To whom it may concern

Please find attached representation from Featherstones PDD to the Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version on behalf of a number of different clients.

Please can you acknowledge receipt of the submission.

I trust that this I in order.

Regards

John Holmes
Dear Mr Mapletoft,

Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies Publication Version
Representation by Featherstones PDD Ltd

Featherstones are a land promotion and residential development company based in Rushcliffe. We act for a range of clients with land interests across the Borough and have participated throughout the Local Plan preparation process, including the Local Plan Part 1 Core Strategy Process. These representations set out the overarching concerns of Featherstones on behalf of all of our clients, as well as also putting forward site specific representations on behalf of individual clients. In this regard separate forms have therefore been completed for different client's interests were appropriate.

Feathertones (652426) clients are:

- Mr Hogg (997476): Land at Platt Lane Keyworth
- Mrs Hurst & Mr Richards (1092662): Land at Nottingham Road, Cropwell Bishop
- Mr Pickford (1092676): Land at Butt Lane, East Bridgeford
- Mr Ruzicka (1092673): Land off Baker’s Hollow, Cotgrave
- Mr Simpson (1092668): Land at Old Loughborough Road, Ruddington
- FFR Developments: Station Hotel, Sutton Bonington.

Featherstones fundamental concern is that the Local Plan Part 2 does not respond appropriately to the Borough’s housing requirements and current housing land supply shortfall. The Local Plan does not allocate sufficient sites. The Council’s assessment of its housing requirement is flawed and significantly downplays its delivery issues and fails to appropriately plan for a contingency. Given the issues faced by the Borough, the experience of delivery since the adoption of the Core Strategy and having regard to the requirements of the NPPF and the emphasis of the Government's proposed changed to the NPPF, it is considered that the Plan does not allocate sufficient sites to ensure, with reasonable certainty, that the Local Plan housing requirements (including providing a 5 year supply of land for housing) will be met. It is considered therefore that unless the Plan is modified, it is unsound.

The Plan is also too narrow in its approach to site allocations and housing delivery. It fails to grasp the need (as demanded by Government) to increase the range of sites, the form of development proposed and to support the growth of villages. A greater number of sites (or outlets) will help increase housing supply, but should also be allocated for specific purposes, in particular to meet the need for self and custom house building and the need to provide specific accommodation for the elderly. An increase in the variety of forms of new housing will broaden the range of markets served and thereby help to further increase housing supply.
In order for the Plan to be made sound a more positive and commercially realistic approach to housing delivery must be adopted with further sites allocated for development. The shortfall in the Plan is significant, but Featherstones believes that there are sufficient suitable, available and sustainable sites which can be bought forward to address the issues within the Plan. This includes the sites identified in these representations.

These sites have been assessed by the Council and have not been found to be unacceptable. Modifications to the Plan can therefore be made relatively easily in order to make the Plan ‘sound’. These changes should be made now prior to the submission of the Plan for examination.

Featherstones would welcome further discussions with the Council about these necessary modifications and the specific sites it is promoting.

Yours sincerely

John Holmes
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>John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Holmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (where relevant)</td>
<td>Several clients - see covering letter</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: Featherstones PDD Ltd

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: Housing Site Selection Report

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

- Page no. 18-68
- Paragraph no. 
- Section 3
- Policy ref. 
- Site ref. Choose an item.
- 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.

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.

Please see attached Statement.

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”).

Please see attached Statement.

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

To discuss in detail the housing supply issues.

**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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Local Plan Part 2 has been submitted for independent examination.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The recommendations of the Planning Inspector appointed to carry out the independent examination have been published.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Local Plan Part 2 has been adopted</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date form completed: 18/06/2018

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

localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk; or

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

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

If you have any questions, please contact the Planning Policy team by telephone on 0115 981.
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.
1.0 Introduction

1.1 The Council’s assessment of its housing supply and more generally to its approach to delivering its housing requirement, are flawed and the Plan is currently unsound.

