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 proposal of building 127 houses in East Bridgford is totally unacceptable.
- Taking a baby in the village for the school and the medical centre is unacceptable, dangerous or congested.
- The school (Primary - St Peter’s) is not big enough. Already too large for a rural village.
- It is impossible to get an appointment at the medical centre. What facilities are there for residents?
- There is already congestion on A6097, A52 both ways. It will be grid lock for hours.
- EB is a small friendly village - it is why we moved here!!
- The roads around EB/Bingham will be more dangerous.
- There will be 250 more cars in EB! How can the village cope with this volume?

Signed: Fiona Farmer
Name: Fiona Farmer
Address: 

East Bridgford Residents Group Drop-In, 16th May 2023
The new proposal for housing in East Bridgford is significantly flawed for the following reasons:

It is NOT what was proposed to the residents in 2017.

There is no allowance for extra infrastructure:
- Roads
- Schooling
- Healthcare

For the same 150 - 250 extra cars and 300 - 400 extra people the building will bring into the village which will be concentrated into a small area of the village. This appears to have been approved by the Parish Council with no consultation with its electorate.

Signed: [signature]
Name: PETER FARMER
Address: [redacted]
### Comment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Mr Paul Fileman (1143961)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event Name</td>
<td>Local Plan Part 2 (Publication Draft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment by</td>
<td>Mr Paul Fileman (1143961)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Date</td>
<td>17/05/18 10:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission Type</td>
<td>Web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

#### Page number
28

#### Paragraph number
All

#### Policy reference
Policy 3: Housing Allocation – Land north of Rempstone, Road, East Leake

#### Site reference
Policy 3: Housing Allocation – Land north of Rempstone, Road, East Leake

#### Policies Map
Yes

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

Please give reasons for your answer, where applicable. You may also use this box if you wish to make representations on one of the Local Plan Part 2’s supporting documents (e.g. Sustainability Appraisal, Habitat Regulations Assessment or Equalities Impact Assessment).

Not qualified to respond to this point.

#### 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:  Effective

(please tick all that apply)

Please give reasons for your answer, where applicable. You may also use this box if you wish to make representations on one of the Local Plan Part 2’s supporting documents (e.g. Sustainability Appraisal, Habitat Regulations Assessment or Equalities Impact Assessment).

Additional housing in East Leake makes reference to possible need for an additional Primary School. However, no reference is made to transport infrastructure.

1. The cross roads in Costock is increasingly dangerous. An additional 350+ cars entering and leaving East Leake will add a substantial amount of traffic to this junction where there have already been fatalities. Traffic lights at the Costock A60 Cross Roads are now essential to ensure safety at this increasingly busy junction.

2. No reference in the plan is made to public transport.

3. No reference in the plan is made to secondary school places - have the needs for these been assessed?

4. No reference in the plan is made to grocery shopping. East Leake has far outgrown its Co-Op, which since its recent refurbishment is even less well suited to the weekly shop leading to further traffic leaving and entering East Leake as people go elsewhere for their weekly shop or use an online delivery service. East Leake is now in need of a respectable supermarket suitable for the weekly shop.

5. No reference is made in the plan to parking in the village. Parking in the centre of the village has recently been extended and a 4 hour lift placed on the parking near the Library / Doctors Surgery. There remains the problem of the other car parks being filled with all day parking of cars as people “park and ride” into Nottingham on the number 1 bus.

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).

See above.

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.

1. Add in changes to public transport infrastructure

2. Add in requirements for space for retail development - preferably in or near the centre of the village but it is understood that this may prove difficult.

3. Add in a proper assessment of school places.

4. Add in traffic safety elements - particularly upgrading Costock A60 Cross Roads to Traffic Lights.
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.

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing sessions of the Public Examination? Please note: if you select NO, your representation(s) will still be considered by the independent Planning Inspector by way of written representations.

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

Happy for the process to consider my written comments.

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.
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)

I have no objections in principle to the proposed development, but firmly object to it being carried out before the infrastructure to support it is provided.

Specifically, the culvied sewer in Main Street regularly discharges raw sewage, and must be improved with a dedicated foul water sewer. Traffic flow through the village must be controlled to prevent speeding at dangerous points and dangerous back stacking at tight spots. Parking at the school must be controlled to allow access for emergency services at peak times.

