Dear Sirs

I would like to strongly object to planning consent being given to the site at Sutton Bonington adjacent to Park Lane and the A6006.

My reasons are

Poor access to site- Houses built on this site would generate a large increase in the traffic in this area. The A6006 is busy now and traffic is likely to increase considerably when the new DNRC is opened. The approach to Sutton Bonington is particularly attractive with mature trees, many of these would have to be destroyed if the proposed site was developed.

Flooding risk.- This site floods regularly during heavy rainstorms and this can only be increased by developing the site in this way.

Sewerage system inadequate- the village has problems already with inadequate sewerage, a problem that will be further increased.

Schooling- there are not enough school places available at schools nearby

Doctors- the doctors surgery is already struggling to cope with the number of residents using the surgery and the problems caused by parked vehicles using the surgery premises.

Transport- we currently only have a regular hourly service to Loughborough (to reach Nottingham by bus takes over an hour and half) so this would mean increased traffic for people going to work in the area.

Please take note of these objections, our lovely village is in danger of becoming linked to Normanton and losing its village identity. If only 80 houses can be built on this site surely it is not worth destroying a village community for such a small dent in your target when there are other bigger sites that could be considered.

Thank you for noting these objections

Mary Dade
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]

Neville Davies

[Signature]

Wendy Davies
Dear Sirs

Housing Proposed Development, Radcliffe on Trent, Nottingham

I have long been concerned with regard to the proposal for a very considerable increase in housing development of 400 properties within Green Belt around the village. This now appears - as has been pointed out by the Labour Party - to have been increased to 920 properties: an increase of over twenty five percent of the population.

I refer in particular to Policy 5.1 Land to the North of Nottingham Road. This is a site that has always been dedicated to Green Belt with past Planning Applications rejected as development would cause a considerable visual loss on the approach to the village. The site being floodland is unsuitable with very restricted drainage, with high voltage cables crossing through the centre and a large animal rescue centre located adjacent to it.

A suitable access from the Nottingham Road which carries a very high volume of traffic would be difficult to provide and to now find that the proposal includes for 5 hectares of employment i.e. uses B1, B2, and B8 covering business and both general and special industrial use should be notified to all of the local residents who are probably unaware of the likely impact of these proposals.

Should the village require properties of this type then there is already an employment site to the east of the village accessed from the main A52 the Bingham Road and this could be extended.

Regardless of the present government’s desperation to build more dwellings to cater for both the increasing indigenous and immigrant population, surely one should give consideration with regard to how development will affect the existing village.

Traffic through the village from Shelford Road is increasing and I would be interested to learn whether a link road taken from land to the North of Policy 53 through Policy 54 to connect with the A52 Bingham Road has been considered. This would greatly alleviate present increasing traffic problems within the village.

I have made my objections, certainly to Policy 5.1, well known over a number of years and trust that some consideration will be given prior to any hasty decisions being made.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

Peter A. Dion

Peter A. Dion
Chartered Building Surveyor

26 June 2018
Comment

Consultee: Mrs Erin Donaldson (1166923)
Event Name: Local Plan Part 2 (Publication Draft)
Comment by: Mrs Erin Donaldson (1166923)
Comment ID: 34
Response Date: 25/06/18 19:37
Status: Submitted
Submission Type: Web
Version: 0.1

To which document does your response relate? Other supporting document

If you answered 'other supporting document' please state which document you refer to
Policy 10 Housing - Land North of Park Lane Sutton Bonington

Page number: 55-57
Paragraph number: 3.103-3.107
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

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?  
No

Do you consider this to be because it is NOT:  
(please tick all that apply)  
. J ustified
. E ffective

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).

There are a number of factors involved as to why the Local Plan Part 2 is not sound, as follows:

1) Building on the land to the North of Park Lane will sprawl the village combining it to neighbouring Normanton on Soar and Zouch with a detrimental affect on the character of each of these three settlements. The previous plan submitted was for 140 houses, the current plan is for 80 houses across 60% of the field, therefore, one can only assume a 2nd phase of development later down the line for the remaining 60 houses on the remaining 40% of land. This comes across that you are trying to shoehorn in a smaller number of houses than before, then building the original proposal. This is not an open and transparent way in which to operate.