1.2 There are two main objections to the Local Plan in its current form:

   I. It is considered that the shortfall in housing supply is significantly greater than the Council have calculated (both in terms of the overall requirement and the 5 year land supply). The Local Plan Part 2 therefore fails to allocate sufficient land to ensure the Borough’s minimum housing requirement will be met and a rolling 5 year supply of land for housing secured.

   II. It is considered that the Plan fails to accord with national policy in relation to the need to meet the needs of different types of housing, in particular to address needs for and encourage provision of housing for the elderly and opportunities for self and custom build housing. Specific sites for this type of housing should be allocated.

1.3 As a result the Plan fails the tests of soundness, in particular it is not positively prepared, effective nor consistent with National Policy.

2.0 Housing Supply Shortfall

2.1 The Borough has a very serious housing land supply issue. It has failed to bring forward enough land in the right place, at the right time. This is due in part to the lack of delivery on almost all of the Borough’s Strategic sites but also due to the significant delays in the preparation and adoption of the Local Plan Part 2.

2.2 It is essential that the Borough adopt a pragmatic approach to planning for the delivery of its minimum housing requirement together with realistic assumptions in relation to delivery on existing and proposed sites.

2.3 It is critical that the Council’s assumption about the deliverability of sites is realistic and robust. In particular, and especially given past experience, the assumptions should not be, individually and collectively, overly optimistic, such that the housing shortfall is down played and future delivery issues inevitable.

2.4 Although the Local Plan does not clearly explain how its residual housing requirement is calculated (housing to be delivered through allocations in the Local Plan Part 2), it appears that the calculation is based on the Trajectory as set out at Appendix B of the Publication Plan. The assumptions that underpin that Trajectory, in relation to the strategic sites, are unrealistic and flawed. There is no clear evidence to reasonably conclude that these large, complex sites will begin delivery in the period suggested, nor deliver, on an ongoing and consistent basis, at the rates assumed. Indeed in relation to Gamston / Tolleton the delivery rates have increased from those assumed in the Trajectory appended to the Core Strategy. It is considered that the Trajectory overstates delivery from these sites during the plan period of at least 1000 dwellings and potentially up to 2000 dwellings. Delivery is likely to commence at the earliest at least 1 and
probably 2 or 3 years later than assumed and delivery rates will at best be ‘on average’ 200 (and more probably 150) dwellings a year rather than 250 dwellings.

2.5 The NPPF makes clear that to be developable there needs to be a ‘reasonable prospect’ that the site is available and can be viably delivered at the point envisaged. The NPPG states that when producing trajectories, local planning authorities should undertake ‘an overall risk assessment … as to whether sites will come forward as anticipated’ (ID:3-025.20140306). It is clear the Council have not done this.

2.6 The emphasis of Government Policy is for Plans to provide sufficient certainty that the minimum housing requirement for the area will be met, in full, during the plan period.

2.7 The Council has acknowledged the need for a buffer in its overall housing supply to take account of inevitable delays and non-implementation of sites. The realities of the housing market (as experienced in Rushcliffe) are that some allocations and permissions are not implemented and others are delayed or delivered at slower rates than what might have been assumed. A contingency for this is essential, which means the need to plan for more permissions (more land for housing) than the minimum housing requirement. In addition to the errors in the housing requirement calculation, it is also considered that the ‘buffer’ or flexibility allowance applied to the Plan is insufficient.

2.8 Whilst there is no set requirement in Government Policy for a housing supply ‘buffer’ to be applied, it is common practice that a ‘buffer’ is applied at a level which reflects the delivery rates in the area and the mix and nature of allocated sites. In Rushcliffe the experience of delivery rates is one of delay and uncertainty and the Plan is reliant on a number of large, complex strategic sites where there would be a significant impact if one or a number were to be delayed or deliver at slower rates than expected.

2.9 In these circumstances a ‘buffer’ of at the very least 10% and more reasonably 15% of the areas overall housing requirement would be appropriate. If a 15% ‘buffer’ were applied to the Borough’s full housing requirement of 13,150, the Plan would need to make provision for 15,122 dwellings.