Signed:

Name:

Address:

East Bridgford Residents Group Drop-In, 16th May 2016, East Bridgford Village Hall
Dear Sirs.

In response to the Rushcliffe Borough Council Local Plan 2 Proposals, and the proposed addition of new residential dwellings in East Bridgford, below are points that should be considered.

1. St. Peter's School is at capacity, having extended the building twice recently. There would be very limited school places available for additional residents, should large numbers of additional dwellings be proposed. Also the school currently accepts large numbers of children from Newton which has resulted in a dramatic increase in car journeys into East Bridgford, having a detrimental impact, see points below. The school should be consulted to understand the implications of additional numbers of residents on the scale being proposed.

2. The main combined-sewer is at capacity. During inclement weather the existing system omits storm-water and excrement onto the highway via the drain covers. Additional dwellings would make this situation unacceptable and could potential put the health of the local residents at risk. A detailed survey of the main sewer should be undertaken to assess whether the existing system could accommodate additional dwellings on the scale being proposed.

3. On-road parking is at capacity. This is currently exacerbated during peak times (8am-9:30am and 3pm-7pm) when the village often becomes grid-locked. Additional cars as a result of additional dwellings on the scale being proposed would only aggravate this situation.

4. Highways incidents on the A46 and / or the A6097 currently results in East Bridgford becoming a ‘short-cut’. This results in the village becoming totally grid-locked causing major delays at the Trent Lane / Gunthorpe Bridge junction, the Kirk Hill / A6097 traffic lights and Butt Lane / Fosse Way junction. Additional cars as a result of additional dwellings on the scale being proposed would only aggravate this situation.

5. Additional dwellings on the scale being proposed would result in additional vehicles-journeys which would cause an unacceptable increase in pollution and danger to residents.
   i) A full analysis of the impact on the air quality should be undertaken.
   ii) Due to the current vehicle numbers and limited parking available inappropriate parking regularly occurs. This has resulted in reported accidents, and recently a child was knocked-over on Kneeton Road due to the obscured visibility caused by parked cars.

6. The Trent Lane / Gunthorpe Bridge junction is incredibly dangerous to exit. It has recently been proposed that Trent Lane be "blocked-off" at this junction and Trent Lane become an access road only for the existing residents and boat-yard. This would also stop the current excessive speeds on this road putting pedestrians at risk, due to there being no pavements.
   If this 'dead-end' situation goes ahead then the additional cars caused by additional dwellings will cause excessive tail-backs at the Kirk Hill / A6097 traffic lights. At peak times the delays are currently excessive.

7. As a local resident and Chartered Architect I am passionate about good quality, appropriate development. On this basis I would suggest that the current proposals for East Bridgford are overbearing, overwhelming, inappropriate, detrimental to the local habitat, and should be vehemently opposed.
I look forward to confirmation that you have received this email.

Your faithfully.
James Firth.

James Firth BA(Hons), Dip.Arch. Grad.Dip. ARB, RIBA.
Director
For and on behalf of JMF Chartered Architects Ltd
www.jmfarchitects.co.uk
WINNER 'British Council for Offices' Design Innovation Award - The Pod, Nottingham.
WINNER 'British Council for Offices' Design Innovation Award - BBC Humberside, Hull.
WINNER 'Best Overseas Design Award' - Rescue Centre, Marina Del Ray, Los Angeles.
This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it/they are addressed. All information is the intellectual property of JMF Chartered Architects Ltd.

Responding To RBC Local Plan 2 ...
East Bridgford Residents Group

TIME FOR ACTION!

The deadline to make representations to Rushcliffe Borough Council is 28th June.

It’s vital that we make our representations along with our comment cards and petition.

Representations can be made:
Online through the Council's consultation system please [CLICK HERE](#). By email to [localdevelopment@rushcliffe.co.uk](mailto:localdevelopment@rushcliffe.co.uk) or please [CLICK HERE](#).

By Post to: Planning Policy
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rushcliffe Arena
Rugby Road
West Bridgford
Nottingham, NG2 7YG

All representations must be submitted by 5.00pm on Thursday 28th June 2018.

---

**The Community Plan:**

*Story So Far*

Click the link above to read about where we are and how we got here!

