

Other supporting document please state which:

3b. To which part of the document does this representation relate? (complete all that apply)

Page no. 33134
Paragraph no.
Policy ref. 4.4
Site ref.

Policies Map 4.4

4. Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2:

4(1) Legally compliant Yes No

4(2) Sound Yes No

4(3) Compiles with the Duty to Co-operate Yes No

→ If you have selected No to Question 4(2), please continue to Question 5.
→ In all other circumstances, please go to Question 6.

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.

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable sustainable development and be consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

5. If you consider the Development Plan is UNSOUND, do you consider this to be because it is NOT: (please tick all that apply)

- Positively Prepared
- Justified
- Effective
- Consistent with national policy

6. Please give reasons for you answer to Questions 4(1), 4(2), 4(3) and 5, 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). You can attach additional information but please make sure it is securely attached and clearly referenced.

This is an excellent plan which includes the best sites for housing in Openshaw, especially south of Berry Lane - in particular 4.4 (Hillside Farm).

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan Part 2 legally compliant or sound, having regard to your responses to Questions 5 and 6. 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.

(If you are suggesting that the Local Plan Part 2 is legally compliant or sound please write "Not applicable").

N/A
3. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing sessions of the Public Examination? (please tick one box only)

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  

Yes, I wish to appear at the examination  

If you have selected No, your representation(s) will still be considered by the independent Planning Inspector by way of written representations.

9. If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions of Public Examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

(Please continue on a separate sheet if 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.

10. 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  

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Please return the completed form by no later than 5pm on Thursday 28 June 2018 to:

localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk; or

Planning Policy
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rushcliffe Arena
Rugby Road,
Nottingham
NG2 7YG

(Electronic copies of this form are available to download at www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy).

If you have any questions, please contact the Planning Policy team by telephone on 0115 981 9911, or email at localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk

---

**Data Protection Notice**

The personal information you provide will only be used by Rushcliffe Borough Council, the Data Controller, in accordance with General Data Protection Regulation 2016/Data Protection Act 2018 to undertake a statutory function (also known as a ‘public task’).

Your personal information will be shared with the Planning Inspectorate in connection with the above purpose.

Your personal data will be kept in accordance with the Council’s retention policy and schedule. Details of which can be found on the Council's website at http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/retention_schedule/.

Your data protection rights are not absolute and in most cases are subject to the Council demonstrating compliance with other statutory legislation, for further information see http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/privacy/.

Representations will be available to view on the Borough Council’s website, but any signatures, addresses, email addresses or telephone numbers will not be included. However, as copies of representations must be made available for public inspection, comments cannot be treated as confidential and will be available for inspection in full.

---

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies Publication Version

Representation Form

Please return by 5pm on Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.

This form has two parts

Part A – Personal details

Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate part B for each issue/representation you wish to make.

Please read the Representation Guidance Notes (available separately) and the Data Protection Notice (see below) before completing the form.

Part A (Please complete in full; in order for the Inspector to consider your representations you must provide your name and postal address).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Heading</th>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent’s Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Mr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>David</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Benson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (where relevant)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title (where relevant)</td>
<td>Self Employed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td>LE12 6WT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Part B (please use a separate Part B form for each representation)

Name/Organisation: 

---

3a. To which document does your response relate? (please tick one)

- Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version
- Local Plan Part 2 Policies Map
- Other supporting document please state which:

---

3b. To which part of the document does this representation relate? (complete all that apply)

Page no. 33-34
Paragraph no.
Policy ref. 44
Site ref.

---

4. Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2:

- 4(1) Legally compliant Yes [ ] No [ ]
- 4(2) Sound Yes [ ] No [ ]
- 4(3) Complies with the Duty to Co-operate Yes [ ] No [ ]

→ If you have selected No to Question 4(2), please continue to Question 5.
→ In all other circumstances, please go to Question 6.

---

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.

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable sustainable development and be consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

5. If you consider the Development Plan is UNSOUND, do you consider this to be because it is NOT: (please tick all that apply)

- Positively Prepared
- Justified
- Effective
- Consistent with national policy

6. Please give reasons for you answer to Questions 4(1), 4(2), 4(3) and 5, 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). You can attach additional information but please make sure it is securely attached and clearly referenced.

As I work in the village on a regular basis, I feel that the road infrastructure is best suited to have houses on the south side of the village and roads on the north side as always a lot buses trying to get access to the A606 and towards Nottingham. Site 4.4 is the most applicable site that I feel should be developed.

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan Part 2 legally compliant or sound, having regard to your responses to Questions 5 and 6. 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.

(If you are suggesting that the Local Plan Part 2 is legally compliant or sound please write "Not applicable").

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing sessions of the Public Examination? (please tick one box only)

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

Yes, I wish to appear at the examination

If you have selected No, your representation(s) will still be considered by the independent Planning Inspector by way of written representations.

9. If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions of Public Examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

(Please continue on a separate sheet if 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.

10. 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

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Please return the completed form by no later than 5pm on Thursday 28 June 2018 to:

localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk; or

Planning Policy
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rushcliffe Arena
Rugby Road,
Nottingham
NG2 7YG

(Electronic copies of this form are available to download at www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy).

If you have any questions, please contact the Planning Policy team by telephone on 0115 981 9911, or email at localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk

---

**Data Protection Notice**

The personal information you provide will only be used by Rushcliffe Borough Council, the Data Controller, in accordance with General Data Protection Regulation 2016/Data Protection Act 2018 to undertake a statutory function (also known as a ‘public task’)

Your personal information will be shared with the Planning Inspectorate in connection with the above purpose.

Your personal data will be kept in accordance with the Council’s retention policy and schedule. Details of which can be found on the Council’s website at http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/retention_schedule/

Your data protection rights are not absolute and in most cases are subject to the Council demonstrating compliance with other statutory legislation, for further information see http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/privacy/

Representations will be available to view on the Borough Council’s website, but any signatures, addresses, email addresses or telephone numbers will not be included. However, as copies of representations must be made available for public inspection, comments cannot be treated as confidential and will be available for inspection in full.

---

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies Publication Version

Representation Form

Please return by 5pm on Thursday 28 June 2018

This form has two parts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part A – Personal details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (where relevant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title (where relevant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please read the Representation Guidance Notes (available separately) and the Data Protection Notice (see below) before completing the form.

**Part A** (Please complete in full; in order for the Inspector to consider your representations you must provide your name and postal address).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent’s Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bentley</td>
<td>Consulting Engineer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Part B (please use a separate Part B form for each representation)

Name/Organisation: 

3a. To which document does your response relate? (please tick one)

- Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version
- Local Plan Part 2 Policies Map

Other supporting document please state which:

3b. To which part of the document does this representation relate? (complete all that apply)

Policy to Housing

Page no.: 55-57 Paragraph no. Policy ref.

Site ref. Policies Map

4. Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2:

- 4(1) Legally compliant Yes No
- 4(2) Sound Yes No
- 4(3) Complies with the Duty to Co-operate Yes No

If you have selected No to Question 4(2), please continue to Question 5.
In all other circumstances, please go to Question 6.

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.

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable sustainable development and be consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

5. If you consider the Development Plan is UNSOUND, do you consider this to be because it is NOT: (please tick all that apply)

- Positively Prepared [✓] Justified [ ]
- Effective [✓] Consistent with national policy [ ]

6. Please give reasons for you answer to Questions 4(1), 4(2), 4(3) and 5, 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). You can attach additional information but please make sure it is securely attached and clearly referenced.

I consider the plan to be unsound because

1) The increased housing will overload the local infrastructure e.g. roads/School capacity etc.

2) It will exacerbate the traffic problem within the village and accessing the already very busy A6006 road.

3) Additional traffic on the A6006 is already certain due to the development of ETA Freight Terminal etc.

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan Part 2 legally compliant or sound, having regard to your responses to Questions 5 and 6. 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.

(If you are suggesting that the Local Plan Part 2 is legally compliant or sound please write "Not applicable").

To make LP Part 2 compliant an additional expense must be forthcoming to improve the safety of traffic (additional) which is heading the village and accessing the A6006.

The geography of the village (i.e. long willow ridge bounded by floodland) on the one hand the railway will make ensuring safe access to the A6006 very expensive.

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing sessions of the Public Examination? (please tick one box only)

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.

Yes, I wish to appear at the examination

If you have selected No, your representation(s) will still be considered by the independent Planning Inspector by way of written representations.

9. If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions of Public Examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

(Please continue on a separate sheet if 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.

10. 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

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Date form completed: 12th June 2018

Please return the completed form by **no later than 5pm on Thursday 28 June 2018** to:

localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk; or

Planning Policy
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rushcliffe Arena
Rugby Road,
Nottingham
NG2 7YG

(Electronic copies of this form are available to download at www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy).

If you have any questions, please contact the Planning Policy team by telephone on 0115 981 9911, or email at localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk

---

**Data Protection Notice**

The personal information you provide will only be used by Rushcliffe Borough Council, the Data Controller, in accordance with General Data Protection Regulation 2016/Data Protection Act 2018 to undertake a statutory function (also known as a 'public task')

Your personal information will be shared with the Planning Inspectorate in connection with the above purpose.

Your personal data will be kept in accordance with the Council’s retention policy and schedule. Details of which can be found on the Council’s website at http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/retention_schedule/

Your data protection rights are not absolute and in most cases are subject to the Council demonstrating compliance with other statutory legislation, for further information see http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/privacy/

Representations will be available to view on the Borough Council’s website, but any signatures, addresses, email addresses or telephone numbers will not be included. However, as copies of representations must be made available for public inspection, comments cannot be treated as confidential and will be available for inspection in full.

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
**Comment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Mr Edward Berridge (1167264)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event Name</td>
<td>Local Plan Part 2 (Publication Draft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment by</td>
<td>Mr Edward Berridge (1167264)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Date</td>
<td>27/06/18 21:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission Type</td>
<td>Web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Files</td>
<td>West Bridgford Wire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Page number** 55-57

**Policy reference** Policy 10: Housing Allocation – Land north of Park Lane, Sutton Bonington

**Site reference** Policy 10: Housing Allocation – Land north of Park Lane, Sutton Bonington

**Policies Map** 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
. Effective

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).

I am firmly against this development for so many reasons:

1. Traffic. The junction where Sutton Bonington meets the A6006 is already extremely busy and at times dangerous. This will only be increased when the Defence centre at Stanford Hall and the completed developments at Junction 24/airport/rail hub, and if this development goes ahead will only add to the misery/danger.

2. Flooding. This proposed site North of Park Lane is always flooding and that is bearing in mind the volume of water the field soaks up. As a resident backing on to the field who’s property, as are all on the street, are on a rain water soak away in the back garden, I am extremely concerned that if this development goes ahead, and when this field is concreted/block paved the question has to asked where this water will then end up, in our gardens or houses?

3. Sewerage. This village has for quite some time had a major issue with blocked drains etc and obviously with another 80-160 properties this will only add to the misery of a sewerage system that just can't service the existing properties.

4. The School. I understand that the school is close to capacity. Surely a development of 80 houses with what would be a fair assumption of an average of 1 child per household would leave nearly all the children unable to go to the village school which would be an outrage. I would also like to draw your attention to a Rushcliffe Borough council report dated 12 September 2017 which I have found published on 'Westbridgfordwire.com', a couple of paragraphs which I will attach below. (Please see page 13 of 50, 4.60)

Sutton Bonington

4.60. The Local Education Authority has identified that, based on existing information, Sutton Bonington Primary School currently has no capacity or potential for expansion in order to accommodate housing growth. As it stands it is not therefore possible at present to recommend any proposed housing allocations at Sutton Bonington. It is proposed that this situation is kept under review and should primary school capacity for new pupils be subsequently identified it may then be appropriate for land to be allocated for housing development. There are currently two housing site options, as shown at Appendix 4.

This shows not even a year ago, and I quote, ' As it stands it is not possible at present to recommend any housing allocations at Sutton Bonington’, so it begs the question what has changed in such a short space of time? Has there suddenly been 80-100 places suddenly become vacant at the school. NO.

5. Pressure on village services. With only 1 shop and a post office and a doctors surgery that operates out of old 'make do' bungalow, can the village services really accommodate such a disproportionate number of new dwellings when it has real difficulties coping with existing numbers.

6. Greedy developers. There seems to be a common theme that occurs with these developments where the site proposal, in this case 80 dwellings, gets the go ahead, the developers start building and the when there part way through they suddenly do a re-calculation that make it unaffordable for
them to continue, due to the number of social housing included. The council then 'rolls over' and grants an alteration to the site to add more dwellings to get the developer back on board, so I believe the reality would be closer 160 dwellings rather than the proposed 80 which would only add more pain and concern to my points raised above.

7, Alternative sites. Whist I'm not against development in principle, the country needs more homes, it surely just cannot be developments being built on any open space with no thought given to the impact it has the local community and existing residents and also on the residents that may purchase a property on any new development. 80 houses will only contribute a tiny amount to the councils new housing needs but given Sutton Bonington is so small with such limited services I believe it will have such a catastrophic and negative impact on the village and its residents. Surely a development of this size would be much more suited to Keyworth or Ruddington where there public services and amenities are far greater and could easily accommodate a development of this size.

Please add any supporting files (if applicable)

West Bridgford Wire
West Bridgford Wire

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 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
Report of the Executive Manager - Communities

Cabinet Portfolio Holder Councillor R G Upton

1. Summary

1.1. The report establishes the level of new housing development that Local Plan Part 2 needs to plan for and recommends a number of proposed housing and mixed use site allocations at settlements across Rushcliffe in order to meet this need.

1.2. Following on from the earlier Issues and Options and Further Options consultations stages, it is proposed that the Borough Council identifies and publishes its preferred housing sites for the purposes of consultation. Following consultation, all feedback received will be considered before finalising the draft Local Plan Part 2.

2. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Cabinet

a) Supports the proposed housing and mixed use site allocations as recommended in the report;

b) Supports publication of the proposed housing and mixed use site allocations for the purposes of public consultation; and

c) Delegates authority to the Executive Manager – Communities, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Housing, to determine the form of consultation and the detail of the main consultation document.

3. Reasons for Recommendation

3.1. To enable preparation of the Local Plan Part 2 to progress further and to identify preferred housing and mixed use site allocations for the purpose of consultation prior to finalising the draft Plan.

4. Supporting Evidence

Rushcliffe Local Plan

4.1. The new Rushcliffe Local Plan will be formed by two parts. Part 1 is the Core Strategy which has already been completed and adopted by the Council. Part 2 is the Land and Planning Policies Plan which is currently being prepared.
4.2. The Core Strategy was adopted by the Council on 22 December 2014. This followed an examination of the Plan by a Planning Inspector during 2014, which included public hearings in July 2014.

4.3. The Plan sets out the broad planning policy direction for Rushcliffe and allocates strategic sites for development. It provides the strategic policies for key areas in relation to housing, the economy, the environment, transport, renewable energy and supporting infrastructure.

4.4. The Plan covers the period up to 2028 but identifies some proposals that would continue post 2028. It is not its purpose to identify non-strategic sites for development. This will be dealt with in the subsequent part 2 of the Local Plan and possibly new neighbourhood plans.

4.5. The Plan sets out that there will be a minimum of 13,150 homes between 2011 and 2028 (774 per annum), which will increase Rushcliffe’s housing stock from 47,350 in 2011 to 60,500 in 2028 (28% increase). Delivery of a minimum of 13,150 homes was planned in the Core Strategy as follows:

- Within existing settlements – around 2,900 homes
- South of Clifton – land is allocated for around 3,000 homes and around 20 hectares of employment development
- Melton Road, Edwalton – land is allocated for around 1,500 homes and up to 4 hectares of employment development
- East of Gamston/North of Tollerton – land is allocated for around 2,500 homes up to 2028, up to a further 1,500 homes post 2028 and 20 hectares of employment development
- Land north of Bingham – land is allocated for around 1,000 homes and 15.5 hectares of employment development.
- Former RAF Newton – allocated for around 550 homes and 6.5 hectares of employment development
- Former Cotgrave Colliery – allocated for around 470 homes and 4.5 hectares of employment development
- East Leake – a minimum target of 400 homes (adjacent to the village)
- Keyworth – a minimum target of 450 homes (adjacent to the village)
- Radcliffe on Trent – a minimum target of 400 homes (adjacent to the village)
- Ruddington – a minimum target of 250 homes (adjacent to the village)
4.6. The Local Plan Part 2 (Land and Planning Policies) is the second part of the Local Plan. It will identify non-strategic allocations and designations in the Borough. It will also set out more detailed policies (sitting below the Core Strategy’s more strategic level policies) for use in the determination of planning applications.

4.7. The latest anticipated timetable for preparation of the Local Plan Part 2 is:

- Issues and Options consultation – January 2016 (completed)
- Further Options consultation – February 2017 (completed)
- Preferred housing sites consultation – October 2017
- Publication of final draft Plan – February 2018
- Submission to Secretary of State for examination by an Inspector – April 2018
- Examination hearing – May 2018
- Adoption – August 2018

Issues and Options consultation

4.8. The Issues and Options consultation was the first stage of preparing the Local Plan Part 2. It identified those key issues that need to be addressed by the Plan and sought the views of all interested parties on these issues. This was in order to help determine which policies and proposals should be included in the final Plan. In relation to a number of these issues, the Core Strategy already sets out that further relevant policies and proposals would follow in Local Plan Part 2. One of the key issues that Local Plan Part 2 needs to address is to identify sites for new housing on the edge of the ‘key settlements’ of East Leake, Keyworth, Radcliffe on Trent and Ruddington. The Core Strategy sets a minimum target for new homes that need to be built on the edge of each these villages up to 2028 and identifies that it is the role of Local Plan Part 2 to allocate those sites needed to meet these targets.