Sutton Bonington is a village community, as are Zouch and Normanton and this plan would certainly start to eat away at the rural communities which they are, significantly changing the nature of the settlements and the local area.

80 houses is such a small proportion of the borough target of 13,150 that it seems foolhardy to start the corrosion of three the rural communities when having such a minimal impact on the overall target. These numbers could easily be met within one of the bigger sites identified which also have the necessary local amenities which Sutton Bonington does not.

2) With an additional 80 houses, one can assume a significant proportion would be occupied by children of Primary School age. Sutton Bonington Primary School would not be able to cope with this influx of children. There is no scope to extend the school which already operates out of 2 porta cabins. It would not be feasible for the 80 new houses to use the primary school in Normanton as the A6006 is far too busy a road to expect children to cross on a daily basis.

3) Drainage and flooding is a real risk with the field sloping towards houses on the adjacent Charnwood Fields and Charnwood Avenue where houses already have inadequate drainage to soakaways. There have been many significant flooding events in the area recently which have threatened property and impacted on local traffic. Building on this field would dramatically increase run-off while also leaving less ground for water absorption; these two together would cause a large increase in flood potential and it is highly likely that this would negatively impact on the residents in the adjacent houses where drainage is already stretched.

4) An additional 80 houses would increase volume of traffic into/out of the village by c. 160 cars which would increase the difficulty in pulling out onto the A6006 during peak times. With the impending opening of DNRC and the East Mids flight freight terminal, traffic in the area is ever increasing and this would just add to the issues further. At some pint there has to be a breaking point and the area is often used as a cut through when other roads have issues and the area always fails to cope with this increase in traffic load.
Parking outside our primary school is currently an issue. After all Sutton Bonington is a village with roads which cater for a village, not for modern volumes of traffic. At drop off and pick up times it is very difficult to get through the village and it can become very dangerous. With the likelihood of a large number of new children trying to fit into a school which is under resourced in terms of suitable buildings, it is also likely that the traffic outside the school will also increase at these peak times, further exacerbating the issue.

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.

Relocate the 80 houses currently proposed for the Sutton Bonington site to elsewhere within the Rushcliffe Borough. There are other locations within the Borough (Cotgrave or Clifton for example) with already established amenities, facilities and services that would cope better with an additional 80 houses.

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
From: Catherine Douglas-Morgan
Sent: 19 June 2018 14:23
To: Localdevelopment
Subject: East Bridgford - Local Plan Part 2
Attachments: IMG_2217.mov

Hi

I am writing to you as a resident of East Bridgford to respond to the Local Plan Part 2 and the housing proposals in East Bridgford. The current proposals were not consulted with the village residents and only put forward by the Parish Council. All sites put forward it is noted are not near any of the Parish Council Members home’s and they have chosen to be put forward a proposal based on the opinions of 9 people! This has no way been consulted properly!!

To use greenbelt land when other brownfield sites could be used is not acceptable, we have many wildlife living in the proposed sites including deer and bats. East Bridgford is a village and by adding so many houses neighbouring towns will soon be merging into one another. The sewage already overflows at times in the village, the public transport is almost non-existent and the current local infrastructure cannot cope with more housing especially as a new development is being built on the outskirts of Bingham for 1200 homes that will use our school and our village facilities.

When the Newton site was developed in 2012 adding over 180 properties there was no additional infrastructure added into the area from the developers and Rushcliffe Borough Council did not impose it. I believe it is highly likely that the 1200 homes in Bingham will be built with little investment in the local infrastructure. This seems to be common practice with Rushcliffe Borough Council not investing in the area as they rely on private builders to do it for them. Cotgrave and other Rushcliffe areas have brownfield sites available and have better services and infrastructure to support new housing. Adding 125+ new homes in East Bridgford is far too much and a big estate is not in keeping with the village and the current proposal in having them in one end of the village is not viable. The traffic in East Bridgford is already a big concern, this amount of new homes would increase the cars in the village by at least 200 cars all at one end of the village, fighting to get to the school or out of East Bridgford via the traffic light or Trent Lane in the morning and evening.