**CPRE How to Respond to a Local Plan Guidance**

Written for us by Bettina from CPRE to help responses on Comment Cards

[Click here for Comment Card](#)

Please print, complete and return to the Post Office by 1st June. To prove the comments received are from EB residents on the electoral roll please fill in your name and address details, without this your comment won't count!

**Save Our Wildlife Leaflet**

Click the link above to read about how identifying and recording wildlife sightings
You asked to be part of our email update list by contacting us or at our drop in meeting.

Want to change how you receive these emails? You can update your preferences or unsubscribe from this list.
Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies
Publication Version

Representation Form

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

This form has two parts:

Part A - Personal details

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent's Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Ian Timms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Flint</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. 29-34

Paragraph no. 4.1

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)

Positive Prepared  [ ]  Justified  [ ]
Effective  [ ]  Consistent with national policy  [ ]

6. Please give reasons for you answer to Questions 4(1), 4(2), 4(3) and 5, where applicable.
You may also use this box if you wish to make representations on one of the Local Plan Part 2’s supporting documents (e.g. Sustainability Appraisal, Habitat Regulations Assessment or Equalities Impact Assessment). You can attach additional information but please make sure it is securely attached and clearly referenced.

I agree with the Borough Council’s decision for the South Side of Burnham.

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”).

\[ N / A \]

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

- No, I do not wish to participate at the hearing session at the examination. I would like my representation to be dealt with by written representation

- Yes, I wish to appear at the examination

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

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

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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

10. Please indicate if you wish to be notified that: (please tick all that apply)

- The Local Plan Part 2 has been submitted for independent examination.

- The recommendations of the Planning Inspector appointed to carry out the independent examination have been published.

- The Local Plan Part 2 has been adopted

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

localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk; or

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

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

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

---

**Data Protection Notice**

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

Representation Form

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent's Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>MARJIE FLINT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>FLINT</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. 29 - 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.

1 APPROVE OF THE BOROUGH COUNCIL PLAN FOR THE SOUTH SIDE OF BUNNY LANE

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan Part 2 legally compliant or sound, having regard to your responses to Questions 5 and 6. You will need to say why this change will make the Local Plan Part 2 legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you could put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

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

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

No, I do not wish to participate at the hearing session at the examination. I would like my representation to be dealt with by written representation

Yes, I wish to appear at the examination

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

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

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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

10. Please indicate if you wish to be notified that: (please tick all that apply)

The Local Plan Part 2 has been submitted for independent examination.

The recommendations of the Planning Inspector appointed to carry out the independent examination have been published.

The Local Plan Part 2 has been adopted

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

localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk; or

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

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

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

---

**Data Protection Notice**

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

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

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

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

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

[Redacted]

Mrs Susan Flint
Mr Mark Flint
We wish to comment on the above
We do not feel that this should be included in the Keyworth neighbourhood plan Traffic on Bunny Lane is already a nightmare and it can often take 5 minutes to join the traffic in the morning prior to 7:30 am Bunny Lane is not built for heavy traffic and the potential for a 100 + extra cars joining heavy traffic on a narrow lane with blind hills I also feel the infrastructure of Keyworth would not cope i.e. Health Services, parking and also services like Sewage which can often be a problem. It is also difficult to get appointments at the Health Centre with often a months wait for certain Dr's There has also been the recent erection of a large Agricultural building within a 100 metres or so of this land for livestock and associated waste that comes with it, surely a development so close would not be considered for Environmental Health reasons

Yours sincerely
Bridget Flynn and Kenneth Baum

Sent from my iPhone
Comment

Consultee: Dr Alan Folwell (1167075)
Event Name: Local Plan Part 2 (Publication Draft)
Comment by: Dr Alan Folwell (1167075)
Comment ID: 32
Response Date: 25/06/18 15:13
Status: Submitted
Submission Type: Web
Version: 0.1

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

Policy reference: Policy 22: Development within the Countryside
Site reference: Please select an option

Policies Map

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)
- Effective
I write to express my support for proposed policy 22 and its application to Aslockton (Local Plan Part 2 pages 88 – 90). Correctly implemented, this should ensure that significant future development in Aslockton will be restricted to the 75 houses presently under construction at Aslackr Park. In addition, the requirement to establish local need is welcomed. (Note that the Aslackr Park development is currently being signposted from the A1 in Lincolnshire – scarcely a sign of local demand!).

