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]

John Edmonds
East Bridgford Resident’s Comments
To Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2

Please write your comments in the box below and sign.
(Name and address optional)

THE INFRASTRUCTURE OF THE VILLAGE CANNOT
COPE WITH ANYMORE HOUSES.
THE DR’S SURGERY IS ALREADY VERY BUSY AND
DOES NOT HAVE THE FACILITIES OR APPTS TO COPE
WITH ANY FURTHER HOUSING IN THE VILLAGE.
MY CHILDREN ATTEND GA ST PETERS ACADEMY UP TO
2017 AND THE CLASS SIZES WERE APPROACHING
40 CHILDREN. NO WAY CAN THE FOOTPRINT OF
THE SCHOOL TAKE ANYMORE CHILDREN EVEN WITH
THE RECENT EXTENSION.
I LIVE ON MAIN STREET AND THE INCREASE IN
TRAFFIC SINCE THE A46 WAS DONG IS LOUD.
I COUNTED 102 VEHICLES QUEUING ALONG TRENCH
LANE LAST WEEK AT 17.00HRS. HOW CAN THIS
VILLAGE COPE WITH ANYMORE URBANIC TRAFFIC
FROM ADDITIONAL HOUSING.
HOW HAS THIS PROPOSAL GOT THIS FAR, WHY ARE
MEMBERS OF THE PARISH COUNCIL SUPPORTING
THIS DEVELOPMENT, ARE THEY NOT SUPPOSED
TO ACT IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THIS
BEAUTIFUL GREENBelt VILLAGE !!!

Signed: [Signature]
Name: AMANDA EDMUNDS
Address: [Redacted]

East Bridgford Residents Group Drop-In, 16th May 2018, East Bridgford Village Hall
From: Richard Mapletoft  
Sent: 18 June 2018 14:51  
To: Localdevelopment  
Subject: FW: Proposed Housing for East Bridgford - 2 plots of 125 houses

From: John Sheppard [mailto:49johnrena@gmail.com]  
Sent: 16 June 2018 17:40  
To: Customerervices  
Subject: Proposed Housing for East Bridgford - 2 plots of 125 houses

I am writing regarding the plans for new houses which have been proposed for East Bridgford.

My objections are:-

The village is not big enough to absorb the amount of houses proposed.

The infrastructure is not adequate to cope with the present volume of traffic, let alone a minimum of another 150 vehicles.

The idea of building more housing without increased facilities doesn’t make sense.

Trying to drive along Main Street and attempting to get out of driveways at any time of the day is a lottery, but at tea time is impossible.

The doctors surgery is always busy, and currently dispensing over 1000 repeat prescriptions per week.

What happened to the proposed phase 2 of the Newton expansion, where more housing, school and doctors were planned? This to me seems absurd that we are considering more housing in our village before the development at Newton is completed. This would provide them with the facilities they need and indeed relieve some pressure from the village in terms of traffic and children attending the village school. The only people that seem to win out of these situations are the developers who are more than happy to make large amounts of money but don’t want to fulfil their contracts in terms of providing the facilities they agree to. Maybe they should be forced to build this part of a development before they can start the housing.

St. Peter’s school is already running at full capacity, with 40 pupils to each class.

East Bridgford is a village and works well as a village. If Rushcliffe Council go ahead with it’s planned expansion, the village will just become a part of Bingham with absolutely no added facilities. I really cannot understand the so called planning, considering the above points.

I do realise that new houses are needed, but please, use some common sense before jumping in on what appears to be the easiest way out.
I sincerely hope that you, as a council, will seriously consider the points which I, and I dare say many other residents have made before this proposed expansion even gets off the ground.

There is also another issue regarding Trent Lane and Butt Lane. I personally believe that Butt Lane should be one way out of the village and Trent Lane one way into the village. Any other proposal will still bring non-resident traffic through the village, and it is only a matter of time before someone is knocked down, as most drivers are in a rush to get to their destination as quickly as possible. I came up Trent Lane the other day at Teatime and counted 117 cars queueing to get out onto the A6097. Do you think that this situation is acceptable?

I look forward to your reply.

From: cllr A Edyvean  
Sent: 02 July 2018 12:27  
To: Richard Mapletoft  
Cc: Cllr J Cottee; Cllr R Inglis; Cllr S Robinson; Cllr R Upton  
Subject: Local plan part2

Dear Richard,

I am writing as a Ward Member for Keyworth and the Wolds to comment on one of the sites proposed in local plan part 2 for development in Keyworth.

We have strong objections to the inclusion of the land between Hillside Farm and Roseland Close as we feel it is not an appropriate site, (key13).

This site was not in the recently approved Neighbourhood Plan, and in the formulation of the plan over several years was considered and rejected. Several other potential sites in the surrounding area of green belt were deemed more appropriate as reserve sites.