I moved to East Bridgford 11 years ago with my then 1 year old son and have since had two more sons. We were attracted to East Bridgford for the village school and the village life. My eldest son started St Peters (the local village school) and we were extremely pleased with our new life. Newton then built a huge amount new housing which meant the village school became fuller and fuller. We experienced a huge increase in traffic in our village as families from Newton use our village for schooling, doctors etc. No investment was made and no promised school was built! Then came the duelling of the A46 which took away a large part of our greenbelt and the road was built closer to the edge our village and the housing. This caused another big increase in traffic in the village as since the duelling with commuters including lorries cutting through our village to miss out the A6907 and the traffic build up there. I no longer feel comfortable letting my now 13 year old and 11 year old walk to the local shop alone during the hours of 4pm to 6.30pm due to the traffic and the speed at which the traffic comes through the village. I know there has been a couple of incidents involving children when they have been hit by cars. The Main Street through the village is predominately a single lane road due to the parking of cars but this does not stop the amount of cars nor the speed they travel at! (See attached which shows a common sight in our village which my son filmed)

In October 2017 I made the decision to move my two younger sons from St Peters (East Bridgford School) one in year 6 and one year 1 to Orston Primary due to the overcrowding and fullness of the school. My sons would complain they were not allowed to ‘run’ at lunch due to the playground being so busy and sometimes didn’t receive lunch until nearly 12.45pm!! On paper the school can take more children in their classrooms but the outside space is not suitable and with adding more houses to the village this will become a bigger issue. Children should be able to run at playtime!!!
Recently East Bridgford Garden Centre gets rebuilt and relaunched and its massive!! It attracts people from all over who come for a day out. They also cut through the village every day of the week so now our weekends are full of cut through traffic also!

I realise you have to find housing sites but urge you to look elsewhere and save our greenbelt and our village. Our village was not consulted on the proposal that was put forward and I believe there is little support for it from residents which would have been clear had procedure been followed properly.

Regards
Catherine Douglas-Morgan
Resident

This message and any attachment are intended solely for the addressee and may contain confidential information. If you have received this message in error, please contact the sender and delete the email and attachment.

Any views or opinions expressed by the author of this email do not necessarily reflect the views of the University of Nottingham. Email communications with the University of Nottingham may be monitored where permitted by law.
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:

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 (where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title (where relevant)</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.: 33/34
- Paragraph no.: 4
- 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) 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positively Prepared</th>
<th>Justified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Consistent with national policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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.

.Keyworth needs more housing and Willside Farm is a good location.

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
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.
Please return by 5pm on Thursday 28 June 2018 to
Rushcliffe Borough Council
BUSINESS SUPPORT UNIT
RECEIVED
27 JUN 2018

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>Title</th>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent’s Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MRS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>MICHELLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>DOWNS</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>[Redacted]</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 2</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 3</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 4</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 5</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number</td>
<td>[Redacted]</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. 4.4 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) 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.

Keywords: New Build Housing and Housing Plan is in a Good Location Within 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").

N/A
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.
Dear Sir / Madam,

I am writing to you, to object to the proposed development stated in LP2. Policy 10 Housing. Land North of Park Lane Sutton Bonington. Predominately section 3B, pages 55-57. I don't feel the plan is justified for the reasons stated below;

1) Proposed housing total. This application had been for 80 homes, yet the original application was for double that amount. I find (as in other developments) if given the go ahead, the developer will try for retrospective planning for at least the original amount of homes. So the 80 is a ruse, to get permission to develop in the first instance. 140 houses were proposed in the Core strategy. Whilst 80 houses are now proposed, this is still over 60% of the field so no reduction in density. My concern is that the rest of the field will be put forward for a 2nd phase of development and Rushcliffe Borough Council are simply aiming to implement the original Core Strategy proposal 'by stealth'.