4.9. The Issues and Options document posed a series of questions in relation to housing delivery at these key settlements and asked for views on the suitability or otherwise of a number of potential housing sites at each settlement. Issues in respect of other topic areas were also highlighted, including retail and town centre development, design, economic development, nature conservation, landscape protection and development in conservation areas.

4.10. The Issues and Options consultation period was for eight weeks ending on 24 March 2016. In total, 397 individuals and organisations responded to this and the associated Green Belt Review consultation conducted at the same time. A summary of the main issues raised concerning housing delivery is set out at Appendix 1 and a more comprehensive summary of consultation feedback is available as a background paper.

4.11. Following that consultation, it became clear that it was likely to be necessary for additional housing land to be allocated through Local Plan Part 2, over and above the level previously expected. This was in order to address:
a) the current absence of a five year supply of deliverable housing sites; and

b) the fact that the Core Strategy’s allocated strategic sites are, as a whole, now very likely to deliver less housing during the plan period (to 2028) than had originally been expected.

Further Options consultation

4.12. It was consequently considered appropriate to undertake an additional round of public consultation for the Local Plan and for the Green Belt Review. This was to supplement the Issues and Options consultation feedback already received and to provide the opportunity for comments to be made in respect of the suitability of a number of extra potential options for housing development.

4.13. The Further Options consultation document was published in February 2017 and consulted on for six weeks up until 31 March 2017. A series of consultation exhibitions were held as part of the consultation at Cotgrave, Cropwell Bishop, East Bridgford, Gotham, Sutton Bonington and Tollerton during March 2017.

4.14. In total, 1322 individuals and organisations responded to the Further Options consultation and the associated Green Belt Review consultation conducted at the same time. A summary of the main issues raised concerning housing delivery is set out at Appendix 2 and a more comprehensive summary of consultation feedback is available as a background paper.

4.15. A key question asked as part of the consultation was whether respondents agreed or not with the Council’s assessment that land may need to be allocated through Local Plan Part 2 to accommodate around 2,000 new homes. The development industry were generally supportive that the Council had acknowledged that there was a housing shortfall. Nonetheless, a large number of respondents from this sector considered that the shortfall had been underestimated and that more than 2,000 homes need to be provided for. These respondents considered that the Council has over-estimated housing delivery rates in the housing trajectory, principally in relation to the strategic sites. A range of alternative minimum housing figures were suggested, ranging from 2,200 to 4,300. A smaller number of planning agents and developers agreed with the Council’s figure of 2,000 homes.

4.16. The responses from most parish and town councils questioned whether the requirement should be as high as 2,000 homes and strongly argued against it going any higher. In terms of responses from residents, a common concern was that the proposed approach ‘rewarded’ developers for slow delivery on the strategic sites. There was general concern at allocating further greenfield and greenbelt sites as a result. Some suggested this approach was contrary to the Core Strategy policy of urban concentration and regeneration and was in contravention of the settlement hierarchy established. A number of respondents expressed frustration that more could not be done to get developers to build the sites that have already been identified and that the focus should be on bringing forward the larger sites instead of allocating further sites in less sustainable rural settlements.
4.17. In responding to both the Issues and Options and Further Options consultations, the development sector have generally been supportive of the allocation of as wide a range of housing sites as possible, in terms of both size and location. Parish/town councils and members of the public have generally been much less enthusiastic and most housing site options have attracted more opposition than support.

Preferred Housing Sites Consultation

4.18. It is now proposed that, following the earlier rounds of Local Plan consultation, the Borough Council should identify its ‘preferred’ proposed housing site allocations. These preferred sites will be published and consulted on as soon as possible during late September/October 2017. The consultation is likely to involve holding a number of public exhibitions in convenient locations across the Borough. Following consultation, all feedback received will be considered before finalising the draft Local Plan Part 2 early in 2018. The draft Plan, which will cover housing land delivery and all other relevant matters, would then be published and representations invited from anyone who wishes to support or object to its content. The draft Plan and all representations received would then be submitted to the Secretary of State. He or she would appoint a Planning Inspector to conduct an examination in public in order to determine whether or not the Plan is sound and legally compliant.

Housing land supply and distribution

4.19. The Further Options document identified that, by April 2019, the shortfall in the amount of land available for housing development could lead to around 900 fewer homes being built than is required over the subsequent five years (2019 to 2024) unless action is taken through Local Plan Part 2 to fix this situation. It identified that the Plan may need to identify enough land for around 2,000 new homes in total. This is enough to satisfy the 1,100 homes it was previously expected the Plan would have to provide for, plus the likely 900 home shortfall. Since the Further Options were published in February 2017 there has been no significant change in circumstances and it, therefore, remains the case that Local Plan Part 2 needs to allocate land for at least 2,000 new homes. There has been no evidence submitted by respondents to the Further Options consultation which it is considered should alter this conclusion. It also remains the case that if there are further delays to the delivery of new homes on the existing strategic allocations, then this could cause the size of the housing shortfall to increase further. Details in respect of housing land supply are set out further in Appendix 3.

4.20. The Further Options document also identified the importance of widening the range of settlements and individual sites delivering new housing development across Rushcliffe. A greater stock of smaller to medium size housing allocations all delivering housing at once should markedly boost short to medium term housing delivery rates, thereby helping to address the present shortfall arising from the delays in delivering the large strategic allocations. If the present shortfall is not addressed it would be likely to further weaken the Council’s ability to resist unwanted speculative development proposals.

4.21. The recommendations that follow in respect of preferred locations and sites for development have been informed by detailed evidence and other background work, including, but not limited to, the draft Green Belt Review
Part 2, landscape and visual analysis of potential development sites, sustainability appraisal of housing growth and site options and further analysis of all housing site options.

Housing sites within the Main Urban Area

4.22. Policy 3 of the Core Strategy adopts a spatial strategy of urban concentration with regeneration and includes an identified settlement hierarchy. This means that when looking to identify sites for housing development preference will usually be given to sites within and adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham (within and around West Bridgford and to the south of Clifton) or areas that can benefit from extra development in order to bring disused sites into use or to help support or provide new services. The consequence of this strategy is that sites in and around larger urban areas will generally be preferred for housing development provided there are no significant obstacles to their development.

4.23. The Issues and Options document identified the following four sites within West Bridgford as potential housing allocations:

- Central College, Greythorn Drive;
- Land south of Wilford Lane;
- Land between Lady Bay Bridge and Radcliffe Road; and
- Abbey Road Depot.

4.24. The first three sites now have planning consent for residential development and, given their location within the existing urban area, it is considered unnecessary to allocate them within the Local Plan. The Abbey Road Depot site (site WB1 – see Appendix 4), however, is yet to secure residential planning permission. The site lies within the main built up area and is classified as previously developed land meaning its redevelopment for housing is in principle acceptable. There are no constraints affecting the site that it is believed cannot be reasonably addressed. In order to support redevelopment of the site it is therefore recommended that it is identified as a proposed allocation for housing. The site is estimated to have capacity for around 50 dwellings.

Housing development adjacent to the Main Urban Area

4.25. In accordance with the strategy of urban concentration, the Core Strategy already allocates land at Melton Road, Edwalton, south of Clifton and east of Gamston for major mixed-use developments. Both the Issues and Options and Further Options consultations explored whether there would be merit in expanding any of these strategic sites to address the housing shortfall. Representations have been submitted by the owners of land to the west of Sharphill Wood at Edwalton promoting its inclusion within the adjacent strategic allocation at Melton Road, Edwalton. In respect of the east of Gamston strategic allocation, separate areas of land adjacent to it, both to the north and to the south of the site, are also being promoted for development. The conclusion, however, is that there would be no merit in including such sites within the strategic allocations. Expanding any one of them would not lead to more homes being built over the next few years than is already due to be delivered. Rather, any extra homes would be built further into the future at the very end of the development of these sites, thereby having no impact at all
on the immediate housing shortfall situation. Furthermore, the proposed removal of all these areas of land from the Green Belt for the purposes of development was previously considered during preparation of the Core Strategy and rejected at that stage.

4.26. Elsewhere adjacent to the main urban area, the Further Options consultation sought views on the suitability of Simkins Farm at Adbolton Lane, West Bridgford (site HOL1 – see Appendix 4) being allocated for development. The conclusion is that heritage assets present on site are sufficient to render it unsuitable for development. It is proposed therefore that it should remain within the Green Belt and not be allocated for housing.

4.27. There are no other sites adjacent to the main urban area that have been put forward by landowners/developers which are deemed to be either appropriate for development and/or would be able to deliver homes soon enough to address the current housing shortfall.

_Bingham_

4.28. The Core Strategy has already allocated land to the north of Bingham for around 1,000 homes and for 15.5 hectares of employment development. The Core Strategy makes no specific provision to require the allocation of further greenfield sites at Bingham. The only available option to allocate more housing land at Bingham would be to expand the existing housing allocation to the north of the town. This, however, would not help as part of resolving the current housing supply shortfall. It is anticipated that it will be at least nine years from now before all the new homes are built on the north of Bingham site. Expanding the site would not lead to any more homes being built on it over the next few years than are already due to be delivered. Rather, any extra homes would be built further into the future at the very end of the site’s development, thereby having no impact at all on the more immediate housing supply shortfall. It is therefore recommended that no further land is allocated for housing development at Bingham.

Former RAF Newton

4.29. It has been suggested by the landowner that the former RAF Newton strategic allocation should be expanded to provide for additional housing delivery. As with the Bingham strategic allocation this would not result in greater housing delivery in the short term and therefore, aside from any other relevant suitability factors, for this reason it is considered inappropriate to increase the size of the allocation at the present time.

_Cotgrave_

4.30. The Core Strategy has already allocated the former Cotgrave Colliery site for around 470 homes and for 4.5 hectares of employment development. While the Core Strategy makes no specific provision to require the allocation of further greenfield sites at Cotgrave, it is considered appropriate that the town, as a designated ‘key settlement’, accommodates some further housing development. Cotgrave is identified as a key settlement because of the range of services and facilities it contains and also because there are some employment opportunities locally. This has enabled the town to support the redevelopment of the former colliery site and it should enable it to support
some extra housing development; although, further improvements to local facilities (e.g. primary schools) will be necessary in order to enable more development to take place.

4.31. It is considered that Cotgrave has scope to sustain around 350 dwellings on greenfield sites adjacent to the town. The key constraint restricting development beyond this level is that the Local Education Authority has indicated that pupil demand for primary school places from around 350 dwellings could be accommodated at Cotgrave, subject to developer contributions towards expanding existing primary school capacity, but no more than this.

4.32. The housing site options at Cotgrave are shown at Appendix 4. In balancing sustainability, Green Belt, settlement capacity and other relevant planning considerations, it is recommended that the following sites be proposed as housing allocations and be removed from the Green Belt:

- Site COT1 – Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park;
- Site COT9 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (1);
- Site COT10 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (2); and
- Site COT11a – Land south of Hollygate Lane (3a)

4.33. Site COT1 (land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park) would form an individual site. When taking into account open space requirements on site, it is anticipated that it has capacity to accommodate around 170 dwellings. On site open space would be required in part to protect heritage assets of archaeological interest that exist within the site.

4.34. Sites COT9, COT10 and COT11a, which are each in separate landownership, would form a single allocation and would be expected to be delivered as one single comprehensive development scheme, with an anticipated capacity of around 180 dwellings. A significant advantage for this area of land is that its development would enhance connectivity between Hollygate Park (the former Cotgrave Colliery) and the existing main built up area of Cotgrave. In order to accommodate development in this location at least two points of access for road traffic are likely to be required for the scheme as a whole.

4.35. The development of all these sites along Hollygate Lane would have an impact on the road and in particular its junction with Colston Gate/Bingham Road. It will need to be demonstrated that the proposed developments are able to appropriately mitigate any potential adverse highway impacts.

**East Leake**

4.36. The Core Strategy sets a minimum target of 400 new homes that need to be built on new greenfield sites at East Leake up to 2028. Planning permission has recently been granted on eight greenfield sites around the village that will deliver around 800 new homes in total. All of the homes count towards the minimum 400 home target, which means it has already been exceeded by around 400 homes. It is recommended that all those greenfield sites with planning permission on the edge of East Leake be included in the Local Plan as housing allocations, with the exception of those sites where development has already been completed.
4.37. It is recommended that it would be unacceptable to identify further land at East Leake for housing development over the plan period. It is considered that to do so would put at risk the Core Strategy’s focus to locate development within or adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham. There are also concerns over East Leake’s capacity to support additional housing at this time and the affect that any further development would have on the character of the village. In particular, the Local Education Authority has identified that local primary schools have no capacity or potential for expansion in order to accommodate further housing growth beyond what already has planning permission.

Keyworth

4.38. The Core Strategy sets a target of a minimum of 450 new homes that need to be built on greenfield sites at Keyworth up to 2028. It is considered that Keyworth has scope to sustain around 580 dwellings in total on greenfield sites adjacent to the village. The key constraint restricting development beyond this level is that the Local Education Authority has indicated that pupil demand for primary school places from up to 580 dwellings could be accommodated at Keyworth, subject to developer contributions towards expanding existing primary school capacity, but no more than this.

4.39. The housing site options at Keyworth are shown at Appendix 4. In balancing sustainability, Green Belt, settlement capacity and other relevant planning considerations, it is recommended that the following sites be proposed as housing allocations and be removed from the Green Belt:

- Site KEY4a – Land off Nicker Hill (1) (estimated capacity around 150 homes);
- Site KEY8 – Land between Platt Lane and Station Road (estimated capacity around 190 homes);
- Site KEY10 – Land south of Debdale Lane (1) (estimated capacity around 190 homes); and
- Site KEY13 – Hillside Farm (estimated capacity around 50 homes)

4.40. For KEY10 it is expected that the more elevated land forming the northern third of the site should remain free of development. It is the case that sites KEY4a, KEY8, and KEY10 are all recommended for housing development by the draft Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan. Whilst site KEY13 is not recommended for allocation by the neighbourhood plan, its allocation in Local Plan Part 2 is considered appropriate due to its comparatively low landscape value and because its removal from the Green Belt would have limited wider impacts on the openness of the Green Belt as a whole.

Radcliffe on Trent

4.41. The Core Strategy sets a target of a minimum of 400 new homes that need to be built on greenfield sites within the existing Green Belt surrounding Radcliffe on Trent up to 2028. A critical issue influencing new housing numbers here is that the Local Education Authority has indicated that there are primary school capacity constraints affecting Radcliffe on Trent, with a lack of scope to expand existing school premises. It would appear therefore that to accommodate housing growth at Radcliffe on Trent a new primary school will need to be provided for in association with new housing development. To
generate the pupil numbers required to sustain a new primary school and to also generate sufficient developer contributions to cover the costs of a new school will require the delivery of upwards of 1,000 new homes. The Rushcliffe Clinical Commissioning Group has also indicated that a serviced plot will be required within one of the allocated sites for a new medical centre. This is because the village’s existing medical centre is incapable of expansion to accommodate the needs that would be generated by the new housing.

4.42. The housing site options adjacent to Radcliffe on Trent are shown at Appendix 4. In balancing sustainability, Green Belt, settlement capacity, flood risk, the availability of suitable sites for development and other relevant planning considerations, it is recommended that the following sites be proposed as housing allocations and be removed, where applicable, from the Green Belt to deliver around 820 new homes:

- Site RAD1 – Land north of Nottingham Road (estimated capacity around 150 homes);
- Site RAD2 – Land adjacent Grooms Cottage (estimated capacity around 50 homes);
- Site RAD3 – Land off Shelford Road (estimated capacity around 400 homes);
- Site RAD5a – Land north of Grantham Road to south of railway line (1a) (estimated capacity around 140 homes);
- Site RAD6 – 72 Main Road (estimated capacity around 5 homes)
- Site RAD13 – The Paddock, Nottingham Road (estimated capacity around 75 homes)

4.43. In respect of site RAD1, it is also recommended that it should include an element of employment land to form, overall, a mixed development. The recently examined draft Radcliffe on Trent Neighbourhood Plan identifies a local community desire for a balance of new and revitalised employment to support housing growth at Radcliffe on Trent. It is recommended that RAD1 provides such an opportunity given its western location close to the main Nottingham urban area, its accessibility to the A52, its low lying topography and the benefits that the former minerals railway line embankment along the western edge of the site would provide in terms of screening future development. Site RAD1 is divided by overhead powerlines which cross the site in a north-south direction. It would be logical for employment to be located to the western side of the powerlines and housing to the east, with development appropriately set back from the powerlines on each side. This would also serve to better avoid any potential conflict between new housing and the existing RSPCA Animal Shelter.

4.44. It would be expected that all the sites would contribute financially and equitably to the provision of a new primary school and medical centre for the village, with the exception of site RAD6 which would be too small to make financial contributions. There would be a requirement for one or two of the sites to provide land to accommodate these new facilities as necessary. Given the flexibility provided by its larger size it is expected that serviced land should be reserved for both the new primary school and the medical centre on site RAD3 (Land off Shelford Road).
4.45. 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 410 dwellings in total adjacent to the village, based on the capacity of local services and the availability of suitable sites for development.

