<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Event Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment by</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submission Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Version</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| **Page number** | Page 49-53 |
| **Paragraph number** | Paras 3.88 -3.99 |
| **Policy reference** | Policy 8.1: Housing Allocation – Land between Butt Lane and Closes Side Lane, East Bridgford |
| **Site reference** | Policy 8.1: Housing Allocation – Land between Butt Lane and Closes Side Lane, East Bridgford |

| **Policies Map** | No |

**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).**

**Summary:**
RBC, in adopting and publishing revised proposals for East Bridgford without organising public consultation meetings or producing revised documentation for consideration by residents and at a formal meeting of the Parish Council, failed in its duty to ‘continue to engage with stakeholders and the community throughout the pre-submission stage’ (regulation 18) and to fulfil its own policy commitment to ‘allow local communities and consultees to see how ideas have developed at various stages with effective feedback’;

Rushcliffe Statement of community Involvement for Planning Policy and Planning Applications (Draft) May 2018
Page 3, Para 2.7 states

We will abide by the following principles when consulting on the Local Plan:

We will involve the public and consultees at the earliest opportunity when producing documents

Consultation will be transparent, open and accessible to all sections of the community, enabling the community to engage with the planning system, not just those who are familiar with it:

The consultation process will allow local communities and consultees to see how ideas have developed at various stages with effective feedback;

And

Wherever possible consultation will be carried out in tandem with other community engagement initiatives

This relates to the “Stages of the preparation of a Development Plan document”, Appendix One of the above document on page 15, where the Rushcliffe Borough Council in meeting its obligations under national regulations, commits to:

Pre-submission (regulation 18)

This is a key stage of plan development and community engagement is required. The Council will consult on issues and options in the early stages of this process and will continue to engage with stakeholders and the community throughout the pre-submission stage using a variety of methods.

Detailed timeline:

The initial stages of the process were satisfactory. The first consideration of development in the Green Belt around East Bridgford identified 10 possible sites. A public meeting was held and responses made. EBPC responded in line with the wishes of the majority of residents as expressed in the Community Plan Appraisal that it was against any development in the Green Belt.

In October 2017, revised proposals were published, identifying four sites in the Green Belt, three from the original list and one new site, South of Butt Lane. A second public meeting was organised, and the PC reacted by agreeing to a number of Parish Councillors working with the EB Community Plan Group to produce a response. That response was considered at the meeting of the PC in November 2017, and a decision reached to support its submission to RBC. Part of that response was to request a more rational planning proposal if development was to take place in the south and east of the village. The expectation was that there would be circulation of any revisions and those revisions made the subject of a further public meeting so that all residents could be consulted and the revisions considered by a formal meeting of the PC. That did not happen.

The revised proposals were incorporated into the draft publication policy document to be considered and voted upon in a full RBC meeting in April. When we learned of this, a letter was sent to the Chief Executive two days before the meeting protesting about the lack of consultation with a request that the letter be circulated to all RBC Councillors (coy included below). To my knowledge this did not occur and has not since despite a second request being made.

Hence, EBPC believes that RBC failed in its duty to ‘continue to engage’ and ‘allow local communities… to see how ideas have developed … with effective feedback’.
Appendix

Letter to RBC Chief Executive 25th April 2018

To:
Mr Allen Graham, Chief Executive
Mr. Richard Mapletoft, Local Development
Rushcliffe Borough Council

By e-mail attachment

Dear Sirs,

Urgent: Local Plan 2 document, Land and Planning Policies, agenda item 8 for the full Council meeting on 26th April 2018

I am writing on behalf of the East Bridgford Parish Council to express its concerns about the proposals for East Bridgford in the above document, beginning on page 85.

The following points raise serious issues, not least about due process.

1. The proposals put forward in the second public consultation for East Bridgford have been changed

1. The number of dwellings has increased from approximately 100 to 125

1. The Parish Council has not had the opportunity to formally consider the new proposals in their entirety at a meeting of the Parish Council (next due, Tuesday 1st May)

1. Residents have not had an opportunity to consider the new, revised arrangements via another public consultation

1. Some aspects of the responses made by the East Bridgford Community Plan group as a result of the second consultation have been included in the new proposals, others have not (eg the MUGA is not mentioned). The Community Plan group did hold a public meeting and its responses attracted majority support from the Parish Council as put forward. However, the interpretation or realisation in the above document has not had the scrutiny mentioned in bullet points 3 and 4 above

I ask for your urgent consideration of the above issues, and communication of our concerns about due process to the appropriate officers and all Borough Councillors in advance of the above RBC meeting.