2) Transport links. Already there is congestion leaving the village via Park Lane, onto the A6006. With the proposed site being next to Park lane, it will put further pressure on an already busy road. It is also extremely busy in the village when there are incidents on the A6 leading to Kegworth where all traffic is diverted through Sutton Bonington causing yet more hazards and long delays. There have been 3 such incidents in the last 6 weeks. Due to Construction traffic will also increase the dangers of traffic incidents, Due to the frequency of movements, Size of vehicles, Debris strewn on the roadway. All of the above a hazards for pedestrians, cyclist and motor vehicle users.

3) Drainage. Sutton Bonington already has issues with flooding, due to poor drainage / run off for the rain water coming off the field. Due to the railways agency filling in the dykes around Sutton Bonington for the railway. The proposed site will increase the pressure on the Victorian drainage / sewer system, which is already unable to handle the volume of water. And compacting the ground to develop will only exacerbate this. As the run off water has no where to go, and will continually flood homes at the corner of Park Lane, Charnwood Fields as in Easter 2018. Drainage to these houses is to soakaways which are already inadequate. All residents on Charnwood Fields and Charnwood Avenue that currently back on to the field experience sodden gardens throughout winter.

4) Infrastructure. Sutton Bonington has only a small Doctors surgery on Orchard Close, which is at full capacity. So if the go ahead goes ahead, there could be a potential of 300 extra persons who will need health care. There is no parking for patients at the surgery who currently have to park outside residents homes of whom most are elderly and have disabled access.

Inadequate Schooling. The village school would be put under heavy strain, as a potential 100 - 200 extra children could be added to the village with the proposed development. The school currently operates out of 2 porta cabins in addition to the main building. There is no space to extend the school even should money become available. The extra intake would mean more poorly heated/temporary learning accommodation. Secondary schools are also at full capacity. Also there is large disruption already with parents taking their children to school by motor vehicle. This will turn to gridlock, with added households. Bringing the village to a stand still. Whilst increasing the tension between the households around the school, and parents parking in front of the homes. The line of parked vehicles is currently over 1000m with cars parking from Orchard Close and Gables Lea narrowing the road to 1 lane. If children were to attend the school at Normanton this is a great cause for concern that children would have to cross the A6006 at peak times where traffic flow is dangerously high and drivers do NOT stick to the current speed limits.

There is only a small off licence in the village, with 3 parking spaces. Extra households will only cause gridlock, again bringing the village to a standstill.

5) Village identity. This certainly be affected / eroded, due to the proximity to Normanton. Presently the villages are separated by the A6006, and fields. If the proposed development of the Sutton Bonington site goes ahead, then its a given the developer will put an application to develop the field on the Normanton side of the A6006. Thus the two villages will virtually merge.

6) Alternative sites.
There are larger better connected alternative sites, such as Cotgrave, Gamston, Clifton. These would be better suited, as these have greater facilities and services. 80% houses would compromise 0.6% of the Rushcliffe BC target for 2028 of 13,150 i.e it would not contribute significantly to the target. The impact on the house numbers in the village is far higher at 10% and will negatively impact accessibility, services for current/future residents.

Regards

Amanda Drake
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>James</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dutton</strong></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. p. 30 - 34
- Paragraph no. 
- Policy ref. 
- Site ref. 
- Policies Map p. 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.

   Good housing sites, well spread across 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").

\[\Box\]
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 25/6/18

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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your personal information will be shared with the Planning Inspectorate in connection with the above purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 <a href="http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/retention_schedule/">http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/retention_schedule/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 <a href="http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/privacy/">http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/privacy/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
BUSINESS SUPPORT UNIT
RECEIVED
27 JUN 2018

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

This form has two parts:
1. Personal Details
2. Agent's Details (if applicable)

Part A - Personal details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Mrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Kate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Dutton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organisation (where relevant)

Job title (where relevant)

Address – line 1

Address – line 2

Address – line 3

Address – line 4

Address – line 5

Postcode

E-mail Address

Telephone Number

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).