4.46. The housing site options adjacent to Ruddington are shown at Appendix 4. In balancing sustainability, Green Belt, settlement capacity, heritage, flood risk and other relevant planning considerations, it is recommended that the following sites are proposed as housing allocations and be removed from the Green Belt:

- Site RUD1 – Land to the west of Wilford Road (south) (estimated capacity around 180 homes);
- Site RUD5 – Land south of Flawforth Lane (estimated capacity around 50 homes); and
- Site RUD13 – Land opposite Mere Way (estimated capacity around 170 homes)

4.47. In addition to these sites, site RUD11 (Old Loughborough Road) has been promoted as a site for self and custom build housing but with the land being retained within the Green Belt. It is argued by the site promoter that low density housing on this site would form a natural extension to development in this location and could take place in a form which reflects and respects the existing character of the area. This assessment has merit and it is therefore recommended that site RUD11 should be identified for self and custom build housing, but be retained within the Green Belt in order that any development schemes does not unduly impact on the openness of the Green Belt. It would have capacity for around 10 dwellings.

4.48. In removing sites RUD5 and RUD13 from the Green Belt it would be appropriate to also remove from the Green Belt the land immediately to their west in order to avoid an ‘island’ of Green Belt remaining. This includes the existing properties on Flawforth Avenue. It would also involve removing sites RUD6 and RUD14 from the Green Belt. However, both are considered to be unsuitable for housing allocations because of the contribution they currently make to the character of Ruddington’s Conservation Area.

4.49. It was not originally expected that Local Plan Part 2 would need to allocate any sites for new housing at smaller ‘other villages’ because requirements would be met elsewhere – at the main urban area of Nottingham and at the ‘key settlements’ of Bingham, Cotgrave, East Leake, Keyworth, Radcliffe on Trent and Ruddington. However, it is now concluded that a number of other villages will need to accommodate some level of new housing on greenfield sites in order to help resolve the current housing shortfall. This is because it is not possible to allocate enough suitable land at the main Nottingham urban area (within Rushcliffe) and at the key settlements alone, which is fully capable of delivering a sufficient number of new homes quickly enough to completely meet the shortfall. There instead needs to be a wider range of
settlements and sites all delivering new housing development at the same time.

4.50. At Aslockton, planning permission has been granted for the development of up to 75 new homes on a site to the south of Abbey Lane. Consequently, this site already contributes to the supply of land available for housing development over the next few years. It is recommended that it is identified as a housing allocation in the Local Plan. However, beyond this it would be unsustainable, based on existing service and infrastructure provision, for any further greenfield sites to be identified for housing development at Aslockton or Whatton.

4.51. At the Further Options consultation stage in February 2017, the villages which were identified as potentially suitable to accommodate a limited level of housing development on greenfield sites, based on assessment work which has been undertaken, are as follows:

- Cropwell Bishop;
- East Bridgford;
- Gotham;
- Sutton Bonington; and
- Tollerton

4.52. These particular villages were identified because, while they do not provide for a full range of facilities as is the case at West Bridgford and the key settlements, the basic level of facilities (e.g. schools; shops) that are available were deemed capable of potentially supporting a relatively limited level of housing growth without compromising the strategy set out in the Core Strategy for the distribution of new housing.

_Cropwell Bishop_

4.53. It is considered that Cropwell Bishop has scope to sustain around 160 dwellings on greenfield sites adjacent to the village, based on the existing size and status of the settlement, the capacity of local services and the size of those sites deemed most suitable for housing development.

4.54. The housing site options adjacent to Cropwell Bishop are shown at Appendix 4. In balancing sustainability, Green Belt, settlement capacity and other relevant planning considerations, it is recommended that the following sites be proposed as housing allocations and be removed from the Green Belt:

- Site CBI2 – Land north of Memorial Hall (estimated capacity around 90 homes); and
- Site CBI5 – Land east of Church Street (estimated capacity around 70 homes)

_East Bridgford_

4.55. It is considered that East Bridgford has scope to sustain around 100 dwellings on greenfield sites adjacent to the village, based on the existing size and status of the settlement, the capacity of local services and the size of those sites deemed suitable for housing development.
4.56. The housing site options adjacent to East Bridgford are shown at Appendix 4. In balancing sustainability, Green Belt, settlement capacity and other relevant planning considerations, it is recommended that the following sites be proposed as housing allocations and be removed from the Green Belt:

- Site EBR6 – Closes Side Lane (west) (estimated capacity around 20 homes);
- Site EBR7 – Closes Side Lane (east) (estimated capacity around 20 homes);
- Site EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane (estimated capacity around 15 homes); and
- Site EBR10 – Land south of Butt Lane (estimated capacity around 45 homes)

**Gotham**

4.57. It is considered that Gotham has scope to sustain around 100 dwellings on greenfield sites adjacent to the village, based on the existing size and status of the settlement, the capacity of local services and the size of the site deemed most suitable for housing development.

4.58. The housing site options adjacent to Gotham are shown at Appendix 4. In balancing sustainability, Green Belt, settlement capacity and other relevant planning considerations, it is recommended that the following site be proposed as a housing allocation:

- Site GOT5a – Land east of Gypsum Way/The Orchards (1) (estimated capacity around 100 homes)

4.59. This would require the site’s removal from the Green Belt. However, in removing this area from the Green Belt it is considered logical to also remove site GOT4 from the Green Belt. This site which contains elements of medieval ridge and furrow is however judged unsuitable for allocation as a housing site. The land would remain as a paddock.

**Sutton Bonington**

4.60. The Local Education Authority has identified that, based on existing information, Sutton Bonington Primary School currently has no capacity or potential for expansion in order to accommodate housing growth. As it stands it is not therefore possible at present to recommend any proposed housing allocations at Sutton Bonington. It is proposed that this situation is kept under review and should primary school capacity for new pupils be subsequently identified it may then be appropriate for land to be allocated for housing development. There are currently two housing site options, as shown at Appendix 4.

**Tollerton**

4.61. The Local Education Authority has identified that Tollerton Primary School currently has no capacity or potential for expansion in order to accommodate housing growth. This situation alone constrains any scope Tollerton might have to accommodate housing development at present. It is therefore
recommended that Local Plan Part 2 does not allocate any sites at Tollerton for housing development.

**Bunny Brickworks**

4.62. The 1996 Local Plan (its Policy E7) allows for Bunny Brickworks (since closed) to be redeveloped for employment purposes. It was asked as part of the Issues and Options consultation whether mixed use development (housing and employment) should be allowed on site in order to assist with its regeneration. The village of Bunny is not one of the ‘other villages’ that have been identified as potentially suitable for a limited level of new housing development. Nonetheless, to support its regeneration it is considered that there is merit in allowing an element of housing development on the former brickworks site. It is consequently recommended that the site (site BUN1 – see Appendix 4) is allocated for mixed housing and employment development. The provision of around 100 dwellings on site alongside new employment development is considered reasonable, taking into account Bunny’s existing size and status and the capacity of its local services.

**Flintham – Former Islamic Institute**

4.63. It was also asked at the Issues and Options consultation stage whether the Local Plan should include new policy to explicitly support the regeneration of the former Islamic Institute at Flintham (Site FLI1 – see Appendix 4). This is a prominent site on the edge of the village which has been derelict for a number of years. The site has recently been granted planning permission for up to 95 dwellings. Accordingly, it is considered appropriate to propose its allocation for up to 95 dwellings.

**Summary**

4.64. In summary, it is recommended that the following new sites (sites which do not already have planning permission) are allocated for housing development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Estimated dwelling capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Bridgford</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site WB1 – Abbey Road Depot</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cotgrave</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site COT1 – Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site COT9 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (1)</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site COT10 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (2)</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site COT11a – Land south of Hollygate Lane (3a)</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>350</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Keyworth</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site KEY4a – Land off Nicker Hill (1)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site KEY8 – Land between Platt Lane and Station Road</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site KEY10 – Land south of Debdale Lane (1)</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site KEY13 – Hillside Farm</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radcliffe on Trent</td>
<td>Site RAD1 – Land north of Nottingham Road (mixed housing and employment development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site RAD2 – Land adjacent Grooms Cottage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site RAD3 – Land off Shelford Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site RAD5a – Land north of Grantham Road to south of railway line (1a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site RAD6 – 72 Main Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site RAD13 – The Paddock, Nottingham Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruddington</td>
<td>Site RUD1 – Land to the west of Wilford Road (south)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site RUD5 – Land south of Flawforth Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site RUD13 – Land opposite Mere Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site RUD11 – Old Loughborough Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropwell Bishop</td>
<td>Site CBI2 – Land north of Memorial Hall (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site CBI5 – Land east of Church Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bridgford</td>
<td>Site EBR6 – Closes Side Lane (west)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site EBR7 – Closes Side Lane (east)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site EBR10 – Land south of Butt Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotham</td>
<td>Site GOT5a – Land east of Gypsum Way/The Orchards (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunny</td>
<td>Site BUN1 – Bunny Brickworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.65. As set out already, Local Plan Part 2 needs to allocate land for the construction of at least 2,000 new homes in total. The development of sites WB1 and RAD13 would not count against this total, as their housing delivery has already been accounted for separately. The remaining sites would collectively deliver around 2,545 new homes in total; 545 homes above the minimum 2,000 homes required. It is considered that this additional housing supply would be beneficial by providing a reasonable land supply buffer should housing delivery on the existing strategic allocations be further delayed. It would also help in guarding against any future housing delivery shortfall should any one of the housing allocations eventually included in Local Plan Part 2 not come forward as expected.
5. **Other Options Considered**

5.1. All reasonable alternatives have been assessed through the sustainability appraisal and housing site selection work undertaken as part of Local Plan 2 preparation.

6. **Risk and Uncertainties**

6.1. None identified.

7. **Implications**

7.1. **Finance**

7.1.1. There are no direct financial implications arising from this report.

7.2. **Legal**

7.2.1. It is a statutory requirement for the Council to have a Local Plan. The Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy was adopted in December 2014. The Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies will, when adopted, mean that the Council has a complete and up to date Local Plan in place.

7.3. **Corporate Priorities**

7.3.1. The adoption of the Rushcliffe Local Plan is a key element of the Council’s corporate priority of supporting economic growth to ensure a sustainable, prosperous and thriving local economy.

7.4. **Other Implications**

7.4.1. None.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For more information contact:</th>
<th>Planning Policy Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Background papers Available for Inspection: | Local Plan Part 1: Rushcliffe Core Strategy, December 2014  
www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy/localplan/localplanpart1corestrateg y |
|--------------------------------------------|-------------|
www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy/localplan/localplanpart2landplanningpolicies/ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of appendices (if any):</th>
<th>Appendix 1: Summary of Local Plan Part 2 Issues and Options consultation – main issues raised concerning housing delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix 2: Summary of Local Plan Part 2 Further Options consultation – main issues raised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix 3: Housing Land Supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix 4: Housing Site Options</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1: Summary of Local Plan Part 2 Issues and Options consultation – main issues raised concerning housing delivery
1. **Issues raised relating to the main urban area (within West Bridgford and land adjacent to West Bridgford/Clifton):**

   - Most respondents do not support further allocations on the edge of the main urban area.

   - A number of developers/landowners have argued for further housing sites adjacent to the main urban area. It is suggested that this is necessary because of delays in delivering the Core Strategy's strategic sites, an absence of a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites, and the need to provide flexibility and a range of sites to meet demand.

   - Additional land west of Sharphill Wood has been specifically suggested as housing land.

   - There is general support for potential housing allocations at Abbey Road Depot, Central College and land between Lady Bay Bridge/Radcliffe Road. The levels of support versus opposition were more balanced towards the possible allocation of land south of Wilford Lane.

2. **Issues raised relating to Bingham:**

   - Most respondents who expressed a view supported not allocating further greenfield sites for housing at Bingham. Developers, who supported further allocations in Bingham, have identified the need for further development to provide flexibility and increase delivery.

3. **Issues raised relating to Cotgrave:**

   - More respondents support allocating additional sites at Cotgrave (including Barton in Fabis PC and East Leake PC) than those against, although there was heavy developer/landowner representation in these responses.

   - The arguments made in favour of development, particularly from the development industry, include the absence of a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites and delays in delivering the Core Strategy’s strategic sites.

4. **Issues raised relating to East Leake:**

   - The majority of respondents have agreed that, apart from the eight sites with planning permission, further greenfield sites should not be allocated. East Leake Parish Council supports this position.

   - Additional housing sites have been put forward by developers/landowners. Gotham Parish Council and Barton in Fabis Parish Council also both support further housing on greenfield sites at East Leake.
5. **Issues raised relating to Keyworth:**

- In response to the questions relating to Keyworth and the possible allocation of those sites identified by the emerging Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan, around 30 agreed that these sites should be allocated and 70 disagreed.

- A significant number of representations from residents in the Nicker Hill area opposed the allocation of site KEYB (land off Nicker Hill), instead favouring site KEYA (land north of Bunny Lane). Conversely residents within the western half of Keyworth have tended to oppose KEYA and favour KEYB. Some developers/landowners have put forward alternative areas of land for development to those supported by the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.

6. **Issues raised relating to Radcliffe on Trent:**

- In response to those questions which asked in which directions housing development should be focused and which sites specifically should be allocated for development, the representations have been mixed, without particularly clear support for any of the options. A significant number of respondents opposed the housing target believing that services (health and education) and infrastructure (the road network) would not be able to meet the needs of new residents.

- Radcliffe Parish Council’s view is that 400 homes should be the limit, otherwise local facilities would be overwhelmed. The Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group both recommend that the new housing development should be spread around the village, with sites bounded on two or more sides by existing built form being considered the most appropriate.

- Developers/landowners support various options for housing growth, with some emphasising the need to go well beyond the minimum housing target (400 homes), in order to respond to the absence of a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites and the delays in delivering the Core Strategy’s strategic sites.

- The Crown Estate has, for the first time, put forward land to the north of Shelford Road (within Shelford Parish) as a proposed housing site.

- In terms of those who specifically expressed a preference for the housing site options, the following responses were received:
### Issues raised relating to Ruddington:

- In response to those questions which asked in which directions housing development should be focused and which sites specifically should be developed, the representations have been mixed, without particularly clear support for any of the options.

- Ruddington Parish Council have provided a record of how its councillors voted for or against each proposed housing site. The Parish Council has identified that RBC should consider other sites, but it has made no specific suggestions.

- Developers/landowners support various options for housing growth, with some emphasising the need to go well beyond the minimum housing target (250 homes), in order to respond to the absence of a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites and the delays in delivering the Core Strategy’s strategic sites.

- In terms of those who specifically expressed a preference for the housing site options, the following responses were received:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Yes in full</th>
<th>Yes in part</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUD4 (Easthorpe House and adjacent land)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD5 (land south of Flawforth Lane)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD6 (land at Loughborough Road)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD7 (land north west of Asher Lane)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD8 (land west of Pasture Lane)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD9 (land south of Landmere Lane)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD10 (land adjacent to Landmere Farm)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Housing development at ‘other villages’:

- There was a mixed response as to whether Local Plan Part 2 should allocate housing sites at ‘other villages’ (all those villages that are not ‘key settlements’).

- Barton in Fabis, Gotham, Kinoulton and Orston Parish Councils, for example, support there being no allocated sites at ‘other settlements’. East Leake Parish Council on the other hand believe consideration should be given to allowing some of the other villages to grow in planned and sympathetic way.

- Those representing the development industry have argued strongly in favour the identification of housing sites at other settlements and a number highlighted the need to deliver around 2,000 homes within such villages.

- A number of developers/landowners have suggested sites, in locations including Aslockton, Bradmore, Bunny, Cropwell Bishop, Costock, Kinoulton, Gotham and Sutton Bonington, on the basis that they can sustain development.

- Again, the absence of a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites and delays in delivering the Core Strategy’s strategic sites have been cited as part of the reason for allocating land for housing development in smaller settlements.
Appendix 2: Summary of Local Plan Part 2
Further Options consultation – main issues raised
1. **Housing Land Supply**

- The development industry were generally supportive that the Council had acknowledged that there was a housing shortfall. Nonetheless, a large number of respondents from this sector considered that the shortfall had been underestimated and that more than 2,000 homes need to be provided for. These respondents considered that the Council has over-estimated housing delivery rates in the housing trajectory, principally in relation to the strategic sites. A range of alternative minimum housing figures were suggested, ranging from 2,200 to 4,300. A smaller number of planning agents and developers agreed with the Council’s figure of 2,000 homes.

- The responses from most parish and town councils questioned whether the requirement should be as high as 2,000 homes and strongly argued against it going any higher. In terms of responses from residents, a common concern was that the proposed approach ‘rewarded’ developers for slow delivery on the strategic sites. There was general concern at allocating further greenfield and greenbelt sites as a result. Some suggested this approach was contrary to the Core Strategy policy of urban concentration and regeneration and was in contravention of the settlement hierarchy established. A number of respondents expressed frustration that more could not be done to get developers to build the sites that have already been identified and that the focus should be on bringing forward the larger sites instead of allocating further sites in less sustainable rural settlements.

2. **Issues raised relating to the main urban area (within West Bridgford and land adjacent to West Bridgford/Clifton):**

- The majority of respondents from the development industry agreed that expanding the current strategic allocations would not address the current shortfall, and that the only way for the Council to do this was by allocating smaller sites for housing in a wider variety of locations.