I am, however, concerned about the logic that classifies Aslockton as a “Third Tier” village, and am dismayed that the Sustainability Assessment deals with “Aslockton and Whatton” as if they are one settlement. Aslockton and Whatton are distinct settlements, each with its own Parish Council and facilities. They should not be lumped together.

Aslockton’s population (excluding the prison inmates), is half that of the other five “Third Tier” Sites and on any rational basis, Aslockton should score significantly worse on Sustainability than the others, particularly on the key criteria of shopping/services, public transport and access to local medical facilities.

1. Aslockton’s only shop has recently closed.
2. Past assessments of Aslockton’s sustainability have scored public transport much more highly than is the current reality. There is no realistic bus service to Nottingham, Newark or Grantham – nor is there any public transport service at all to support any evening activities outside the village. The only potentially useful rail service is for day shift commuters to Nottingham, but his route is used by relatively few workers, many of whom get to and from Aslockton station by car. Business travel to and from London by rail is impracticable without driving to Grantham Station.
3. Aslockton does not have a Medical Centre and the poor public transport services mean that the car is the only realistic mode of transport for attendance at an appointment at a medical centre in one of the neighbouring villages.

For all the reasons above, Aslockton should not be classified as a “Third Tier” village. I am seriously concerned that future developers will continue the recent trend of pursuing sites which are not favoured by the Local Plan, as these sites are often more commercially attractive. The erroneous definition of Aslockton as “Third Tier” runs the risk of putting our village in the firing line again for unwanted large developments.

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

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing sessions of the Public Examination? Please note: if you select NO, your representation(s) will still be considered by the independent Planning Inspector by way of written representations.

No, I do not wish to participate at the hearing session at the examination. I would like my representation to be dealt with by written representation

Please indicate if you wish to be notified that: (please tick all that apply)

. The Local Plan Part 2 has been submitted for independent examination.
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To which document does your response relate? Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version

Policy reference: Policy 6.1: Housing Allocation – Land west of Wilford Road, Ruddington
Site reference: Policy 6.1: Housing Allocation – Land west of Wilford Road, Ruddington

Policies Map

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)  
- Justified  
- Effective

Please give reasons for your answer, where applicable. You may also use this box if you wish to make representations on one of the Local Plan Part 2’s supporting documents (e.g. Sustainability Appraisal, Habitat Regulations Assessment or Equalities Impact Assessment).

Ruddington is at capacity already for vehicles and parking. Congestion on the High St is a regular feature and the historical centre is being eroded.

The capacity for more people using the facilities cannot be sustained.

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.

It is not sound because it does not take into account the needs of Ruddington Village. It is a cultural, heritage centre well used by visitors and locals and does not have the capacity to facilitate any more residents.

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)
COMMENTS ON THE RUSHCLIFFE LOCAL PLAN PART 2

We are relieved to read (3.25, page 26) that "It is considered that it would be unacceptable to identify further land at East Leake for housing development".

WE SINCERELY HOPE THIS DECISION WILL BE FINAL AND PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NOT BE GRANTED ON THE PROPOSED ADDITIONAL SITE AT LANTERN LANE or any other.

By the Borough Council's own admission:

"Planning permission has recently been granted on nine greenfield sites around the village that will deliver around 1,000 new homes in total. All of the homes count towards the minimum 400 home target, which means it has already been exceeded by around 600 homes". (3.24, page 26).

Many East Leake residents are astounded at the recent explosive expansion of our village which has put tremendous pressure on the schools and, in particular, the Health Center which has struggled to accommodate such a large influx of residents. The East Leake Parish Council has argued on our behalf that such expansion is unsustainable. Unfortunately it seems we must absorb yet a further 235 homes for which planning permission has been granted on land north of Rempstone Road (3.25, page 26) which will enlarge to twice its size an area currently being built on. When complete it will be interesting to see if indeed 20% of these new properties are "affordable housing" as promised.