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.

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.

Hillside Farm in my opinion is the Best site put forward for allocation Due to its Close location to the village amenities.

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
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 25-06-18

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 '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.
**From:** Gordon Dyne  
**Sent:** 28 June 2018 10:50  
**To:** Localdevelopment  
**Subject:** Personnel Response to Rushcliffe Local Plan Part Two  
**Attachments:** G Dyne LP2 response.docx  
**Categories:** Phil

See attached.

Cheers - Gordon Dyne
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>Gordon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Dyne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (where relevant)</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title (where relevant)</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 1</td>
<td>6 Lyons Close.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 2</td>
<td>Ruddington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 3</td>
<td>Notts</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>NG11 6BQ</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: RNCSIG

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version</th>
<th>Local Plan Part 2 Policies Map</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page no.</th>
<th>See attached</th>
<th>Paragraph no.</th>
<th>See attached</th>
<th>Policy ref.</th>
<th>Choose an item.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ref.</th>
<th>Policies Map</th>
<th>Choose an item.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4(1) Legally compliant</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4(2) Sound</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(3) Complies with the Duty to Co-operate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→ 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)

- 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.

Click here to enter text.

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”).

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.
- Yes, I wish to appear at the examination
- I would like my representation to be dealt with by written representation

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

Click here to enter a date.

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

---

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.

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.
Housing Development Allocations

Policy 2.1 Land rear of Mill Lane/Pld Park, Cotgrave

Object to this allocation unless there is adequate provision for buffering of the woodland area to the north. Policy 38 Non Designated Natural Assets applies. As with other locations where habitat protection/mitigation is promised the issue is going to be proper implementation and monitoring to ensure that planning consents are followed in every case.

Policy 2.2 Land south of Hollygate Lane, Cotgrave

Object to this allocation unless there is adequate provision for buffering the Grantham Canal as this is an important Local Wildlife Site and part of the Green Infrastructure, in line with Policy 36 Designated Nature Conservation Sites. As with other locations where habitat protection/mitigation is promised the issue is going to be proper implementation and monitoring to ensure that planning consents are followed in every case.

Policy 3 Land north of Rempstone Rd, East Leake

Object to the allocation as it represents a significant intrusion into the wider countryside and because of its location being separate from East Leake will inevitably lead to pressure for further infill, which will result in the loss of farmland type habitats that will support a range of species.

Policy 4.1 Land of Nicker Hill, Keyworth

Object to allocation as this is adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site. If the allocation were allowed we would expect there to be significant mitigation and buffering in line with Policy 36 Designated Nature Conservation Sites. As with other locations where habitat protection/mitigation is promised the issue is going to be proper implementation and monitoring to ensure that planning consents are followed in every case.

Policy 4.3 Land south of Debdale Lane Keyworth

Object to allocation as this areas includes historical ridge and furrow and areas of woodland that should be conserved. Policy 38 Non Designated Natural Assets would seem to apply. If the allocation is allowed there must be adequate mitigation and buffering. As with other locations where habitat protection/mitigation is promised the issue is going to be proper implementation and monitoring to ensure that planning consents are followed in every case.

Policy 6.1 Land west of Wilford Rd, Ruddington

Object to allocation

It adds to the already considerable pressure on infrastructure on in the village (roads, medical, schooling) and at the very least the Local Plan should be modified to take into account the wholly unaccountable decision by the Planning Enquiry Planning Ito allow the housing development on Asher Lane in Ruddington and the Local Plan for Ruddington must be adjusted to take into account this unexpected windfall and the number of houses allocated to Ruddington reduced pro rata.

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Policy 6.2 Land south of Flawforth Lane, Ruddington

Object. It adds to the already considerable pressure on infrastructure on in the village (roads, medical, schooling) and at the very least the Local Plan should be modified to take into account the wholly unaccountable decision by the Planning Enquiry Planning Ito allow the housing development on Asher Lane in Ruddington and the Local Plan for Ruddington must be adjusted to take into account this unexpected windfall and the number of houses allocated to Ruddington reduced pro rata.