- Certain parish councils (for example, Holme Pierrepont and Gamston), did not support identification of land around the main urban area for housing development and argued for a more distributed pattern of development. Others, including East Leake and East Bridgford parish councils, favoured more emphasis on the main urban area.

- Of the responses received from members of the public, the majority disagreed with the Council’s approach, arguing that the sites adjacent to the main urban area were more suitable as they were located in a more sustainable location and had availability of appropriate infrastructure compared to sites in the rural area.
3. Issues raised relating to Simkins Farm, Adbolton

- In response to whether respondents supported development at Simkins Farm, the majority disagreed. 52 agreed all of the site should be developed, 8 agreed part of the site and 110 disagreed with any development (with a further 84 anonymous respondents also disagreeing).

- Those respondents who were supportive of development cited the accessibility of the site in terms of proximity to the main urban area and associated facilities.

- Issues highlighted by respondents objecting to the site included the importance of the site as valued open space adjoining a built up area, negative impact on the character of Lady Bay and the precedent of previous applications on the site being refused on the grounds of Green Belt, archaeological value and heritage value.

4. Issues raised relating to Bingham:

- There was agreement from a clear majority of respondents for not allocating further greenfield sites for housing in Bingham.

- Representatives of the development industry highlighted, for instance, the single ownership by the Crown Estate of the majority of potentially developable land around Bingham as reason for not allocating further sites (given the lack of progress with land North of Bingham).

- There was only limited support for additional allocations on the edge of Bingham. Comments received in support related to the relative sustainability of the settlement in terms of public transport, services and facilities when compared to more rural settlements.

5. Issues raised relating to Cotgrave:

- In response to the question whether it is agreed that Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for housing at Cotgrave in the plan period, 80 agreed, 102 disagreed and 38 stated that they did not know.

- A number of reasons were cited by those of the view that Cotgrave should have no further housing allocations. In particular, many respondents believe that local services, facilities and road infrastructure are insufficient to accommodate further development.

- From those respondents who are more supportive of development, a number made the point that more housing would assist regeneration and that infrastructure should be delivered before any development goes ahead.
In terms of those who specifically expressed a preference for the housing site options, the following responses were received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes – all of site</th>
<th>Yes – but only part of site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COT1 – Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT2 – Land at Main Road</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT3 – Land rear of and to the west of Main Road</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT4 Land off Woodgate Lane</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT5 – Bakers Hollow</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT6 – The Brickyard, Owthorpe Road</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT7– Land behind Firdale (2)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT8 – Land behind Firdale</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT9 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (1)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT10 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (2)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT11 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (3)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT12– Land south of Plumtree Lane</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other location</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Issues raised relating to East Leake:

- The responses clearly indicate that there is overwhelming agreement with the Council’s position that no additional sites (beyond sites already granted planning permission) should be allocated. 333 respondents supported no further allocations, 32 did not support this position and 21 did not know.

- There are, however, a number of landowners/developers promoting the development of sites at East Leake who argue that the village can sustainably support further growth.

- In terms of those who specifically expressed a preference for the housing site options, the following responses were received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes – all of site</th>
<th>Yes – but only part of site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EL9 – Land south of West Leake Road</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL10 – Land north of West Leake Road</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL11 – Brook Furlong Farm</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL12 – Land off Rempstone Road (north)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL13 – Land off Rempstone Road (south)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL14 – Land north of Lantern Lane (2)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. **Issues raised relating to Keyworth:**

- There was no overall consensus on the number of houses that should be built on greenfield sites in Keyworth. The majority of comments in this respect were received from the development industry and statutory consultees. There was only a limited response from members of the public suggesting an overall dwelling number, although of those who did respond there was resistance to growth, particularly above 450 homes. Keyworth Parish Council is still of the opinion that 450 dwellings should be the limit for Keyworth.

- In terms of those who specifically expressed a preference for the housing site options, the following responses were received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes – all of site</th>
<th>Yes – but only part of site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KEY1 – Land east of Willow Brook</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY2 – Land off Selby Lane and Willowbrook</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY3 – Land south of Selby Lane</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY4 – Land off Nicker Hill</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY5 – Hill Top Farm, Platt Lane (1)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY6 – Hill Top Farm, Platt Lane (2)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY7 – Shelton Farm, Platt Lane</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY8 – Land between Platt Lane and Station Road</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY9 – Land north of Debdale Lane (1)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY10 – Land south of Debdale Lane (1)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY11 – Land south of Debdale Lane (2)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY12 – Land north of Debdale Lane (2)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY13 – Hillside Farm</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY14 – Land south of Bunny Lane</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other location</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **Issues raised relating to Radcliffe on Trent:**

- There was no overall consensus on the number of houses that should be built on greenfield sites in Radcliffe. The majority of comments in this respect were received from the development industry and statutory consultees. There was only a limited response from members of the public suggesting an overall dwelling number, although of those who did respond there was resistance to growth, particularly above 400 homes. Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council accepted a maximum of 500 dwellings up to the year 2028, acknowledging the Borough Council’s position in relation to the current housing shortfall. The figure of 500 was accepted on the basis that appropriate infrastructure was provided and any negative impacts on facilities were addressed and mitigated.
The development industry were generally supportive of including a higher minimum housing figure than the 400 stated in the Core Strategy. Alternative minimum housing figures suggested ranged from 600 to 700 houses. It was argued that an increasing of the minimum housing figure was needed to ensure the plan’s flexibility.

In order to build upon site specific consultation that was undertaken at Issues and Options stage, a further two additional sites that have been submitted to the Borough Council as available for development were consulted upon. In terms of those who specifically expressed a preference for the housing site options, the following responses were received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes-all of the site</th>
<th>Yes-part of the site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site RAD11 – North of Holme Lane</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(potential capacity around 115 homes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site RAD12 – Land to the north of Shelford Road</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(potential capacity around 180 homes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other location</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Issues raised relating to Ruddington:

- In terms of whether sites should be allocated for more than 250 dwellings, Ruddington Parish Council is of the view that 250 should be the maximum number on greenfield allocations. A number of comments from the general public also support this view.

- There is a general consensus amongst most developers and landowners that it would be possible for Ruddington to sustain more than the minimum of 250 dwellings.

- In order to build upon site specific consultation that was undertaken at Issues and Options stage, a further four additional sites that have been submitted to the Borough Council as available for development were consulted upon. In terms of those who specifically expressed a preference for the housing site options, the following responses were received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes-all of the site</th>
<th>Yes-part of the site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUD11-Old Loughborough Road</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD12-Land to the East side of Loughborough Road</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD13- Land Opposite Mere Way</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD14-Croft House</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other location</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. **Housing development at Aslockton and Whatton**

- In terms of support for the Borough Council’s view that no further greenfield allocations should be made at Aslockton and Whatton, the following responses were received.

| Support for Borough Council’s position for no further allocations for greenfield development as Aslockton and Whatton |  |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 37 |  |
| No | 19 |  |
| Don’t know | 26 |  |

- Aslockton Parish Council states that it has already undergone considerable expansion for a small village with so few facilities and limited public transport. Expansion will already increase car-borne travel and with 75 additional houses already committed the village should only accommodate very small individual developments such as conversions, annexes etc.

- A number of landowners/developers promoting sites at Aslockton and Whatton made a number of points in an attempting to justify that it would be appropriate for further growth at one or both villages.

11. **Housing development at ‘other villages’**:

- Overall, the level of support and no support for development at other villages was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cropwell Bishop</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bridgford</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotham</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton Bonington</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tollerton</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other settlement</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The general view of the parish councils of these villages is that, other than minor levels of new housing development, significant housing growth would be unsustainable. East Leake Parish Council in contrast supports spreading growth as wide as possible.

12. **Housing development at ‘Cropwell Bishop’**:

- In relation to the principle of identifying Cropwell Bishop as a suitable village for a limited level of growth, the majority of residents were not in favour, but a reasonable number did support it.
There was no overall consensus on the number of new homes that could be accommodated on greenfield sites adjacent to Cropwell Bishop. The option of no growth received the most support from residents but there was also support from residents for some growth. This ranged from in the region of 10 units to 150. There was a relatively even distribution of support within this range.

Cropwell Bishop Parish Council suggested a maximum of 150 homes stating that this could be accommodated in the village providing the infrastructure is upgraded.

In terms of those who specifically expressed a preference for the housing site options, the following responses were received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>YES – all of site</th>
<th>YES – part of site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CB11 – Land to the south of Nottingham Road and east of Kinoulton Road</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB12 – Land north of Memorial Hall (1)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB13 – Land north of Memorial Hall (2)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB14 – Land north of Fern Road (2)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB15 – Land north of Fern Road (1)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB16 – Land north of Fern Road (3)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other location</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Housing development at ‘East Bridgford’:

In relation to identifying East Bridgford as a suitable village for a limited level of growth, most respondents opposed rather than supported new development at the village. East Bridgford Parish Council does not support any development in the Green Belt around East Bridgford.

A number of landowners/developers promoting sites at East Bridgford made a number of points in an attempting to justify that it would be appropriate for further growth at the village.

In terms of those who specifically expressed a preference for the housing site options, the following responses were received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes – all of site</th>
<th>Yes – but only part of site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EBR1- Land behind Kirk Hill (east)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR2 – Land behind Kirk Hill (west)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR3 – Land north of Kneeton Road (1)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR4 – Land north of Kneeton Road (2)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR5 - Land at Lammas Lane</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR6 – Closes Side Lane (west)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR7 – Closes Side Lane (east)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. **Housing development at ‘Gotham’:**

- In relation to identifying Gotham as a suitable village for a limited level of growth, more responses supported rather than opposed new development at Gotham, although answers were often qualified in relation to matters such as the number and type of new dwellings, the infrastructure required to enable development to take place, and the sites that are considered suitable.

- In total, 74 responses supported development on greenfield sites around Gotham, 59 did not support development on greenfield sites around Gotham and 24 responses did not know.

- In terms of support for specific sites contained within the further options consultation document. The responses received were mostly negative about most of the sites. The only site that that gained more support than those that objected was GOT1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes – all of site</th>
<th>Yes – but only part of site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOT1-Land to the rear of former British Legion</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOT2-Land North of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (West)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOT3-Land North of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (East)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOT4-The Orchards Leake Road</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOT5-Land East of Gypsum Way</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOT6-East of Leake Road</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOT7-Land East of Hill Road</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOT8- Land South of Moor Lane</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other location</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. **Housing development at ‘Sutton Bonington’:**

- In relation to identifying Sutton Bonington as a suitable village for a limited level of growth, more responses opposed rather than supported new development at the village. The Parish Council does not support any development adjacent to the existing village.
When asked whether there was support for any additional sites, the following responses were received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes – all of site</th>
<th>Yes – but only part of site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUT1 – Land north of Park Lane</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. **Housing development at ‘Tollerton’:**

- In relation to identifying Tollerton as a suitable village for a limited level of growth, more responses opposed rather than supported new development at the village. Tollerton Parish Council does not support any removal of land from the Green Belt and stated that exceptional circumstances have not been proven and Tollerton does not have basic levels of facilities, including a GP, and the primary school is at capacity. In its view, road capacity, safety, absence of cycle ways, pavements and limited public transport issues restrict further housing.

- When asked whether there was support for any of the additional sites, the following responses were received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes – all of site</th>
<th>Yes – but only part of site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOL1 - Land at Burnside Grove</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL2 – West of Tollerton Lane and North of Medina Drive</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL3 – Land east of Tollerton Lane</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other location</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Housing Land Supply
## Housing Land Supply

### Anticipated housing land supply at 1 April 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing target over Plan Period (2011 to 2028)</td>
<td>13,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing target for period 2011 to 2019*</td>
<td>4,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing target for period 2019 and 2028**</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual target 2019 to 2028</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected total number of homes built between 2011 and 2019</td>
<td>3,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected shortfall in homes built between 2011 and 2019</td>
<td>882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing requirement for 5 year period 2019 to 2024 (1000 per year over 5 years plus 882 home shortfall, with a 20% buffer applied†)</td>
<td>7,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of homes expected to be built on deliverable sites between 2019-2024††</td>
<td>6,159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Potential shortfall in homes built between 2019 and 2024**
(housing requirement minus anticipated housing supply)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>899</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Calculated based on Core Strategy Policy 3 (part 3) – 500 homes between 2011-3, 2,350 homes between 2013-2018 and 1,300 homes between 2018-19.

** Core Strategy paragraph 3.3.9 sets out that once the Local Plan Part 2 is adopted the housing requirement for subsequent years will be calculated on an ‘annualised calculation’ basis.

† National planning policy requires a 20% buffer to be applied where there has been substantial under delivery of new homes in preceding years.

†† Based on the ‘Rushcliffe housing trajectory as at April 2016’ (see below) and on the previous assumptions that Local Plan Part 2 would only need to allocate enough land for 1,100 new homes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completions on allocated sites and identified SHLAA capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Mellor Road, Edwinstowe (1,500) (Policy 40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at former Colgate Coatings (499) (Policy 31)</td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Norton, Newton Phase 2 (950) (Policy 32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land within Bingham (1,099) (Policy 29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land south of Colston (8,990) (Policy 24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Gamston/North of Tollerton (3,000 - 4,000) (Policy 25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill and change of use in broad locations</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding East Leake to be allocated (490) Policy 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding Keyworth to be allocated (460) Policy 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding Ruddington to be allocated (340) Policy 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding Ruddington to be allocated (340) Policy 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total completions</td>
<td></td>
<td>293</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>1,303</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completions</td>
<td></td>
<td>293</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>2,076</td>
<td>2,575</td>
<td>3,369</td>
<td>6,546</td>
<td>5,786</td>
<td>7,179</td>
<td>8,373</td>
<td>9,427</td>
<td>10,431</td>
<td>11,364</td>
<td>12,310</td>
<td>12,026</td>
<td>13,652</td>
<td>14,341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Housing Site Options
Dear Councillor Lawrence,

Please find attached my letter opposing the proposed housing development for East Bridgford.

Regards,

Samantha Birkin
14th June 2018

Dear Councillor Lawrence,

RE: Rushcliffe Local Plan Part Two – East Bridgford

I am writing with regard to the proposed development of 125 new houses to be built on two large Green Belt sites in East Bridgford. This is of great concern as it is far more than was originally proposed. Residents have not been consulted again in respect of this increase.

The 2016 Community Plan Group Questionnaire which East Bridgford residents completed said, “We find Green Belt Development on the edge of the village unacceptable.” This was true of 85% of residents who stated that carefully designed developments on the edge of the village were unacceptable. According to the Village Plan, what is now being proposed by Rushcliffe Borough Council does not reflect the thoughts and feelings of the majority of East Bridgford Residents.

If the 125 houses were to go ahead it would cause far greater congestion of our already struggling roads. Traffic would be at unmanageable levels. As it is currently, there are barely spaces to park on the village streets, and traffic uses the village as a cut through to avoid queuing on the A6097. The Community Plan 2016 said that the volume of traffic is the biggest concern to residents (question 10, 69, 70). With the proposed development bringing potentially an extra 200 cars to our village roads, this is a real concern for safety.

Child safety is a concern. If there are more cars on our roads due to the extra housing, there will be serious obstruction for those trying to use the roads, resulting in dangerous situations. Emergency vehicles will be unable to pass, cars will park on pavements, and drive along pavements to pass parked vehicles. In the few short months that my daughter has been a pupil at East Bridgford St Peter’s Academy, there have been accidents involving children on our village streets. In my opinion sadly this will only get worse.

Rushcliffe’s Local Plan and National planning guidance states that there should be accessible sustainable transport for development sites. People should be able to travel by non-car alternatives. By allocating the East Bridgford site, it is an area remote from public transport. For instance, the last bus from Nottingham to East Bridgford is at 7pm! Therefore Rushcliffe Borough Council are not following their own policy by considering East Bridgford as a site for potential development.

The increased traffic on our roads will cause our local businesses to suffer, as there will be more congestion, less space to park and therefore less passing trade for our businesses.

The village school has a maximum intake of 300 children. This is a condition that has been set by the Highways Agency when the new extension was built due to traffic concerns. So where will the extra
children who will potentially be living in the village go to school, if the new houses go ahead? Bingham? Will the increased numbers of houses mean far greater competition for places in a school that has always had the policy that if you live in the village, you go to school in the village?

There is of course concern that there will be damage to the ecological wildlife and fauna if the houses are built.

One of my concerns is that the proposed development will increase the chances of East Bridgford merging with Bingham. One of the purposes of having Green Belt is to prevent sprawl of large built up areas, and the proposed development conflicts with more than one of the five purposes of Green Belt. It will mean that the setting and character of our village will be destroyed, and the countryside will be encroached upon. In the Community Plan 2016, the fields separating the village from the roads were the highest priority to those living in the village, and in my opinion should not be lost. In the 2016 Community Plan questionnaire, residents also said that The Green Belt was one of the most important aspects of the village and should be preserved (questions 9,10,13,30).

There are alternatives to building in East Bridgford, which would still achieve the objectively assessed housing need. For example, Newton would welcome extra development, and the facilities which they were promised when they bought their homes, such as a new school and community centre. Why hasn’t this been delivered? Also, housing plans have not been delivered for Clifton and Gamston, both of which have excellent transport links and can provide homes where people can easily get to work.