The Neighbourhood Plan Inspector defined the view from Bunny Lane towards the Village as a Key View into the settlement. Development of Key13 will substantially detract from this view.

Hillside farm itself is a busy working farm, indeed planning permission has recently been granted to expand the farm buildings, it must surely be inappropriate to develop housing right up to the border of a busy working farm if alternatives are available.

The site is in close proximity to the sewage works, again surely it is inappropriate to develop due to this proximity if other sites are available.

There is evidence that existing drainage to the site is problematic and surface water run off has led to flooding and erosion of gardens on Roseland Close. Again if suitable sites are available elsewhere, why choose a site that is likely to be more problematical.

Finally we are aware that the Parish Council has raised similar objections. Having recently seen the Neighbourhood Plan passed with an outstanding majority, inclusion of this site flies in the face of the Neighbourhood Plan and all those that supported it.

We therefore urge you to reconsider the inclusion of Key13 into local plan part 2.

Yours Sincerely

Cllr Andy Edyvean
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

E.R. Eggleshaw
I have considerable concern about the proposals:

1. Primarily that with the spread of Bingham heading towards East Bridgford it conflicts with the green belt's intention.
2. It conflicts with the neighbourhood plan and will impact on the countryside and benefits of living in the village.
3. It appears to add considerable strain on local amenities - the medical centre and school.

Signed: [Signature]
Name: [Name]
Address: [Address]
Planning Policy
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rushcliffe Arena
Rugby Rd
West Bridgford
NG2 7YG

18/6/18
Dear Sir,
I wish to comment on the draft LAPP published by RBC which plans to unnecessarily remove land from the green belt.
As a resident of one of the streets that will suffer as a consequence at some time by your proposal I write to object to your proposed plans for housing on areas GOT5a and in particular GOT4 as shown on your map.

I feel that the LAPP is unsound in that it:
1, Unnecessarily removes land from the green belt. No exceptional circumstances have been shown to support it’s removal and this is contrary to National policy.

2, It has not followed existing and proposed national policy on the use of smaller sites and housing numbers.

3, It is non-compliant in it’s duty to cooperate with the emerging Gotham Neighbourhood Plan and with existing planning policy.

4, It has not effectively assessed alternative sites.

5, Access to area GOT5a is not described and must be consulted upon BEFORE land is allocated from the green belt.

I understand that Rushcliffe’s housing target is some 30% higher than they should be. Rushcliffe’s own Core Strategy states that housing allowances in villages like Gotham should be for local needs only. Between 70 and 140 new houses, many of which will be unaffordable to locals, is not aimed at locals.

The LAPP Policies Map for Gotham should be redrawn to include sites GOT1 and GOT 3 within the inset boundary. The LAPP Policies Map for Gotham should be redrawn to remove GOT5a and GOT4 from the inset boundary.

Yours sincerely
Dear Sirs,

I note with disappointment the latest plans for the development of the area and expansion of housing stock. Such things are inevitable in a rising population. Over the last 10 years I have accepted that such developments e.g. to the former Cotgrave colliery site, are inevitable. My concerns are at the infrastructure which supports such developments - in particular the local road system.

Steadily the journey times to get anywhere are increasing. It takes 7-8 minutes to reach Tollerton at 07.30am. By 07.40am it often takes 10 minutes as the morning traffic starts to build. During the high-traffic periods, it takes 35-40 minutes to travel to the Forest area just north of Nottingham City Centre - a journey time which takes 20 minutes in the low intensity periods.

The local road system from Cotgrave depends upon access to and from the A52. This is a dual carriageway with a specific capacity. At some points during the day this capacity is exceeded. Moreover the length of time of these periods is now increasing. Access to Nottingham from Cotgrave via the A52 in the morning can only be described as being horrendous.

* There is a need for an additional bridge over the River Trent to reduce the traffic load on the Lady Bay Bridge and/or for a wider bridge at Lady Bay.

* There is a need for better access along the Radcliffe Road, perhaps widening the Radcliffe Road to allow an additional lane.

* There is a need for improved flow at the main roundabouts by flyovers.

* There is a need to make the A52 into a three lane dual carriageway.

* The A453 junction with the A52 is developing into a bottleneck, especially so at rush hour periods.

* There is a need for much improved road over the River Trent - this junction is steadily grinding to a halt.

* There is a need for better enforcement of traffic flow at major traffic light controlled intersections to prevent people entering the box - without being able to exit the box - and blocking the flow of traffic.

* The condition of the roads to and from Cotgrave is starting to deteriorate. The condition of roads and pavements in and around Cotgrave would not be tolerated in West Bridgford!

However much of these suggested improvements would only be of significant value if the traffic flow to the west of Nottingham City Centre, around the ring road, can be improved, perhaps by introduction of appropriate fly-overs at major roundabouts/intersections.

Graham Ewing