It would also be interesting to know where, in any of the Borough's new developments, properties suitable for our increasing elderly population have been built.
Quoting CORE STRATEGY DOCUMENT Page 63: POLICY 8: HOUSING SIZE, MIX AND CHOICE: "Respondents to surveys have also indicated that if they had to move to properties in the future their aspirations would include two bedroom bungalows or purpose built 'retirement villages'. In terms of housing mix, it is expected that where practical a proportion of new residential development should cater for the needs of the elderly".

Peter Franklin
Valerie Franklin.
Dear Sir or Madam

We would like to comment on the impact of the proposed next developments shown in the Local Plan Part 2 relating to sites on either side of Hollygate Lane (Policy 2.1 and Policy 2.2).

The plan states that access to the sites from Hollygate Road and modification of the junction of Hollygate Lane and Colston Gate are required. However there is no consideration of the impact of the additional developments to traffic or management thereof along Bingham Road, through the centre of the village. We have already seen significant impact of the additional traffic caused by the development of Phase 1. At peak periods, the volume and speed of traffic passing on Bingham Road makes exit from properties onto the road dangerous (and can take 5 minutes to enter the road). Additionally we have two young daughters needing to cross this road at peak times for school. We have, on at least 3 occasions in the last 6 months walked onto the pavement outside of our property to find a car driving along the pavement to avoid waiting for a gap in the traffic. Similarly, we have had at least 4 incidents in the last couple of months, when slowly approaching the end of our drive in the car been met by a van or small truck also travelling down the pavement. It has only been by good luck that one of our children has not been seriously injured, or killed. The illegal driving is undoubtedly influenced by the sheer volume of traffic along this road causing impatience in drivers waiting for space to overtake parked vehicles. The local road infrastructure can not safely accommodate further traffic demands from the extensive proposed development of a significant number of houses. We already believe that formal traffic calming measures should be introduced along the stretch of Bingham road from the Colston Gate/Hollygate Lane junction and Thomas James Estate Agents, yet this has not been deemed important until a major incident occurs.

The plan also requires that surface water run off issues must also be addressed. Again, standing water and the volume and speed of traffic along Bingham road caused by the additional housing already completed is significantly affecting the properties along Bingham Road. Constant road wear, development of pot holes, water spray from passing cars, lorries and buses, the speed of traffic and the bad drainage along Bingham Road has led to significant erosion and damage to the wall to our property and neighbouring properties facing the road. Again this would be furthered impacted by further housing development and already needs to be addressed by effective traffic calming and proper improvements to drainage.

The plan requires that green infrastructure should maintain and improve pedestrian linkages to the Country Park and Grantham Canal, however it is not clear from the plan how this will be achieved. The development outlined in Plan 2.1 will potentially significantly impact access to the country park from East Acres and the country park will effectively be surrounded by housing development from both this and the previous phase. It is difficult to see how access and use of the country park will be enhanced by the proximity of the current proposal but rather this would seem detrimental.

As a lay person, it is not easy to determine from the six page document of requirements for submission of comments to the plan how these comments should be prepared, how to effectively use the representation form, nor how individual comments will be addressed in the final decision making; in fact the whole process seems to be intended to discourage comment and objection. We would be very keen to understand specifically how these concerns will be addressed in the future planning consultation and the needs of current residents of the village will be met.

Best regards
Stephen & Jacquie French
I take great exception to the so called “ideals” of the above. Not only is it too general but also narrow minded.
I am a resident of Keyworth, have been for 54 years during which time there have been changes, some not for the
better! We have more than enough hairdressers, likewise Pharmacies, but NO Bank! What is the problem with
having a bank?
The costs involved in this “plan” would be better used in resurfacing the roads in Rushcliffe, there is a good patch of
road under the railway bridge on the Melton Road in Tollerton, & the A46 is great (because it is new)! The rest
remain abysmal.
Also stopping cars with madcap drivers - the area is NOT a race track & speeding is by no means acceptable. It
could kill other road users, not to mention a child.
Rushcliffe also installed traffic lights at the junction of the A606 & Plumtree road - for walkers to cross!!! Why oh
why are these lights never in use at rush hour times of day? What a colossal waste of money.
No more housing is required in Keyworth, consideration should be given to the amount of cars in use, has anyone
been on the access roads to Keyworth & registered the amount of traffic attempting to get to work on time & return
home in the evening? 300/400 more vehicles on the roads would be absolutely horrendous!
I object to the Local Plan - part 2.

Sent from my iPad