The new 125 home plan would significantly change the village forever. There is no village support for large development on the edge of the village or even medium sized development, this is clear from questions 25a and 25b of the Community Plan. Please consider alternative and better suited development sites.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs S J Birkin
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

Joan Dirksw

your name
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]

[Your Name]
Comment

Consultee  Miss Emma Blackband (1167003)
Event Name  Local Plan Part 2 (Publication Draft)
Comment by  Miss Emma Blackband (1167003)
Comment ID  28
Response Date  25/06/18 10:53
Status  Submitted
Submission Type  Web
Version  0.1

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

Page number  35 and 40
Paragraph number  Map and area 5.4 north of Grantham road
Policy reference  Policy 5.4: Housing Allocation – Land north of Grantham Road, Radcliffe on Trent
Site reference  Policy 5.4: Housing Allocation – Land north of Grantham Road, Radcliffe on Trent
Policies Map  Yes

Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2 to be legally compliant?  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).

I am unaware of any legal planning laws so I have ticked yes. I do not believe my feedback to have legal grounds.
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:  
(please tick all that apply)

- Positively Prepared
- 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).

I believe not all impacts have been visualized in the plan for the area, current village inhabitants and the surrounding flora and fauna.

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).

I believe more can be done

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.

Firstly I hope I have ticked the right boxes for the right reasons as most of the language has confused me. I feel there should be a laymans right to voice their opinions and concerns without worry that they will be overlooked because they did or did not select the right tick box.

I wish to discuss predominately the area of 5.4 North of Grantham road, the area of Radcliffe where I live.

**Pedestrian Crossing needed at Hudson way:-**

This road is heavily congested - as a family I have sometimes had to wait 10 to 15 minutes or even more on occasion on the central reservation near Hudson way to cross with my children as traffic drives too fast to cross, or drivers are looking at their phones - I believe if even more houses are added to the other side of the road a pedestrian crossing needs to be added by Woodside stores to help support families and the elderly and those not able to dash across the road and hope they make it across.

**Recreational space for dog walkers, Play area for Children accessibly by prams, wheelchairs and the elderly.**
Additionally the field next to Hudson way to the west of the planned development at 5.4 north of Grantham road has been used for over 11 years since I have lived here and many many years previously as a recreational space to exercise dogs. As the Bingham road playing field does not allow for exercising dogs nor the field next to the golf course (not accessible via prams/wheelchairs/elderly/)that this area be retained as a exercise filed for dogs. Additionally the children's play area on the Bingham Road fields is not even suitable for the current children in the local area - my recommendation is that this field to the west of the development be a enhanced park with suitable equipment for the children and families in this area.

**Treeline and vegetation**

The current level of trees and green growth along the A52 should be enhanced to maintain the visual look of the village and increased areas of vegetation to help with the pollution level increased generated by even more traffic heading in to the area.

**Traffic through the village**

The traffic is currently overloaded through the center of the village, and at school collection times is even at dangerous levels for children - any part of the application relating to the increase in traffic needs to be looked at. maybe even making the center of the village a no car zone and fully pedestrianized.

---

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,

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 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,

[Signatures]

CA BREWSTER

GL BOURNE
Comment

Consultee                      MR Oliver Boyes (1138246)
Event Name                    Local Plan Part 2 (Publication Draft)
Comment by                   MR Oliver Boyes (1138246)
Comment ID                     35
Response Date                 25/06/18 21:15
Status                        Submitted
Submission Type               Web
Version                       0.1

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

Page number                   33
Paragraph number              4.3
Policy reference              Policy 4.3: Housing Allocation – Land south of Debdale Lane, Keyworth
Site reference                Policy 4.3: Housing Allocation – Land south of Debdale Lane, Keyworth
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).

1 National policy says you should only change green belt boundaries where there are ‘exceptional circumstances’. The plan does not make it clear what the exceptional circumstances are. What
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: (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).

I am very concerned about the use of any Greenfield site around Keyworth, and would argue against any Greenfield use for housing. If Greenfield sites are the only option for new housing, then there are a number of things that need to be taken into consideration.

1 National policy says you should only change green belt boundaries where there are ‘exceptional circumstances’. The plan does not make it clear what the exceptional circumstances are. What is exceptional about Keyworth which means we should be changing the boundaries around the village now?
2 The plans of Keyworth in the document don’t even show High Court Drive, so how can it be lawful to develop a planning policy based on incorrect information?
3 Adverse visual impact due to the high ground goes against national policies on minimising the effect of new developments on the rural landscape
4 Extra traffic goes against national policies on sustainable and environmentally friendly developments
5 The impact on the existing environment, including hedgerows, trees, wildlife, road network and the visual impact of any new buildings on the landscape.
6 Following the publication of the recent Government white paper ‘Fixing our Broken Housing Market’, published in February 2017, can Rushcliffe Council demonstrate that they have reconsidered their plans, and what exactly are the ‘exceptional circumstances’ which justify them wanting to amend the green belt boundary around Keyworth?
7 It is my understanding that local authorities are required to have regard to national government policy on things like this, including emerging policy such as a white paper, and if necessary amend their plans to ensure they take national policy into account. If national policy is moving towards more robust protection of green belt land, then Rushcliffe has got a duty to reconsider any plans which run contrary to that policy prior to any plan being finalised and approved and planning permission approved for new housing on the green belt areas in question.

I strongly disagree that the land south of Debdale lane Site Policy 4.3 as highlighted in the Rushcliffe Local Plan part 2, should be used for housing. My reasons are as follows:
1. The proposal to site 190+ homes on this site South of Debdale Lane will have a major visual impact on the local and wider area. The plot is sited on top of a hill, and is the highest point for up to 15 miles, with views out towards the west, starting from the North and moving anticlockwise for over 150 degrees towards the South. Compared with the other site around Keyworth shown in the Rushcliffe Local Plan, the site South of Debdale Lane are by far the sites with the greatest visual impact on the landscape.

This significant visual impact is both looking out from the village and looking in from the surrounding area, noting that the original Neighbourhood plan sight line photos are not correct. The land north of Bunny Lane is the highest topographically of all the sites proposed, and is visible from many miles away, including, Derby City Centre, Nottingham City centre, Bunny & Bunny Hill, Gotham, A453 up to the M1 junction and Clifton village.

2. Access to this site will be directly via Bunny lane at the edge of Keyworth village. Bunny lane is a key road in to the village, and its rolling/ undulating nature in the 1000m before you enter the village, not lend itself to a major road junction being added. A junction for a large housing development would create a large number of additional vehicles trying to access this road during busy periods throughout the working day, and is likely to become an accident hot spot at busy times during the day.

Bunny Lane is exactly that, a country lane and is not suitable for another 400 to 600 cars per day. It is already very difficult to pass cyclists & horses, on the undulating surface. There have been a number of bad accidents on the lane and at the cross roads over the years. The proposed new housing on land to South of Debdale Lane will do little to reduce this risk.

3. The exits from Pendock Lane at Bradmore & Keyworth Lane at Bunny on to the A60 in the rush hour are almost impossible to negotiate by car, and are very dangerous. The queue to get on to the A60 can be up to 40 cars during times between 7-9am and 5-6pm. The queue back along the A60 from the A52 Nottingham Night bypass roundabout during the same times is already over 3 miles, daily trailing back through Bunny and up Bunny Hill.

With this amount of existing traffic congestion on the West side of Keyworth, the plan for another 400 to 600 vehicles exiting Keyworth along these roads, and adding to the queues, is not acceptable in terms of Health and Safety and the impact it will have on the arterial routes away from Keyworth and its users.

4. The most sensible idea would seem to locate all of the new housing allocation in the sites at policy 4.1 & 4.2, and provide a new double width access and new junction onto the main road A606 Melton Road. This would provide much better access into Nottingham for the whole village. Also the land is relatively low- lying and would have minimal visual impact on the surrounding countryside.

5. National government planning policy states that green belt land should only be used for housing development in “exceptional circumstances.” There is no evidence in any of the proposals that there are exceptional circumstances to justify building on green belt land around Keyworth. Any such development without clearly setting out the exceptional need would therefore be contrary to national planning policy and therefore subject to legal challenge.

6. Such a large new development of more than 400 houses would create a lot more traffic on Bunny Lane. This would be very dangerous - Bunny Lane is a narrow winding country road, is especially popular with cyclists, and has seen many serious accidents already in recent years. If any new development has to happen around the village (which I disagree with) then the other main access roads to Keyworth to the north and east of the village would be far more suitable and link directly to the main A606 Melton Road, which would suggest that sites at policy 4.1, 4.2 & 4.4 would be more suitable. These sites are also on lower lying land hence would also cause far less adverse visual impact than site at Policy 4.3.

7. It is well known that the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan (KNP) was drawn up by parish councillors who had personal conflicts of interest for and against certain sites, because of where they personally live within the village. Those interests were not properly declared or managed when the KNP was being produced. I am very surprised to see that Rushcliffe continue to refer to the KNP within their own consultation document as I understand the police have been involved in investigating certain activities of parish councillors in relation to the Plan. It should be given no weight at all in the consultation exercise while these allegations remain under investigation.
Do you consider that the Local Plan Part 2 complies with the Duty to Co-operate?  

No

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
I do not consider this Policy to be legally compliant as the number of houses proposed is not based on sound evidence. The 2017 Midlands Rural Housing Survey is the most recent evidence base for assessing housing need in Cropwell Bishop, and it concluded that 14 affordable homes and 6 open...
market homes are required to meet real local housing need for those people with local connections. The proposal for 70 houses is therefore grossly disproportionate (more than 300% greater) to the scale of need. The figure of 70 appears to be based on the size of the plot of land brought forward, rather than actual need. By proposing more houses in Cropwell Bishop to meet the shortfall from failure of the private sector to deliver their approved planning permissions on the strategic sites, RBC is contradicting its own approach to sustainable development. Building this many houses that are surplus to real local need, will by definition attract more people to move into the village away from centres of employment and public transport, and who will therefore travel further, commute longer distances to work and thus increase greenhouse gas emissions.

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

(please tick all that apply)

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).

This Policy is not justified as it is not based on up to date evidence, see comments regarding the Midland Rural Housing Needs Survey above. With regard to sustainability, bringing more people into a small village with low local employment opportunities, poor public transport and limited facilities and services is fundamentally unsustainable and would lead to increased emission of greenhouse gases from increased private transport. Para 6.87 of SA clearly recognises this, as it states that the settlement is one of the least accessible third tier settlements. As the key bus service (Villager 2) has recently been withdrawn and replaced with a less frequent service, these credentials are further weakened. There is therefore a negative impact in relation to this transport objective."

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.

The proposed housing numbers should be based on local need rather than on a perceived need to rectify the failures of market forces which have allowed developers with permissions on the Strategic Sites to fail to build houses in a timely manner. RBC’s initial approach in identify Strategic Sites fear the conurbation for development and limiting housebuilding in villages to what is actually needed for local people was sustainable, this approach has now been undermined by these proposals for substantive housing in small villages. A more appropriate scale of housing at this site would be that identified as needed by the Midlands Rural Housing Survey ie. 14 affordable homes and 6 open market homes.

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.

Written representation should be sufficient in this regard, given the available evidence.
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,

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

LINDA BRAMFORD

MICHAEL BRAMFORD
Concerns regarding proposed development plan:

- Harm to the Green Belt area. With Bramham & Newton developments we are at risk if these areas merging as opposed to being distinct living areas.

- Traffic through the village. There is already a high amount of traffic coming through East Bridgford, making the main road difficult to negotiate with the parked cars in the same area. More houses would mean more people travelling through & therefore more cars. The likelihood of people going round the village on the AS2 instead is minimal.

- Amenities. The village school is already at capacity. What alternatives are being proposed?

Signed: [redacted]
Name: [redacted]
Address: [redacted]
To which document does your response relate? Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version

Page number 55-57

Paragraph number 3.103-107

Policy reference Policy 10: Housing Allocation – Land north of Park Lane, Sutton Bonington

Site reference Policy 10: Housing Allocation – Land north of Park Lane, Sutton Bonington

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

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
- Justified
- Effective

---

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).

**- Transport**

Sutton Bonington is next to the busy A6006 and as such, is subject to the effects of increasing traffic congestion. With a proposed East Midlands Freight Terminal & the DNRC development, this already overloaded road is likely to become even busier over the next few years, with no obvious way of expanding the capacity of the road.

This is particularly relevant given the location of Policy 10. The entrance to village already has a tendency to become congested (both in and out of the village) due to the difficulty in getting onto & off the A6006, and the entrance to the site will have to be along this end of Park Lane. This means that access to the site is going to have a negative effect on the increasing traffic pressures, and access itself could potentially be quite dangerous given it’s inevitable location on the blind bend (cannot be any closer to the exit onto A6006, but traffic leaving the site will be hidden from southbound traffic out of the village).

The roads in Sutton Bonington are already subject to overcrowding, particularly around pick up & drop times for the school. This is only going to increase the problem.

Public transport is very poor in Sutton Bonington. An hourly bus travels through into Nottingham but takes an unreasonable 1.5hrs. What this would in is a complete reliance on private transport, where this would not be such a requirement at other sites.

**- Schools**

Sutton Bonington school has recently announced that it would be in a position to increase places by 20, however this is realistically inadequate for the 80+ houses being proposed. The other roadblock is that the school cannot expand beyond its current limits- it is enclosed and already operating past it’s capacity (temporary blocks).

Normanton school, in the neighbouring village (see next point) is relatively close to the proposed site. It is, however, across the other side of the previously mentioned A6006. What this means is crossing the dangerous A-road with small children or having to get across the junction in vehicles. Whilst the latter is likely to be no more than incredibly frustrating on a daily basis for new residents, the former is nothing short of negligent, given the heavy traffic, speed and inability to put traffic calming measures in place (would be quite dangerous to slow the number of lorries feeding into the A6006 down).

**- Proximity to neighbouring village**

Normanton is a mere 200m from the nearest single house & 400m between groupings of houses. There are currently 2 fields separating the villages, which is really the limit before effectively merging them. This is clearly not in keeping with any attempt to preserve rural settlements within the area, and would be detrimental to both villages, which has distinct & individual characters. It would essentially create a 3-mile strip of houses.
- **Effect on village**

Sutton Bonington is a small village and the proposed site will increase the population by 10-20%, which is unacceptable. The village has a rural character that is surely likely to be negatively impacted by a potential development of this size.

As discussed in other points of this letter, the effects on current residents from the perspective of schooling & local amenities are obvious.

- **Flooding**

The Greenfield proposed and surrounding area is subject to regular flooding, due to its location in zone 1 and proximity to zone 2. Park Lane (along with nearby roads) is subjected to flooding already, as are the bordering houses on Charnwood Fields (as we can personally attest to). The majority of our neighbours have also experienced similar flooding in the gardens. There is currently a drainage ditch separating the field but this is not effective enough, and any new development on this site will almost certainly worsen flooding. Local drainage is unknown and therefore the risk of flooding being exacerbated by development is likely.

- **Local services**

The local amenities in the village are limited at present and will not be able to cope with such a large influx of residents. New residents will likely struggle with getting access to at-capacity GP facilities (no room to expand) and will have a negative effect on current residents. This is demonstrated clearly by the example of the parking at the GP surgery at present. Parking is limited to on-street space, which is shared with local residents. This is already beyond reasonable limits and will undoubtedly be increased with new residents. The local shop also has no ability to increase parking.

The new site is highly unlikely to be able to provide for new residents, given the current drive for high-density housing.

- **Poor site for future residents**

Future residents for the proposed site would be subject to the downsides of the location. As previously mentioned the lack of transport could be a factor in geographical isolation and requires private transport for the purposes of work & leisure. There are no local opportunities for employment, hence the need for transport for all residents.

The site is next to a busy A-road on one side, and a railway on another. Behind the railway is the Hatherware industrial estate, which has been linked to chemical production (from waste burning & industrial processes) which could be a potential health risk.

---

**Please add any supporting files (if applicable)**

L.Bridges objection letter.docx

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

No

**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.**

- **Alternative sites**

80-140 houses is a small percentage of the overall number of homes required in the local plan. As previously mentioned this is a huge percentage increase in population & dwellings for the small village, but would represent a much smaller impact at or near some of the other sites proposed, such as Ruddington or Keyworth. The other benefit of considering another site like these (or Cotgrave or Bingham) would be the superior transport links already afforded.
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 or Madam,

Re: Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2, Policy 10 (Land north of Park Lane, Sutton Bonington)

I would like to raise some objections regarding the Policy 10 of the local plan, as stated above. I am a resident on Charnwood Fields and so have some personal reasons for opposing a potential development on the site, however I have also provided some objections to the practicalities of this site within the plan.