2.10 That would equate to around a further 800 dwellings than assumed in the Council’s current Trajectory, which suggests 14,338 dwellings in the Plan Period. However if our conclusions above in relation to the housing trajectory are also taken into account, i.e. that the Council are only currently planning (even in a best case scenario) for the delivery of around 13,300 dwellings over the Plan period, the Council need to allocate sites sufficient to deliver a further 1,800 or so dwellings (the difference between 15,122 and 13,300).

2.11 Whilst there have been, and continue to be, major delays to the delivery of most of the Borough’s strategic sites, experience at Cotgrave and East Leake demonstrates that delivery on sites can be consistently high if suitable sites are brought forward. Experience at East Leake in particular has shown how new houses can be brought forward quickly, when there are significant permissions granted on different sites.

2.12 There is no reason to believe that this experience could not be replicated in other villages across the Borough, provided sufficient sites are made available. Rushcliffe is a very strong housing market area and demand is unlikely to constrain delivery rates.

2.13 Having regard to the growth of East Leake, more houses than indicated in the Preferred Housing Sites document could be accommodated in the larger villages of Keyworth, Ruddington and Cotgrave. There are suitable sites available for development, which can contribute to the housing requirement in a suitable and sustainable way. Further details are set out below in relation to modifications to the Plan. The sites include land off Platt Lane, Keyworth, (which has previously been identified as a suitable site in the first ‘Publication’ Version of the Neighbourhood Plan) land at Baker’s Hollow, Cotgrave; and land at Old Loughborough Road, Ruddington (which was identified as a preferred site in the ‘Preferred Housing Sites Consultation’).
2.14 The Borough Council’s recognition that growth is both necessary and sustainable at East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Sutton Bonington is welcomed. However, given the housing requirements, further development in some of these villages could be identified too. These and other villages are capable of accommodating development and making a meaningful and sustainable contribution to meeting the Borough’s challenging housing requirements and current supply shortfall. Details of suitable sites are set out below under modification to the Plan. This includes suitable additional sites in Cropwell Bishop. It is also considered that Aslockton and Costock are suitable locations for some small scale growth. Both have good access to services and facilities (Costock, as a result of close proximity to and direct relationship with East Leake). Both Costock and Aslockton are outside the Green Belt and have suitable sites available for development.

2.15 In relation to these smaller settlements it is considered that it would be inconsistent to conclude that development on land at Bunny Brickworks, Bunny and the former Islamic Institute at Flintham (for 100 and 95 houses respectively) is sustainable, whilst development in villages with a better range of services and facilities on sites better related to those villages and those services and facilities, is not sustainable. Both sites are remote from the village centres, in settlements with limited access to services and facilities. The fact that these isolated sites have been previously used does not in itself justify the allocation of these sites before, or instead of, better located, more sustainable, green field sites.

2.16 When allocating sites the Council should maximise housing supply via the widest possible range of sites by location and by size of site. A greater range of sites, by type and size, will improve the rate of delivery of new homes. Increasing sales outlets will increase overall delivery of housing. In general increasing the number of sales outlets available means increasing the number of housing sites. The maximum delivery is achieved not just because there are more sales outlets but because the widest possible range of products and locations are available to meet the widest possible range of demand.

2.17 This approach was advocated in the Housing White Paper, which presented a range of measures to increase delivery and ensure housing requirements are met. A Key emphasis of the White Paper is to encourage development in villages and to support the development of small and medium sized sites. This has translated into the Draft revised NPPF, which includes a requirement to provide small sites (paragraph 59) and at paragraph 80 the need to ‘identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services’.

3.0 Delivering a wide choice of homes

3.1 As well as recognising the importance of small sites and development within villages to support local communities and contribute to housing delivery, the White Paper and Draft NPPF seek to reinforce the need for local planning authorities, as well as to Plan for a sufficient amount land for housing to Plan for a sufficient ‘variety of land’ to come forward and that ‘the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed’ (paragraph 60 – Draft NPPF).