Policy 6.3 Land opposite Mere Way, Ruddington

Object. It adds to the already considerable pressure on infrastructure on in the village (roads, medical, schooling) and at the very least the Local Plan should be modified to take into account the wholly unaccountable decision by the Planning Enquiry Planning Ito allow the housing development on Asher Lane in Ruddington and the Local Plan for Ruddington must be adjusted to take into account this unexpected windfall and the number of houses allocated to Ruddington reduced pro rata.

Policy 8.2 Land south of Butt Lane, East Bridgford

Object to the allocation as it will create problems for Springdale Wood and the adjacent wildflower meadow. Policy 36 and Policy 38 should be considered here and if development is allowed, adequate mitigation and buffering must be provided. As with other locations where habitat protection/mitigation is promised the issue is going to be proper implementation and monitoring to ensure that planning consents are followed in every case.

Policy 9 Land east of Gypsum Way/The Orchards, Gotham

Object to this allocation as it is adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site and represents an intrusion into the wider landscape. If the allocation was allowed we would expect significant appropriate mitigation and buffering of the LWS inline with Policy 36 on Designated Nature Conservation Sites. As with other locations where habitat protection/mitigation is promised the issue is going to be proper implementation and monitoring to ensure that planning consents are followed in every case.

Policy 12 Housing Standards

Rushcliffe has supported the promotion of inclusion of Swift boxes within new housing and we feel that this should become part of housing standards that at least a proportion of houses in a development should incorporate birds and bat boxes within the structure. But in addition the standards could also promote the use of hedgehog gaps within fencing on development and also grey water conservation schemes.

Climate Change, Flood Risk and Water Management

Policy 19 Development affecting watercourses

Strongly support the specific mention of biodiversity in this policy. But would make the following observations

Policy 19c should specifically mention a **minimum** 10 metre buffer zone around water courses as per 5.32 and 5.33

5.31 strongly support para on water quality.

5.33 Strongly support the recognition of the importance of buffer zones around a range of different natural and semi natural features.

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

Policy 20 Managing Water Quality
RNCSIG supports this policy.

Policy 22 Development in the Countryside
RNCSIG wish to make the following observations about this policy

2e) Expansion of all businesses in rural areas - there should be a caveat in reference to activities being appropriate to the particular rural area and to the likely effects on local environment, including natural habitats. See statement 3a.

Policy 23 Redevelopment of Bunny Brickworks
Whilst welcoming the specific habitat protection promised in the policy for this site, RNCSIG are still concerned that the new development will create additional pressure on the nearby Bunny Wood Nature Reserve, which is one of Rushcliffes premier nature reserves and an example of ancient woodland. We also would want to see a proper and final solution to the dust problems that have plagued this area for years, arising from the presence of the incinerator ash. As with other locations where habitat protection/mitigation is promised the issue is going to be proper implementation and monitoring to ensure that planning consents are followed in every case.

Policy 28 Protecting Heritage Assets
RNCSIG supports this policy in particular to protecting both Registered and non Registered gardens.

Policy 31 Tourism and Leisure
Should not just regard the Landscape Character as something of value to tourism, but must also recognize the value of biodiversity in promoting a "good" tourist environment.

Policy 32 Recreation and Open Space

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Support this policy, providing it recognizes the provision for green infrastructure within and around such areas.

Policy 33 Local Green Space

Support the leaving/creation of such green spaces not only for it’s leisure value, but also in that it again provides useful opportunities to create some additional green infrastructure around and within such sites. We also feel such GI work also provides opportunities to support the National Pollinator Strategy.

Green Infrastructure and the Natural Environment

12.4 Believe that the PRIMARY purpose of Green Infrastructure must be to provide habitat and linkages for biodiversity, otherwise it can be seen as nothing more than a path with mown grassy edges. It must been seen as an opportunity to support both movement of wildlife and people in a pleasant environment.