- Transport
Sutton Bonington is next to the busy A6006 and as such, is subject to the effects of increasing traffic congestion. With a proposed East Midlands Freight Terminal & the DNRC development, this already overloaded road is likely to become even busier over the next few years, with no obvious way of expanding the capacity of the road.
This is particularly relevant given the location of Policy 10. The entrance to village already has a tendency to become congested (both in and out of the village) due to the difficulty in getting onto & off the A6006, and the entrance to the site will have to be along this end of Park Lane. This means that access to the site is going to have a negative effect on the increasing traffic pressures, and access itself could potentially be quite dangerous given it’s inevitable location on the blind bend (cannot be any closer to the exit onto A6006, but traffic leaving the site will be hidden from southbound traffic out of the village).
The roads in Sutton Bonington are already subject to overcrowding, particularly around pick up & drop times for the school. This is only going to increase the problem.
Public transport is very poor in Sutton Bonington. An hourly bus travels through into Nottingham but takes an unreasonable 1.5hrs. What this would in is a complete reliance on private transport, where this would not be such a requirement at other sites.
- **Schools**
  Sutton Bonington school has recently announced that it would be in a position to increase places by 20, however this is realistically inadequate for the 80+ houses being proposed. The other roadblock is that the school cannot expand beyond its current limits- it is enclosed and already operating past it’s capacity (temporary blocks).
  Normanton school, in the neighbouring village (see next point) is relatively close to the proposed site. It is, however, across the other side of the previously mentioned A6006. What this means is crossing the dangerous A-road with small children or having to get across the junction in vehicles. Whilst the latter is likely to be no more than incredibly frustrating on a daily basis for new residents, the former is nothing short of negligent, given the heavy traffic, speed and inability to put traffic calming measures in place (would be quite dangerous to slow the number of lorries feeding into the A6006 down).

- **Proximity to neighbouring village**
  Normanton is a mere 200m from the nearest single house & 400m between groupings of houses. There are currently 2 fields separating the villages, which is really the limit before effectively merging them. This is clearly not in keeping with any attempt to preserve rural settlements within the area, and would be detrimental to both villages, which has distinct & individual characters. It would essentially create a 3-mile strip of houses.

- **Effect on village**
  Sutton Bonington is a small village and the proposed site will increase the population by 10-20%, which is unacceptable. The village has a rural character that is surely likely to be negatively impacted by a potential development of this size.
  As discussed in other points of this letter, the effects on current residents from the perspective of schooling & local amenities are obvious.

- **Flooding**
  The Greenfield proposed and surrounding area is subject to regular flooding, due to its location in zone 1 and proximity to zone 2. Park Lane (along with nearby roads) is subjected to flooding already, as are the bordering houses on Charnwood Fields (as we can personally attest to). The majority of our neighbours have also experienced similar flooding in the gardens. There is currently a drainage ditch separating the field but this is not effective enough, and any new development on this site will almost certainly worsen flooding. Local drainage is unknown and therefore the risk of flooding being exacerbated by development is likely.

- **Local services**
  The local amenities in the village are limited at present and will not be able to cope with such a large influx of residents. New residents will likely struggle with getting access to at-capacity GP facilities (no room to expand) and will have a negative effect on current residents. This is demonstrated clearly by the example of the parking at the GP surgery at present. Parking is limited to on-street space, which is shared with local residents. This is already beyond reasonable limits
and will undoubtedly be increased with new residents. The local shop also has no ability to increase parking. The new site is highly unlikely to be able to provide for new residents, given the current drive for high-density housing.

- **Poor site for future residents**
  Future residents for the proposed site would be subject to the downsides of the location. As previously mentioned the lack of transport could be a factor in geographical isolation and requires private transport for the purposes of work & leisure. There are no local opportunities for employment, hence the need for transport for all residents.
  The site is next to a busy A-road on one side, and a railway on another. Behind the railway is the Hathernware industrial estate, which has been linked to chemical production (from waste burning & industrial processes) which could be a potential health risk.

- **Personal issues**
  Although we accept that personal objections do not carry a particular heavy weight in planning, it would be amiss to miss them altogether.
  We own one of the properties on Charnwood Fields and have a property that is designed to make particular use of the view over the proposed site. This is clearly very upsetting that the view may be significantly compromised.
  The other immediate concern I have is that I am due to start specialist Anaesthetics training, which will demand antisocial hours and therefore daytime sleep at home. This is likely to be disturbed with any planned development and could not only compromise my physical & mental health, but potentially my patients. This would clearly be out of my control and unacceptable.

- **Alternative sites**
  80-140 houses is a small percentage of the overall number of homes required in the local plan. As previously mentioned this is a huge percentage increase in population & dwellings for the small village, but would represent a much smaller impact at or near some of the other sites proposed, such as Ruddington or Keyworth. The other benefit of considering another site like these (or Cotgrave or Bingham) would be the superior transport links already afforded.

I hope that the contents of this letter are strongly considered, not just from my own perspective but also in realising that this is a completely unsuitable site for future development.

Yours faithfully,

Dr Elizabeth Bridges
Dear Sir or Madam,

Please find attached form LP2 Response form objecting to the proposed new development at Sutton Bonington.

Subsequent to completing the online form, it was noticed that the proposed site is actually south of Park Lane, not north, as stated. Please amend as necessary.

Yours faithfully,

Jill and John M Brodie
Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies Publication Version

Representation Form

This form has two parts:

Part A – Personal details

Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate part B for each issue/representation you wish to make.

Please read the Representation Guidance Notes (available separately) and the Data Protection Notice (see below) before completing the form.

Part A (Please complete in full; in order for the Inspector to consider your representations you must provide your name and postal address).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent’s Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>John and Jill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Brodie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (where relevant)</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title (where relevant)</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 1</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 2</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 3</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 4</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 5</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Part B (please use a separate Part B form for each representation)

Name/Organisation: Mr. and Mrs. John and Jill Brodie

3a. To which document does your response relate? (please tick one)

- Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version
- Local Plan Part 2 Policies Map
- Other supporting document please state which: Click here to enter text.

3b. To which part of the document does this representation relate? (complete all that apply)

- Page no. ?
- Paragraph no. ?
- Policy ref. Policy 10: Housing Allocation – Land north of Park Lane, Sutton Bonington
- Site ref. Policy 10: Housing Allocation – Land north of Park Lane, Sutton Bonington
- Policies Map Click here to enter text.

4. Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2:

- 4(1) Legally compliant Yes □ No □
- 4(2) Sound Yes □ No □
- 4(3) Complies with the Duty to Co-operate Yes □ No □

→ If you have selected No to Question 4(2), please continue to Question 5.
→ In all other circumstances, please go to Question 6.

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).

5. If you consider the Development Plan is UNSOUND, do you consider this to be because it is NOT: (please tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positively Prepared</th>
<th>Justified</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Consistent with national policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Please give reasons for you answer to Questions 4(1), 4(2), 4(3) and 5, 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). You can attach additional information but please make sure it is securely attached and clearly referenced.

We are horrified to hear of plans to develop land North of Park Lane, Sutton Bonington for a minimum of 80 new houses, with a site that has the potential to be increased to incorporate further new homes. The A6006 that abuts this land has had numerous serious accidents on it through careless and speeding drivers and has had warning signs to alert drivers and motorcyclists to the dangers thereupon for many years now, being so close an access road to the Donington Circuit.

The proposed site is at the bottom and climbing the hill adjacent to the road and Hathernware Industrial Estate, where we understand there are already complaints from villagers of unacceptable activities involving public health from plastics being burnt illegally.

The flood plane around this area is subject to flooding every year and an increase in housing en masse will only add to this flooding problem. The River Soar floods numerous times every year and has been flooded into the villages of Sutton Bonington and Normanton-on-Soar historically. Indeed, it is only a few weeks ago since Normanton-on-Soar residents were on national T.V. showing evidence of the flooding of homes that had already been flooded earlier in the winter months.

There is already an increase in road users of the A6006 owing to the newly constructed DNRC.

From a personal point of view, we have lived on Melton Lane, Sutton Bonington for 25 years and have seen a dramatic increase in the amount of 'rat race' traffic as drivers use it to cut through to the far side of Kegworth and consequently avoid having to use the junction onto the A6 at Zouch and subsequent traffic queues, which can be substantial in busy times and downright gridlocked when there is an incident on the M1.

Speeding vehicles have long been a problem on Melton Lane, which adjoins Trowell Lane where it meets the junction with the A6006 less than a mile from Sutton Bonington village junction (Park Lane) and literally the other side of Hathernware Industrial Estate, adjoining the proposed site for the new housing development. Any traffic from this proposed site would inevitably turn left instead of right, then turn left at the top of the hill into Trowell Lane and Melton Lane to get to Kegworth and beyond for Derby, Nottingham, East Midlands Airport, East Midlands new logistics park under construction currently, the M1
Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
(If you are suggesting that the Local Plan Part 2 is legally compliant or sound please write “Not applicable”).

Click here to enter text.

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing sessions of the Public Examination? (please tick one box only)

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.

Yes, I wish to appear at the examination

If you have selected No, your representation(s) will still be considered by the independent Planning Inspector by way of written representations.

9. If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions of Public Examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Click here to enter text.

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.

10. 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

Date form completed 06/06/2018

Please return the completed form by no later than 5pm on Thursday 28 June 2018 to:

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.

localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk; or

Planning Policy
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rushcliffe Arena
Rugby Road,
Nottingham
NG2 7YG

(Electronic copies of this form are available to download at www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy).

If you have any questions, please contact the Planning Policy team by telephone on 0115 981 9911, or email at localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk

---

Data Protection Notice

The personal information you provide will only be used by Rushcliffe Borough Council, the Data Controller, in accordance with General Data Protection Regulation 2016/Data Protection Act 2018 to undertake a statutory function (also known as a ‘public task’)

Your personal information will be shared with the Planning Inspectorate in connection with the above purpose.

Your personal data will be kept in accordance with the Council’s retention policy and schedule. Details of which can be found on the Council’s website at http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/retention_schedule/

Your data protection rights are not absolute and in most cases are subject to the Council demonstrating compliance with other statutory legislation, for further information see http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/privacy/

Representations will be available to view on the Borough Council’s website, but any signatures, addresses, email addresses or telephone numbers will not be included. However, as copies of representations must be made available for public inspection, comments cannot be treated as confidential and will be available for inspection in full.
Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies Publication Version

Representation Form

Please return by 5pm on Thursday 28 June 2018 to:
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road
Nottingham
NG2 7YG

This form has two parts:

Part A – Personal details
Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate part B for each issue/representation you wish to make.

Please read the Representation Guidance Notes (available separately) and the Data Protection Notice (see below) before completing the form.

Part A (Please complete in full; in order for the Inspector to consider your representations you must provide your name and postal address).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent's Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title (where relevant)</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Part B (please use a separate Part B form for each representation)

Name/Organisation: 

3a. To which document does your response relate? (please tick one)

Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version
Local Plan Part 2 Policies Map

Other supporting document [please state which]:

3b. To which part of the document does this representation relate? (complete all that apply)

Page no. 29
Paragraph no.
Policy ref. 4.4
Site ref.

Policies Map

4. Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2:

4(1) Legally compliant [Yes] [No]
4(2) Sound [Yes] [No]
4(3) Complies with the Duty to Co-operate [Yes] [No]

→ If you have selected No to Question 4(2), please continue to Question 5.
→ In all other circumstances, please go to Question 6.

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.

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable sustainable development and be consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

5. If you consider the Development Plan is UNSOUND, do you consider this to be because it is NOT: (please tick all that apply)

- Positively Prepared
- Justified
- Effective
- Consistent with national policy

6. Please give reasons for you answer to Questions 4(1), 4(2), 4(3) and 5, 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, Habitual Regulations Assessment or Equalities Impact Assessment). You can attach additional information but please make sure it is securely attached and clearly referenced.

I Support the BBC plan, (see there is no reason to not expand coslact on a brownfield site coming towards castlehe and also with an extra on brown lane in the food as the best site for houses as it is close to the village center.

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan Part 2 legally compliant or sound, having regard to your responses to Questions 5 and 6. 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.

(If you are suggesting that the Local Plan Part 2 is legally compliant or sound please write "Not applicable").

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing sessions of the Public Examination? (please tick one box only)

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.

Yes, I wish to appear at the examination

If you have selected No, your representation(s) will still be considered by the independent Planning Inspector by way of written representations.

9. If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions of Public Examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

(Please continue on a separate sheet if 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.

10. 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

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Please return the completed form by no later than 5pm on Thursday 28 June 2018 to:

localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk; or

Planning Policy
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rushcliffe Arena
Rugby Road,
Nottingham
NG2 7YG

(Electronic copies of this form are available to download at www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy).

If you have any questions, please contact the Planning Policy team by telephone on 0115 981 9911, or email at localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Data Protection Notice

The personal information you provide will only be used by Rushcliffe Borough Council, the Data Controller, in accordance with General Data Protection Regulation 2016/Data Protection Act 2018 to undertake a statutory function (also known as a 'public task')

Your personal information will be shared with the Planning Inspectorate in connection with the above purpose.

Your personal data will be kept in accordance with the Council's retention policy and schedule. Details of which can be found on the Council's website at http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/retention_schedule/

Your data protection rights are not absolute and in most cases are subject to the Council demonstrating compliance with other statutory legislation, for further information see http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/privacy/

Representations will be available to view on the Borough Council's website, but any signatures, addresses, email addresses or telephone numbers will not be included. However, as copies of representations must be made available for public inspection, comments cannot be treated as confidential and will be available for inspection in full.

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies Publication Version

Representation Form

Please return by 5pm on Thursday 28 June 2018 to: Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road
Nottingham
NG2 7YG

This form has two parts:

Part A – Personal details

Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate part B for each issue/representation you wish to make.

Please read the Representation Guidance Notes (available separately) and the Data Protection Notice (see below) before completing the form.

**Part A** (Please complete in full; in order for the Inspector to consider your representations you must provide your name and postal address).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent's Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Part B (please use a separate Part B form for each representation)

Name/Organisation: 

3a. To which document does your response relate? (please tick one)

Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version [ ] Local Plan Part 2 Policies Map [ ]

Other supporting document [ ] please state which: 

3b. To which part of the document does this representation relate? (complete all that apply)

Page no. 30-34 Paragraph no. 4.4 Policy ref. 4.4

Site ref. 

Policies Map 30

4. Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2:

4(1) Legally compliant Yes [ ] No [ ]

4(2) Sound Yes [ ] No [ ]

4(3) Complies with the Duty to Co-operate Yes [ ] No [ ]

→ If you have selected No to Question 4(2), please continue to Question 5.
→ In all other circumstances, please go to Question 6.

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.

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable sustainable development and be consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

5. If you consider the Development Plan is UNSOUND, do you consider this to be because it is NOT: (please tick all that apply)

- Positively Prepared
- Justified
- Effective
- Consistent with national policy

6. Please give reasons for you answer to Questions 4(1), 4(2), 4(3) and 5, 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). You can attach additional information but please make sure it is securely attached and clearly referenced.

My daughter attends school in Keyworth and if we were to move to the Keyworth area we would actively look to the Bunny Lane area. It would suit for walking to the school and be close to all the local amenities and already on local bus routes. Hillside farm would be an excellent location for development in the village.

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan Part 2 legally compliant or sound, having regard to your responses to Questions 5 and 6. 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.

(If you are suggesting that the Local Plan Part 2 is legally compliant or sound please write "Not applicable").
8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing sessions of the Public Examination? (please tick one box only)

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

Yes, I wish to appear at the examination

If you have selected No, your representation(s) will still be considered by the independent Planning Inspector by way of written representations.

9. If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions of Public Examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

(Please continue on a separate sheet if 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.

10. 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

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Please return the completed form by no later than 5pm on Thursday 28 June 2018 to:

localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk; or

Planning Policy
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rushcliffe Arena
Rugby Road,
Nottingham
NG2 7YG

(Electronic copies of this form are available to download at www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy).

If you have any questions, please contact the Planning Policy team by telephone on 0115 981 9911, or email at localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk

---

**Data Protection Notice**

The personal information you provide will only be used by Rushcliffe Borough Council, the Data Controller, in accordance with General Data Protection Regulation 2016/Data Protection Act 2018 to undertake a statutory function (also known as a ‘public task’)

Your personal information will be shared with the Planning Inspectorate in connection with the above purpose.

Your personal data will be kept in accordance with the Council’s retention policy and schedule. Details of which can be found on the Council’s website at [http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/retention_schedule/](http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/retention_schedule/)

Your data protection rights are not absolute and in most cases are subject to the Council demonstrating compliance with other statutory legislation, for further information see [http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/privacy/](http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/privacy/)

Reprsentations will be available to view on the Borough Council’s website, but any signatures, addresses, email addresses or telephone numbers will not be included. However, as copies of representations must be made available for public inspection, comments cannot be treated as confidential and will be available for inspection in full.

---

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
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. This is a document existing before you made the proposals for the above plan.
- is unsound as it has not followed existing and proposed national policy on use of smaller sites and housing numbers. Again, Rushcliffe not acting in accordance with government policy. Similar queries have ruined East Leake.
- is unsound in that it unnecessarily removes land from the green belt. You should be making positive efforts to retain greenbelt and build on ‘brown’ land.
- 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]

Ian Brown
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: Effective
(please tick all that apply)

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 plan states that Ruddington can sustain around 350 new houses to be built across 3 sites, ref - 6.1,6.2 and 6.3 totaling 350 homes. However, the recent planning inspector decision which gave outline planning permission of the Asher lane development is an additional 175 homes, thus making the total in excess of 500. For a village whose resources and infrastructure can be at times pushed to capacity this additional new homes is unsustainable.

A reasonable plan would be to re-consider and drop the 6.1 Land West of Wilford Road proposal of 130 homes, as the infrastructure here is very limited and the additional homes onto roads that are already congested will cause distress for residents.

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
Please return by 5pm on Thursday 28 June 2018 to: Rushcliffe Borough Council, Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road, Nottingham, NG2 7YG

This form has two parts:

Part A – Personal details

Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate part B for each issue/representation you wish to make.

Please read the Representation Guidance Notes (available separately) and the Data Protection Notice (see below) before completing the form.