Yours sincerely,

Philip Clarke
Chairman, East Bridgford Parish Council

cc Borough Cllr. Nigel Lawrence
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? 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).

Summary:

RBC, in adopting and publishing revised proposals for East Bridgford without organising public consultation meetings or producing revised documentation for consideration by residents and at a formal meeting of the Parish Council, failed in its duty to ‘continue to engage with stakeholders and the community throughout the pre-submission stage’ (regulation 18) and to fulfil its own policy commitment to ‘allow local communities and consultees to see how ideas have developed at various stages with effective feedback’;

Rushcliffe Statement of community Involvement for Planning Policy and Planning Applications (Draft)
May 2018

Page 3, Para 2.7 states

We will abide by the following principles when consulting on the Local Plan:

We will involve the public and consultees at the earliest opportunity when producing documents

Consultation will be transparent, open and accessible to all sections of the community, enabling the community to engage with the planning system, not just those who are familiar with it:

The consultation process will allow local communities and consultees to see how ideas have developed at various stages with effective feedback;

And

Wherever possible consultation will be carried out in tandem with other community engagement initiatives

This relates to the “Stages of the preparation of a Development Plan document”, Appendix One of the above document on page 15, where the Rushcliffe Borough Council in meeting its obligations under national regulations, commits to:

Pre-submission (regulation 18)

This is a key stage of plan development and community engagement is required. The Council will consult on issues and options in the early stages of this process and will continue to engage with stakeholders and the community throughout the pre-submission stage using a variety of methods.

Detailed timeline:

The initial stages of the process were satisfactory. The first consideration of development in the Green Belt around East Bridgford identified 10 possible sites. A public meeting was held and responses made. EBPC responded in line with the wishes of the majority of residents as expressed in the Community Plan Appraisal that it was against any development in the Green Belt.

In October 2017, revised proposals were published, identifying four sites in the Green Belt, three from the original list and one new site, South of Butt Lane. A second public meeting was organised, and the PC reacted by agreeing to a number of Parish Councillors working with the EB Community Plan Group to produce a response. That response was considered at the meeting of the PC in November 2017, and a decision reached to support its submission to RBC. Part of that response was to request a more rational planning proposal if development was to take place in the south and east of the village. The expectation was that there would be circulation of any revisions and those revisions made the...
subject of a further public meeting so that all residents could be consulted and the revisions considered by a formal meeting of the PC. That did not happen.

The revised proposals were incorporated into the draft publication policy document to be considered and voted upon in a full RBC meeting in April. When we learned of this, a letter was sent to the Chief Executive two days before the meeting protesting about the lack of consultation with a request that the letter be circulated to all RBC Councillors (coy included below). To my knowledge this did not occur and has not since despite a second request being made.

Hence, EBPC believes that RBC failed in its duty to ‘continue to engage’ and ‘allow local communities … to see how ideas have developed … with effective feedback’.

Appendix

Letter to RBC Chief Executive 25th April 2018

To:
Mr Allen Graham, Chief Executive
Mr. Richard Mapletoft, Local Development
Rushcliffe Borough Council

By e-mail attachment

Dear Sirs,

Urgent: Local Plan 2 document, Land and Planning Policies, agenda item 8 for the full Council meeting on 26th April 2018

I am writing on behalf of the East Bridgford Parish Council to express its concerns about the proposals for East Bridgford in the above document, beginning on page 85.

The following points raise serious issues, not least about due process.

1 The proposals put forward in the second public consultation for East Bridgford have been changed

1 The number of dwellings has increased from approximately 100 to 125

1 The Parish Council has not had the opportunity to formally consider the new proposals in their entirety at a meeting of the Parish Council (next due, Tuesday 1st May)

1 Residents have not had an opportunity to consider the new, revised arrangements via another public consultation

1 Some aspects of the responses made by the East Bridgford Community Plan group as a result of the second consultation have been included in the new proposals, others have not (eg the MUGA is not mentioned). The Community Plan group did hold a public meeting and its responses attracted majority support from the Parish Council as put forward. However, the interpretation or realisation in the above document has not had the scrutiny mentioned in bullet points 3 and 4 above
I ask for your urgent consideration of the above issues, and communication of our concerns about due process to the appropriate officers and all Borough Councillors in advance of the above RBC meeting.

Yours sincerely,

Philip Clarke
Chairman, East Bridgford Parish Council
cc Borough Cllr. Nigel Lawrence

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.

East Bridgford Parish Council believes that, to fulfil its stated duty, Rushcliffe Borough Council should withdraw the section about East Bridgford from the draft publication, and, if it wishes to continue with any proposals, carry out the full process of consultation about the revised changes which that duty requires.

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.