12.5 Please to see specific mention of the Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy and the Rushcliffe Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Exercise.

12.6 Support the opportunities seen for improving the natural environment.

12.7 This paragraph seems to suggest that wildlife within Green Infrastructure is regarded as of less importance than human activities, yet it is fundamental to the concept of GI. So whilst I support the overall aim that development should at a minimum not adversely affect Green Infrastructure the policy must specifically recognize biodiversity and human activity as co-equals.

Policy 34 Green Infrastructure and Open Spaces

Support a policy that promotes Green Infrastructure and Open Spaces, but we find some of the wording confusing and unclear as to what it is actually trying to say.

34.2) "Development that protects, enhances, or widens their Green Infrastructure importance will be supported, provided it does not adversely affect their primary functions".

This policy statement appears to be confusing and am unclear as to what it actually saying.

34.3) this policy statement does not acknowledge that loss of good habitat cannot be easily or quickly replaced through mitigation/habitat creation works.

34.4) "Planning permission will not be granted for development which would adversely affect access to open spaces and opportunities should be sought to protect or enhance the rights of way network and, where applicable, its open environment." Unclear what this statement actually means.

Policy 35 Green Infrastructure and Network and Urban Fringe

RNCSIG supports this policy in particular we are pleased to see reference to the Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy and the Rushcliffe Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Exercise in 12.15.

Biodiversity and Geodiversity

RNCSIG is pleased to see the recognition of the value of wildlife and biodiversity in these policies, and are particularly pleased to see that Local Wildlife Sites are included in the hierarchy of protection and are regarded as of "material consideration when considering planning applications".

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
But would observe that 12.20 " and that non-designated sites or wildlife corridors will only be permitted where there is overriding need" does not actually make sense and should actually read " and that development of non-designated sites or wildlife corridors will only be permitted where there is overriding need"

**Policy 36 Designated Nature Conservation Sites**

Strongly supports the hierarchy provided for SSSI’s, Local Wildlife Sites, Local Geological Sites, Local Nature Reserves and irreplaceable habitats. But feel a level of protection to LWS’s is particularly important as they are the crucial component of Rushcliffes critical wildlife capital, as there are very few SSSI’s in Rushcliffe.

However would make the following comments

4c - in Core Strategy Policy 17 there is a firm commitment that biodiversity of Rushcliffe will be increased over the Core Strategy period. However this policy only talks about no NET Loss and therefore is at odds with the Core Strategy.

**Monitoring proposals**

Natural England planning function is now very weak, applies only to SSSI’s so we are not convinced this is a meaningful target in anyway.

For targets RBC should look at

- loss /damage to SSSI’s, Local Wildlife Sites/GI etc to development

- level of net gain to wildlife habitat arising from development.

**Policy 37 Trees and Woodlands**

I welcome RBC’s commitment to promoting trees and woodland, both in existing towns and villages, as well as the wider countryside, but now also in the context of new developments. In particular we welcome the recognition that the protection of existing trees must be a priority and that the planting of new trees needs to be appropriate in terms of types of tree, impact on any existing habitat and also take into account Landscape Character.

The policy should also recognize the value of traditional local orchards.

**Policy 38 Non Designated Biodiversity Assets and the Wider Ecological Network**

I welcome this policy and the recognition of the value of the Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Exercises. In particular we endorse the need to recognize the range of different habitats identified and the areas of concentrated opportunity (BOA’s).

**Environmental Protection**

**Policy 40 Pollution and Land Contamination**

I supports this policy with the following caveat.

Policy 40 1b) welcome the inclusion of Light Pollution as an issue, but would also suggest that Sound Pollution should also be considered, as both can impact on wildlife.

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Policy 41 Air Quality

I support this policy.

Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

Policy 43 Planning Obligation Threshold

I support the inclusion of Biodiversity Mitigation as part of the Planning Obligation Threshold and the setting of a minimum of 10 dwellings or 1,000 square metres per development floorspace for contributions.

However I suggest that RBC must be committed to enforcing such obligations.