**Part A** (Please complete in full; in order for the inspector to consider your representations you must provide your name and postal address).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent's Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mr</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>VICTORIA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>BROWN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation</strong> (where relevant)</td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job title</strong> (where relevant)</td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 1</strong></td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 2</strong></td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 3</strong></td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 4</strong></td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 5</strong></td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postcode</strong></td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-mail Address</strong></td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone Number</strong></td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Part B (please use a separate Part B form for each representation)

Name/Organisation:

3a. To which document does your response relate? (please tick one)

Local Plan Part 2
Publication Version

Local Plan Part 2 Policies Map

Other supporting document please state which:

3b. To which part of the document does this representation relate? (complete all that apply)

Page no. 33/34

Paragraph no.

Policy ref. 4.4

Site ref. Policies menu

4. Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2:

4(1) Legally compliant

Yes ☑

4(2) Sound

Yes ☑

4(3) Complies with the Duty to Co-operate

Yes ☑

→ If you have selected No to Question 4(2), please continue to Question 5.
→ In all other circumstances, please go to Question 6.

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.

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable sustainable development and be consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

5. If you consider the Development Plan is UNSOUND, do you consider this to be because it is NOT: (please tick all that apply)

- Positively Prepared
- Justified
- Effective
- Consistent with national policy

6. Please give reasons for you answer to Questions 4(1), 4(2), 4(3) and 5, 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). You can attach additional information but please make sure it is securely attached and clearly referenced.

I am aware that there are four sites for development however I feel that Hillside Farm is the ideal site and the preferred choice. Overall this is an excellent plan, it includes the best sites for housing in Keyworth, especially to the west and in particular 4.4 (Hillside Farm). This is a good site, close to village amenities and a location that I would choose to live as opposed to the alternative locations if I were looking to buy again and move property in Keyworth.

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan Part 2 legally compliant or sound, having regard to your responses to Questions 5 and 6. 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.

(If you are suggesting that the Local Plan Part 2 is legally compliant or sound please write 'Not applicable')

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
6. **If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing sessions of the Public Examination?** (please tick one box only)

- [ ] **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.
- [ ] **Yes, I wish to appear at the examination**

If you have selected **No**, your representation(s) will still be considered by the independent Planning Inspector by way of written representations.

---

9. **If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions of Public Examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:**

   

   (Please continue on a separate sheet if 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.

---

10. **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

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Please return the completed form by no later than 5pm on Thursday 28 June 2018 to:

localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk, or

Planning Policy
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rushcliffe Arena
Rugby Road,
Nottingham
NG2 7YG

(Electronic copies of this form are available to download at www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy).

If you have any questions, please contact the Planning Policy team by telephone on 0115 981 9911, or email at localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Protection Notice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The personal information you provide will only be used by Rushcliffe Borough Council, the Data Controller, in accordance with General Data Protection Regulation 2016/Data Protection Act 2018 to undertake a statutory function (also known as a ‘public task’).

Your personal information will be shared with the Planning Inspectorate in connection with the above purpose.

Your personal data will be kept in accordance with the Council’s retention policy and schedule. Details of which can be found on the Council’s website at http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/retention schedule/

Your data protection rights are not absolute and in most cases are subject to the Council demonstrating compliance with other statutory legislation, for further information see http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/privacy/

Representations will be available to view on the Borough Council’s website, but any signatures, addresses, email addresses or telephone numbers will not be included. However, as copies of representations must be made available for public inspection, comments cannot be treated as confidential and will be available for inspection in full.

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Dear Sirs. My representations concerning the above Plan -

Developments
No site proposed for development should extend up to any Green Belt boundaries, e.g. RUD 8 extended up to Clifton, & RUD 2 extended up to Wilford.

There needs to be adequate improvements made of access to sites proposed for development, e.g. Flawforth Lane from Ruddington South East (Ecoplants) to it's junction with A60 Loughborough Road, also the existing roundabout on the A60 Loughborough Road at Mere Way. Both need more lanes for traffic, which queues during rush hours.

The developments proposed in the above Plan will emphasise the need for an extension to the NET tram route into Ruddington village.

Similarly, there will be a need for a Park and Ride site, with dedicated buses, and restrictions to all-day parking in Ruddington village.

The approval of the Asher Lane development by the national Planning Inspectorate should not be accepted at face value, it is clearly now a proposal which must be considered in the context of the above Plan. Is it a result of inadequate briefing of the Inspectorate?

Traffic lights at the Kirk Lane/High Street/Charles Street crossroads is not acceptable in the conservation area of Ruddington; queues of lorries waiting for the lights to change are similarly unacceptable, with the associated pollution.

Consultation
I wish to be notified by post of -

all actions and procedures affecting the boundaries and extent of the built urban area of the village of Ruddington.
Any encroachments on the Green Belt surrounding the village of Ruddington.
all planning enquiries proposals applications amendments and approvals in the postcode area of NG11 6NF, Old Road.

Thanking you in anticipation,
Yours faithfully

Peter Burnett
Comment

Consultee: mr Peter Burnett (1166984)
Event Name: Local Plan Part 2 (Publication Draft)
Comment by: mr Peter Burnett (1166984)
Comment ID: 29
Response Date: 25/06/18 11:27
Status: Submitted
Submission Type: Web
Version: 0.1

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

If you answered 'other supporting document' please state which document you refer to
Rushcliffe Green Belt Review email dated Mar 30 2017

Policy reference: Policy 6.2: Housing Allocation – Land south of Flawforth Lane, Ruddington

Site reference: Policy 6.2: Housing Allocation – Land south of Flawforth Lane, Ruddington

Policies Map: Yes

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

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.
2. **Justified** – the plan should be based on evidence, and be the most appropriate strategy for the district when considered against other reasonable alternatives.
3. **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

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
Comment

Consultee mr Peter Burnett (1166984)
Event Name Local Plan Part 2 (Publication Draft)
Comment by mr Peter Burnett (1166984)
Comment ID 30
Response Date 25/06/18 11:31
Status Submitted
Submission Type Web
Version 0.1

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

If you answered 'other supporting document' please state which document you refer to Rushcliffe Green Belt Review email dated Mar 30 2017

Page number 100
Paragraph number 3b
Policy reference Policy 6.3: Housing Allocation – Land opposite Mere Way, Ruddington
Site reference Policy 6.3: Housing Allocation – Land opposite Mere Way, Ruddington

Policies Map Yes

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

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
### Comment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>mr Peter Burnett (1166984)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event Name</td>
<td>Local Plan Part 2 (Publication Draft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment by</td>
<td>mr Peter Burnett (1166984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Date</td>
<td>25/06/18 11:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission Type</td>
<td>Web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**To which document does your response relate?**

Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version

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

Rushcliffe Green Belt Review email dated Mar 30 2017

**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

**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 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
Please find attached a letter and attachment for submission to the inspector as part of their considerations of the Rushcliffe local plan part 2.
Apologies for the last minute and would be obliged to receive your acknowledgement of receipt.

Kind regards

Mary

Mary Butler & Peter Williams

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com
June 27th 2018

**Rushcliffe Borough Council Local Plan Part 2**

We would bring the following matters to the attention of the Planning inspector in regards to the inclusion of Hillside farm (Key 13) by Rushcliffe Borough Council in their Local Plan Part 2 in respect of housing within Keyworth and in particular in reference to Hillside Farm Policy no 4.4 which make policy 4.4 Unsound and should be removed from the plan.

Rushcliffe Borough Council has in their Local Plan part 2 incorrectly included Hillside Farm Keyworth (Key13) Policy 4.4 as suitable to be removed from the Greenbelt and designated it for housing development for 50 / 70 / 90 houses?

Whilst we appreciate the arduous requirement on them to identify additional housing land, primarily due to the failure of the existing allocations made in their Local Plan Part 1 (which included the 450 new homes that Keyworth has already agreed to in preparing its Neighbourhood Plan) to build out at a rate to satisfy their 5 year land supply requirements. This apparently scientific exercise has for reasons explained later resulted in an incorrect conclusion that will very very likely not even achieve the very minor (RBC quotation) contribution to RBC housing target.

It is very likely that the 3 major sites
Key 4A (Nicker Hill Policy 4.1),
Key 8 (Plat Lane / Station Road Policy 4.2)
Key 10 (Bunny Lane North / Debdale Lane South – Policy 4.3) which have numbers of 530 in the current local plan part 2 and similarly identified for housing in the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan will actually come forward with proposed housing numbers from the developers that will largely satisfy Rushcliffe Borough Councils new assessment that Keyworth can sustainably support 590 new houses.

Key 4a (policy 4.1) is already being promoted by the developers at a forthcoming exhibition with 160 homes.
North of Bunny Lane (policy 4.3) – Has shown numbers in excess of 200 in various versions and has the most flexibility to accommodate significant affordable housing so come in at a greater density. This site is still being incorrectly referred to by Rushcliffe as “South of Debdale Lane” This site will only be accessible by car from Bunny Lane, houses will front onto Bunny lane (not Debdale lane) it will have its major effects on Bunny Lane. This name again reinforcing something of a lack of local knowledge by Rushcliffe in their preparation of local plan part 2.

Rushcliffe has a comfortable cushion built into its projected housing numbers in Local plan part 2.

Sites elsewhere in Rushcliffe not identified in this plan but being won on appeal by developers are also adding regularly to their housing supply numbers.

Brownfield sites with Keyworth are currently being developed that will provide windfall homes in double numbers and the interim findings from the house building investigations being carried out by Oliver Letwin suggest that he will be presenting the Govt. with proposals in the autumn that both explain the rate of build out at larger sites and suggest concrete reasons how this can be increased 0 the major issue faced by Rushcliffe in satisfying their 5 year housing supply.

So No sites additional to Key 4A, 8 & 10 should be or need to be allocated for housing in in Keyworth in the Rushcliffe local plan Part 2
For the following reasons Key 13 Hillside policy 4.4 is currently but unsoundly included in Rushcliffe Borough Council Local Plan Part 2

1. Rushcliffe Borough Council should follow the “Housing and other recommendations” contained in The Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan.

1.12* The final development strategy brought forward by the KNPD, illustrated by the Proposals Map in Appendix 1, is a combination of Option 1a and 2, as set out in the original series of options. The Housing (H) and Economic Development (ED) policies set out the KNPD Development Strategy which will support the forthcoming allocation of sites as part of the Local Plan: Part 2. The preferred sites, which are supported and which in ideal circumstances would form part of that document, are set out in Appendix 3 of this document.

*Keyworth Neighbourhood plan Adopted May 2018.
This Neighbourhood plan received overwhelmingly support by local residents in the referendum with turnout and numbers voting for it far in excess of any previous consultations or those submitting representations. If Rushcliffe insist that additional land in Keyworth is to be immediately allocated for housing (which my previous arguments say is not necessary) then it should be the safeguarded land identified in adopted Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan.

It is only a quirk of the planning system and its misalignment with the localism agenda that mean the housing land allocations in our adopted neighbourhood plan only have the legal status of recommendations and not formal allocations. The right to make such allocations seemed not to have been included in the legislation encouraging villages such as ours to determine our own development though the Neighbourhood planning process. It only subsequently emerging that Keyworth being surrounded by Greenbelt would not have the legal authority to do more than make recommendations.

This should however not stop Rushcliffe BC who hold the legal power from respecting Kenworth’s recommendations as binding and show that local democracy matters. To not do so makes their plan unsound under almost every interpretation of the guidance provided and certainly not positively prepared.

Keyworth started to undertake its neighbourhood plan very early in the Neighbourhood planning system (part of the second wave) The people of Keyworth entered into this process with enthusiasm that whilst it was felt that 450 new houses was a larger number than the village needed to be sustainable in its balance of young and across income levels and continue to thrive long term, it accepted that development was going to happen. It knew that it would mean the loss of Greenbelt fields and that we were better to engage proactively in deciding how this should happen than simply allowing Rushcliffe to do so.

The people were however misled into believing that they would be allocating land for housing in their neighbourhood plan, only to be told when consultations and enquiries were concluding that because the land it would be allocating for housing in its neighbourhood plan is Greenbelt (from the beginning an obvious, known and accepted fact by Keyworth since the village is surrounded by Greenbelt with no significant undeveloped area within the village envelope)

Additionally of note within Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan

Key Views in and out of the village. Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan POLICY HC3 – Developments that affect Key Views into the village including those to the conservation area will be resisted. These Key Views include those across Key 13 so when it came to planning any proposed development would be constrained by this policy.
2. Rushcliffe in creating their Local Plan part 2 have NOT maintained an awareness of the implications on Key 13 (Hillside Farm) of current developments at the very active FARMSTEAD at Hillside farm (under separate ownership) It is incorrect of Rushcliffe simply to refer to it in Policy 4.4 as the neighbouring farm which gives the impression of the site bordering on fields

Applications 17/01570 & 17/01575 submitted July 2017 and approved in October 2017, gave approval to two agricultural buildings. These buildings have now been constructed. There are now 2 very new Large Barns 10 M high (they were constructed on built up land on a ridge and not cut into the hill) with unrestricted permission to house 450 animals and farm machinery alongside a large farmyard in operation up to 20 hours a day located directly on the boundary of Key13

Current farming practices at Greenhay’s farm which will be transferred across to Hillside the “adjacent farm” to policy 4.4. alongside housing 450 animals.

Greenhays Farm will be demolished as it stands on Land South of Debdale / North of bunny Lane Policy 4.3

These New Barns will have associated manure heaps for the animal waste. Environmental health recommendations are that these should not be sited within 150m of residential properties so any subsequent planning application for Key13 would not be permitted to have housing within 150m of those heaps effectively making the site undevelopable so an unsound inclusion for housing in the local plan part 2.

3. Rushcliffe Have not properly or reasonably compared Key 13 to all of the possible sites around Keyworth which would be much easier to develop and seem in their assessments
to have prioritised one purpose of Greenbelt protection above others. This makes the policy 4.4 Unsound

They claim that sites other than Hillside Farm are less sustainable yet if one actually examines their summary then the assessments for many of the secondary sites (ignoring 4A 8 &10) are fairly equal and if one correctly assesses Key 13 against Landscape Value which should be a negative not neutral then this site would be even less sustainable.

Rushcliffe dismiss out of hand Key 1&2 in their reports to Cabinet, Council and Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies Housing Site Selection Report April 2018 “to prevent coalescence of Stanton and Keyworth” (which were not assed as part of the Keyworth neighbourhood plan as technically located in Stanton). Stanton and Keyworth are already coalesced. Stanton Lane, Stanton is not a separate settlement is it a continuation of Nicker Hill Keyworth, it is more separate from the other parts of Stanton, than it is from Keyworth.

The official address of Willowbrook School which is technically located in Stanton is - Willow Brook, Keyworth, Nottingham. NG12 5BB

The same for Keyworth Catholic Church - St Margaret Clitherow Willow Brook, Keyworth NG12 5BB
Stanton has no local resources except a garden centre and a petrol station. Stanton residents rely upon the shops and other resources of Keyworth. Stanton is essentially 2 very separate ribbon developments.

Keyworth and the part of Stanton located on Stanton lane and Willowbrook are essentially one and the same village already permanently coalesced. The idea that the Greenbelt contributes to keeping them as separate settlements is a misrepresentation of the current reality

Their Justification for not including **Key 9** (Land North of Debdale Lane) – identified as “recommended for safeguarded land” in the adopted Keyworth neighbourhood plan “unsuitable due to urban sprawl”. Keyworth is a rural village not an urban centre and as such all development on its edge could be described as “urban sprawl” Key13 would be an identical protrusion into the countryside so should be unsuitable due to prevention of urban sprawl. With Key13 being additionally highly visible as it is on an approach to the village whereas Key 9 is accessed from the middle of the village and hidden by the contours of the land. They then further dismiss this site simply by saying that selected allocations are more sustainable which when one reviews their summary is just not the case.

They ignores the important greenbelt purposes that development of Key 13 would be contrary to the removal of High Grade Farm Land and impact upon the openness of the countryside

The current landowner has over the past few years, sought to block off views across it, allowed hedges on Bunny lane to grow unrestrained and to use it to park an old car and other miscellaneous items on, however **Key 13 Hillside Farm remains High Value Greenbelt Land.**

They have completely failed to properly assess visual receptors for this site. To the extent that it is not clear that they actually walked the whole site making their sustainability assessment not sufficiently thorough or Sound.

Visually, there is little value related to the site, which **does not form part of the visual amenity for any receptors**.


This is clearly incorrect as this photograph from our dining table illustrates. All of the houses on Roseland Close are visual receptors for this site
They have failed to properly assess the effect on the amount of the site that will actually be developable and contribute to the housing supply due to the need to ensure the amenity of any new householders is protected from overlooking. Significant overlooking will occur from all the homes on Roseland close that adjoin the site. All of the properties have main windows orientated to the site and gardens that are built up and overlook the site.