3.2 These are not new requirements, the NPPF together with the NPPG make clear that local authorities should plan positively for a choice of housing, but it is clear that Government believe Local Plans are failing to deliver on these requirements. The Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2 embodies this failure. As set out the Plan simply allocates land for housing, leaving to the market (driven almost entirely by a small number of large national housebuilders) to determine the type of housing to be delivered. The Policies in the Publication Plan will fail to deliver the choice of homes needed and which the NPPF demand. In particular it fails to address the need to ensure the delivery of houses for the elderly and houses for self and customer build.

3.3 The Policy position is quiet clear, Paragraph 50 of the NPPF requires local planning authorities to deliver a ‘wide choice of high quality houses’ and to Plan for a mix of housing based on the needs of different groups in the community including ‘older people’ and ‘people wishing to build their own houses’. These requirements are reinforced in the NPPG. ID: 12-006-20150320 states that:
‘Local Planning Authorities should ensure that the policies in their Local Plan recognises, the diverse types of housing needed in their area and , where appropriate, identify specific sites for all types of housing to meet their anticipated housing requirement. This could include sites for older people’s housing …’

3.4 The Local Plan Part 2 as set out fails to Plan positively for these requirements. The approach is outdated and will simply perpetuate the forms of housing choice and delivery (which is focussed on national house builder stock) which the Government is seeking to move away from.

3.5 Further guidance is set out in the NPPG at ID 2a – 021 – 20160401. In relation to Housing for older people it states that;

‘The need to provide housing for older people is critical given the projected increase in the number of households aged 65 and over accounts for over half of the new households’

And

‘Plan makers will need to consider the size, location and quality of dwellings needed in the future for older people’. And

‘Local authorities should therefore identify particular types of general housing as part of their assessment.’

3.6 In relation to self build and custom housebuilding the NPPG state that:

‘The government wants to enable more people to build or commission their own home and wants to make this form of housing a mainstream housing option.’ (ID 2a – 021 – 20160401)

3.6 The Local Plan Part 2 fails to address these requirements and is unsound as a result. It should allocate specific sites to meet these needs to provide the certainty required that these housing needs will be met. Reliance on generic policies (policies 13 and 14) will simply fail to deliver the necessary step change in housing delivery. Indeed Policy 13 simply suggest that the Borough Council will ‘seek an appropriate percentage of dwellings’ to provide for self-build plots but even this is subject to ‘site specific circumstances’. Suitable sites are available, which have been promoted to meet specific needs. These are set out in the section on modification to the Plan, below.

3.7 The NPPG includes a specific section on self and custom build housing. It established a requirement on local planning authorities to give permission to enough suitable served plots of land to meet demand. Unless direct action is taken the requirements set out will not be met.

4.0 Necessary Modification to the Plan (changes necessary to make the Plan sound)

4.1 The Local Plan Part 2 should be changed in order to be made sound. It should allocate additional sites to deliver at least a further 1,800 new homes and it should allocate sites specifically to meet the needs of the elderly and to deliver self and custom build properties.

4.2 There are a number of sites promoted by Featherstones on behalf of its clients, which are suitable and available for development but currently omitted from the Plan. These sites should be allocated for development. Details of these sites are set out in separate representations. The sites are;
1. Land off Baker’s Hollow, Cotgrave (on behalf of Mr Ruzicka)
2. Land at Old Loughborough Road, Ruddington (on behalf of Mr Simpson)
3. Land south of Nottingham Road, Cropwell Bishop (on behalf of Mrs Hurst & Mr Richards)
4. Land at Platt Lane, Keyworth (on behalf of Mr Hogg)

4.3 Featherstones have also promoted land at Butt Lane, East Bridgford, which is proposed to be allocated under Policy 8.2. This allocation is strongly supported, but it is considered that the specific approach to the allocation should be amended to ensure that the site can deliver an appropriate number of dwellings. Details in relation to Land at Butt Lane, East Bridgford (on behalf of Mr Pickford) are also set out in separate representations.