Overlooking that will occur from our balcony over 2/3rd of the site at Hillside Farm

In our case (9 Roseland Close) the existing large 1st floor balcony located effectively on 2nd floor level (in relation to the adjacent land levels of Key 13) and the as yet unbuilt but having planning permission that would create a second balcony on the west facing side of this property and the permission 03/01368/FUL (building has been in progress since 2003) that permits the doubling in size of the existing as built balcony mean that large swathes of the site will be overlooked at high level and cause considerable difficulty in designing-in sufficient privacy for any new properties.
4. Failure to look at their proposed housing sites in the round and appreciate that even if it were possible to make safe road access from the steeply sloping Key13 up onto Bunny lane (where most of the traffic would be making a right turn) that such access would almost certainly impact upon any necessary access to the much larger and more important site Key10 policy 4.3 (which should ideally have 2 access roads)

Rushcliffe highlight traffic issues as a main issue raised in respect of Key 10. The congestion, road speeds, blind dip and so difficulty of creating a safe access onto Bunny lane is highlight as a significant issue in all of the previous highways consultations for RBC local plan and Keyworth Neighbourhood plans. However no mentioned or mitigation in any way in is in policy 4.3. To add an access into Hillside policy 4.4 will compound and maybe make impossible the access to 4.3 They make no mention of the physical difficulty in making access in policy 4.4. despite the top edge of the site being several meters below the level of the road.

The Hillside site drops away quickly to the extent that the roof level of the barn is below the highway level. The current farm access (illustrated) is very steeply inclined. Brookview Drive 100m further along Bunny lane in Keyworth is the nearest comparison to a possible access road onto Hillside (policy 4.4) Although Brookview Drive is not as steep and drops over a longer distance it is still unusable when there is any significant snowfall. Rushcliffe provide a grit bin as in indication of the seriousness of the slope. Fortunately Brookview Drive has two entrances and the second more gently slope up to Main street means that residents can maintain access in most weathers. This will not be the case for any new development on Hillside and there will be several snow days each year when the residents will not be able to access Bunny Lane.

Should the inspector still find sound reason that this land at Hillside Farm should be included then the local plan must be amended to ensure that the following serious matters are specifically referred to and mitigated in the local plan policy 4.4

a) Water Course
Whilst some general policy reference are made to watercourses in the case of Hillside Farm a specific detailed long term and fully funded plan must be referred to. A Plan Agreed with the property owners on Roseland Close must be in place for the management and maintenance of the 2 watercourses located on the eastern (between Key13 and the properties on Roseland Close) and southern edges of Key13. Vehicular (mechanical digger) The properties are subject to undercutting if these ditches are not maintained. Machinery access to the watercourse on the Eastern edge is only available from Key13 and regular maintenance is necessary as the Roseland Close properties are on built up land
which has been subject to undercutting from the quantity of water discharged from Bunny lane that uses the watercourse, which will irrespective of any SUDS plan invariable increase to some extent by the development of the land North of Bunny Lane (policy 4.3)

Photo shows previous flooding on Bunny Lane that discharges into the watercourse

The top end of his watercourse was the subject of partial culverting by Rushcliffe borough council in the 1990’s but below that runs in a deep field ditch and previous indications by Seven Trent are that they will not permit it to be piped. It was the subject of major attention by digger some 5/6 years ago.

The requirement to ensure access is detailed in the charges register for Hillside Farm yet no mention has been made of this restraint by the developer who is promoting this property as per the plans displayed (the only documents in the public realm) as part of the development of the Keyworth Neighbourhood plan which showed development covering the entire site.

C: Charges Register (Hillside Farm) – extract from HM land Register.
1 The land is subject to rights of drainage ancillary rights of access for maintenance purposes in favour of the adjoining housing estate known as Brookview Meadows.

b) Visual amenity and privacy of existing residents
As shown by the previous picture taken from our dining room table our house is located close to the western edge with primary living rooms within meters of the proposed site. It is important that the policy makes specific reference to preserving the privacy and amenity of the existing residential properties

c) Privacy of new residents
As the properties on Roseland Close are built on made up land then they are already several meters higher than the adjoining Hillside Farm effectively putting gardens at 1st floor level. As mentioned previously we have a balcony at 1st floor level as well as window at 2nd floor (effectively 3rd floor level) It is important that the policy is specific in regards to ensuring the privacy and amenity of the new residential properties and that the residents are not subject to overlooking in gardens and rooms

d) Legal Ownership and deliverability – I am unsure if this matter is covered within your enquiries but as raised in an as yet unanswered letter written to Rushcliffe Borough council (copy attached) when it became clear that they had serious intentions to include Hillside farm in their local plan the legal boundary between the properties on Roseland Close and Hillside farm is unclear. This lack of clarity has not been an issue (maintenance matters have been dealt with on a cooperative fashion between ourselves and the landowner) However the confusion about this cannot exist if this field is to becomes a development site. Clarification should there be prolonged dispute would result on deliverability and the matter should ideally be referred to in any policy.
To conclude I would urge the Planning inspector to see the inherent but perhaps intended flaws in the process that has been carried out and resulted incorrectly in the inclusion of Hillside Farm Policy 4.4 in the Rushcliffe Borough Council Local Plan Part 2.

I am not a planning professional and so apologise and ask for the inspectors indulgence if the incorrect planning phrase has been attached to my reasoning but ask that respect is given to the intention and content of issues I have raised. I ask that they do what they can to ensure that Rushcliffe Borough Council respect local democracy, a position held by the Parish Council and our Local Borough Councillors and so remove this policy 4.4 and follow the now adopted Keyworth Neighbourhood plan and its long considered and consulted upon recommendations in the creation of their Local Plan part 2.

I am happy to appear at the enquiry and explain these points and how they affect the Local Plan should it not be clear from my written submission.

Yours sincerely

Mary Butler

Attachment – copy of letter Mary Butler 27.11.17 to RBC re site 376 in SHLAA
Phillip Marshall,
Planning Policy,
Rushcliffe Borough Council,
Civic Centre, Pavilion Road,
West Bridgford,
Nottingham,
NG2 5FE.

Via Email: _______________________

November 27th 2017

Attachments: Land registry Entry Hillside Farm, Bunny Lane Keyworth
Letter to Mr Smeeton regarding discharge from High Court Drive

Dear Mr Marshall,

**Strategic Housing Land Supply site 376 – Hillside Farm Bunny Lane Keyworth**

This letter is not intended just as a response to your current consultation on your preferred sites for housing as part of your preparations for part 2 of your local plan but is prompted by the very unexpected (given the extensive work done by the neighbourhood planning process) inclusion of the above site in your preferred locations for Keyworth. As such I would appreciate a direct response to the matters I raise since it may be that I will have to instigate a more formal and no doubt protracted course of action with the owner / developer to establish the unknowns about the site.

I am the owner of 9 Roseland Close Keyworth, NG12 5LQ. This house although situated on the Brookview Drive estate development was not part of the ‘standard’ 1970’s development of Roseland Close by the developers Richard Costain Homes. This house was developed by the previous owners of ‘The bungalow’ Bunny Lane Keyworth (now demolished) and the field OS field no 37 (1921 edition). This field, located to the south of Bunny Lane, sat adjacent to what at the time was field 8768 on which Hillside Farm was subsequently developed from which site SHLAA 376 (showing as land reference 9169 on your current land search) has evolved.

We purchased the property from the original landowners in 2000 and retain the original deeds. The majority of this field was sold in 1972, by the previous owners of our property, now known as Plovers Ridge, 9 Roseland Close, to Richard Costain homes for their development of the Roseland Close area of the estate (referred to as Brookview Meadows on the Land registry title to Hillside Farm (copy attached ) However the area of land on which our property is situated was never the subject of the sale and so at the time its boundaries appear not to have been accurately defined in relation to the adjoining fields.

Between this land and site 376 there was and remains a very wide, established and mature hedgerow (being both a LBAP priority habitat and following the line of the enclosure act hedge) having on the far side of it a ditch which takes substantial run off from Bunny Lane and we now understand High Court Drive (off Bunny Lane) as well as regular storm drain overflow etc.

This ditch has been the subject of discussions with Seven Trent over past years and they have been categorical that we are not permitted to pipe the ditch. The flow of water has over the years resulted in considerable undermining including the gardens on Roseland Close which were to varying levels built up several meters above the level of the adjoining farmland.

This undermining damage was sufficient that I believe a statutory body, possibly yourselves or Seven Trent did at some time before our purchase start to culvert the ditch behind the properties although stopping part way along.
This mature hedge and ditch was, as you will see from the photograph below, the extent of the features, with the exception of the addition of a post and rail fence that Mr Smeeton, owner of Hillside Farm introduced because he said he “intended to keep horses”. This fence was placed on what we treated as a notional boundary.

There was no need in my view to clarify the boundary further since we are not contemplating selling our property and to do so would no doubt require the employment of professional advisors and surveyors. The situation is undoubtable further complicated in that all the other houses on Roseland Close that adjoin the field purchased their homes from a developer and may well have differing situations on their deeds and in their understandings, possibly that their boundary ends at their garden. The people at the top of the development on Bunny lane certainly cultivate a portion of the field alongside their wall and believe that to be in their ownership. The picture is certainly likely to be confused.

I shall write more extensively regarding the site in my submission to your preferred site consultation but suffice it to say Hillside farm, until its active degradation, isolation and promotion to yourselves as site 376, was an open site under agricultural production both as pasture and crop. A site so open in fact that the 2014 Draft neighbourhood plan had the views across it through to the village centre as key views into the settlement.

As you will also see from this enlargement the site contained nothing more substantial as a defensible western boundary than a flimsy post and rail.

However it is not in question that continued access is required to the ditch, a ditch that Seven Trent say cannot be piped. The last major action being re-digging the ditch by the use of a mechanical digger working alongside. As such this access requirement is reflected in the charges register of Hillside farm.

C: Charges Register (Hillside Farm)
1 The land is subject to rights of drainage ancillary rights of access for maintenance purposes in favour of the adjoining housing estate known as Brookview Meadows.
Below is the site constraints and delivery information as listed on the Barratt Homes display boards for the site 376 Hillside as promoted for inclusion in the consultation for the Neighbourhood Plan 2014. This is the only information ever made available to the public or ourselves as significant adjoining landholders and beneficiaries of the access rights.

Site Constraints?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraint</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected View Out of Keyworth</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Containment in Landscape</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Quality &amp; Character Impact</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Constraint</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Environment Constraint</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Constraint</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Constraint</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball Environment Constraint</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed Buildings</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Asset</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contaminated Land</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Constraint</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topographical Constraint</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access / Right Of Way Constraint</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Constraint</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership Constraints</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Delivery

Barratt Homes is bringing forward land at Hillside Farm for development through the planning process in partnership with the Landowners. A contractual arrangement is in place and there is no legal impediment to site implementation and development. There is every prospect of early delivery given the size of the site, potential number of dwellings (approximately 90) and the relative ease with which development could come forward as one of a number of potential housing sites around Keyworth.

The indicative scheme layout they presented alongside this information drew itself right up to our domestic garden and certainly showed no indications of the extensive ditch area or allowed for access as granted to us. At the time of this consultation we again mentioned the issues with the site boundary.

However since, for other very good reasons, some commented upon in your SHLAA assessment, it was not selected as a preferred or safeguarded site in the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan, so we felt no need to take further formal action.

We continued to maintain the area including the ditch and up to the post and rail as had become custom. The only other significant matter being the need to remind Mr Smeeton of his responsibilities under the Weeds act to control the spread of thistle seed after he turned his open productive acreage into neglected scrub land adding neither livestock (despite the strategic placing of two pig shelters) nor cropping for the last two years. Although the addition of a traffic cone and a car for the last few months alongside Norman Davill’s (adjoining landowner) JCB and piles of concrete building waste certainly adds to the amenity. This picture does though well illustrate the continued thinness of the “defensible” western boundary of this site, the bad neighbourliness of Norman and so the vulnerability to pressure of further development westwards should this site ever be developed.
I was however recently advised that the development ‘High Court Drive’ off Bunny Lane was granted permission by Mr Smeaton to discharge into the ditch running on our property. I was of course surprised to learn this and immediately wrote to Mr Smeeton seeking clarification (copy attached) I have yet to receive a response. What is certain however is that I as the owner of the largest stretch and possibly all of the ditch have certainly not given any such permission for any additional discharge into the ditch and that this action would seem to indicate that Mr Smeeton is asserting some form of proprietorship over the ditch.

The completely unexpected inclusion of site 376 by Rushcliffe in their preferred sites with no additional information and certainly no prior approach to ourselves, either by the owner Mr Smeeton or the promoting developer Barratt home to discuss defining the actual area of the site, its boundaries and how they might intend to develop it alongside discharge their duties under the charges on the property seems to be an owner who is either exceptionally careless or just cavalier that they can ignore such matters whilst still promoting a site to yourselves as having no site constraints and capable of early delivery.

The latest 2016 Rushcliffe SHLAA still contains information on this site 376 with an indicative allocation of 90 homes (so we must assume it is still being promoted with the indicative layout presented in 2014).

In its introductory section the SHLAA is very clear that in order to be classed as ‘deliverable’ a site must be:  
- Suitable – the site offers a suitable location for development which would contribute to the creation of sustainable, mixed communities;
- Available – the site is available now; and
- Achievable – there is a reasonable prospect that housing will be developed on the site at a particular point in time (within 5 years).

The first is clearly up for discussion but the second and third given the dispute about what actually constitutes the site area and the restriction regarding access requirements are questionable and I feel that the sites deliverability should be commented upon not only in the context of requiring a change of Greenbelt Policy but the ownership uncertainties and restriction issue I have highlighted.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

Mary Butler
Planning Policy
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rushcliffe Arena
Rugby Road
West Bridgford
NG2 7YG

Dear Sir,

I/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]

P. W. Butler
In addition to the template kindly provided by G. P. C. I would like you to take into account the items listed below:

1) Compensation: Subsidence Damage

2) to provide car standing on 94 Heake Road.

3) New good quality Fencing to any gates affected

16.6.2018: Up to 4 pm Mrs. Butter had not received any notification of any properties being demolished. So the most affected properties being Nos. 88 and 94 were I suspect being kept in the dark until the eleventh hour. I consider that very understand.

Mrs. Pauline Butter has lived in Gotham nearly 60 yrs. "Aunty Pauline", as she is known by generations of children through her work as Playgroup Leader and her years of voluntary work as a Sunday School Teacher. Also Pauline is an organist at St. Lawrence Church, Gotham and Barton and is also ready to step
when required at Thropton, Kingston and, Ratcliffe on Soar. She is a pillar of the Community and yet she is treated as "Zone Disciple". Many Gotham residents are aggast at how she is being treated.

Urgent decisions are required - we will not accept any further damage off as this is causing serious concerns to Mrs. Butler.

Affect on:

Traffic
Parking Availability
Schools

DRS
From: Michael Bye
Sent: 26 June 2018 22:31
To: Localdevelopment
Subject: Local Plan Part 2: Ruddington Proposed Development Sites
Importance: High

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to you as a resident of Ruddington, with my thoughts regarding the proposed development sites within the village boundary.

One cannot be against the development of further housing. People need homes to live in. However, it should be self-evident to decision makers that housing can only be built where it is supported by adequate infrastructure, and Ruddington is sorely lacking in this respect:

1. The volume of traffic in the village is already unreasonable. Hundreds of motorists use the village as a rat-run to get through to Clifton and the A453. Traffic queues, in both directions, on Kirk Lane can be outrageous. School busses and NCT busses fight for turn on to the High Street. 40’ articulated lorries from British Gypsum also vie for space on the narrow streets, right next to hundreds of school children making their way to and from school each day. Parking in the village is already next to impossible as both shop staff and people avoiding the Parking Charge Levy in town park first thing in the morning leaving no space for anyone else. With the addition of over 500 new homes (including the approved development on Asher Lane), is this a sustainable situation?

2. The tram line did not come to Ruddington, so this limits public transport options just at the same time bus services were reduced. I also note that double yellow lines have just been put in at the Wilford Lane stop, which prevent people driving there to use the tram service too.

3. James Peacock Infant School is already at capacity. It is extremely cramped for the children, and is a marked contrast to other schools in surrounding areas I have personally seen. Covenants prevent further development on its grounds too, so no more children can be accommodated there. Where will all the children from the new homes go to school?

4. It is worth noting that the land in the ‘RUD01’ area is prone to flooding. I can only imagine that this will be dealt with by putting water into the sewage system. In times of flood the system will not be able to cope with the increased volume of water, and I have to imagine this water will end up in the River Trent. Is that an acceptable environmental position? I believe steps have been put in place to prevent individual householders increasing surface run-off by ensuring any hard landscaping allows water to soak naturally into the ground. Will the same apply to all the new proposed developments?

5. There will be an impact of wildlife and the environment if all the proposed developments are allow to proceed. This can be partly mitigated, but already we have seen only lip-service has been paid to this in the development on Pasture Lane. I think I have counted 3 bird boxes and a couple of insect houses have been installed for a site that covers several acres. If development companies are to be granted permission to build, they should be forced to consider mitigation seriously and be fined if they don’t follow-up on commitments they made in order to gain the permission in the first place. Can it be promised this will be properly policed?

6. Finally, all the proposed development sites are on Green Belt land. Of course, this suits developers well. Green field sites are much easier and cheaper to develop than brown field/former industrial sites. But I don’t think planning authorities should be concerned with the profits, and dividends paid to shareholders, in private companies.
Instead they should ask if destroying green spaces is good for people and the wider environment. Do you suppose it is?

Personally I believe that further development could be considered in Ruddington if proper attention was given to some of the points above – before the development actually takes place. If the council cannot afford to make the necessary improvements then that is unfortunate, but nonetheless that should be a barrier to such further development. Simply granting permission for 500 homes and adding thousands of people into the equation will not solve the systemic problems facing the village already today.

Many thanks and regards,

Michael Bye

Michael Bye
Director | Ceramic Glass Ltd

ceramicglass.co.uk

Ceramic Glass Ltd,