Dear Sir,

I regret to 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]

CHRISTINA GARTSIDE
Comment
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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: Yes

Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2 to be legally compliant?

- Yes
- No

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:  . Positively Prepared
(please tick all that apply)  . Justified

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 has seen many shops close over recent years, eg Barclays Bank, Midland Bank, Convenience store and Thomas's the green grocer. People park their cars in the village and then get the bus into Nottingham to go to work. This has slowly been strangling the shops in the center because shoppers cannot come to buy their items and leave again. Its very difficult to support local trade when you cannot have access to small local shops. Increased housing development will not assist the revitalisation of the village, but will increase the slow death of village life. It will no longer be a village, merely a suburb of a major city, with no heart, or people who really care about it.

Over recent years, Ruddington has already taken its fair share of new housing developments, with estates on the ex railway land, the old Woodhouse yard on Camelot Street, the huge estate on Pasture Lane, plus other infilling site eg Bostocks shop site. The village simply cannot sustain further residential development, without it losing the essence of being a village.

James Peacock School is 50 years old so probably a new primary school is needed to accommodate the new children. Where will they go after 11 years of age? Rushcliffe and West Bridgford schools are over subscribed. Are Rushcliffe planning to build new primary and secondary schools in Ruddington?

The increased housing will put intense stress on the existing doctors surgeries and dental care resources, and NHS care staff, which will need to be financed from somewhere.

With every new house comes at least 1 or 2 cars. The village is very busy with through-traffic, which often gets gridlocked on the hill outside Sainsburys, with cars parking on one side. Increased traffic will only increase this pressure-point.

The proposed site West of Wilford Road, is a flood zone. The Fairham Brook has often flooded the area and it would not be safe or practical to build residential housing on a flood zone. The new housing could also be the cause of water damage to existing properties.

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).

I don’t think that the planners are listening to the views of the people that actually live in Ruddington, and are only adhering to their instructions, to build more houses at any cost.

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.

Simply, do not plan to build on the site west of Wilford Road, which is in the green belt and a major asset to Ruddington as it forms a natural barrier from the city of Nottingham.
If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing sessions of the Public Examination? Please note: if you select NO, your representation(s) will still be considered by the independent Planning Inspector by way of written representations.

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

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

- The Local Plan Part 2 has been submitted for independent examination.
- The recommendations of the Planning Inspector appointed to carry out the independent examination have been published.
- The Local Plan Part 2 has been adopted.
From: Cllr Nigel Lawrence []
Sent: 12 May 2018 11:18
To: Local Plan Ph 2

Richard

The attached emails have come to me via our MP, Robert Jenrick.

They may already be on your lists, but please could you ensure they are included in the consultation next week.

Cllr Nigel Lawrence, East Bridgford Ward, Rushcliffe BC

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Sue Tomlinson _______________________
> Sent: 10 May 2018 10:40
> To: GRAY, Susan _______________________
> Subject: Note from Sue Tomlinson to your Facebook Page Robert Jenrick
> 
> Dear Robert
> 
> I hope this email finds you well. I am writing as I am very concerned about the impact of the proposed 125 homes will have in the fabric of East Bridgford. I live next door to St Peters school a fabulous village school which is already bursting at the seams and drawing in large numbers of cars in the morning and afternoon. The congestion causes a real problem for local residents already. Main Street is completely clogged at rush hour as commuters use it as a cut through to avoid the hold up nearer to Bingham. Rushcliffe council has not done a traffic survey to identify what issues there currently are and what the impact of over 150 new cars will have on the village. Would it be possible to put some pressure on the council to do a traffic survey?
> 
> Thank you for your time
> 
> Best wishes
> 
> Sue
> 
> Sent from my iPhone
> From: Cllr N Lawrence _______________________
> Sent: 11 May 2018 10:03
> To:  
> Subject: Fwd: Greenbelt Development East Bridgford
I wish for it to be noted by yourself and the council that myself and the majority of the residents of East Bridgford oppose this newly planned development.

EB is indeed a small, vibrant community, but is already struggling in terms of roads, pavements, doctors surgery, schools, parking and traffic.

On another note, when myself and my husband made enquiries to the planning office at RBC regards the building of one eco home in EB on greenbelt (as EB residents) we were refused. So why the change of heart on such a massive scale??? It would seem to me that there is something not right here.

I will be attending the meeting in EB village hall to voice my opinion.

Kind regards
Sara Gerakios
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]

[Signatures]

[Redacted]
Please see the below response to Local Plan Part 2 as it concerns proposed development in Sutton Bonington:

- **Excessive Proportional Increase and Urbanisation.**

The proposed development of 80 houses has only a very small impact on the target on the borough at 0.6% but a significant impact on the village, a 10% increase in dwellings, leading to many adverse outcomes for the residents, discussed below.

**Education.**

There is no scope to increase capacity at either the village primary school or the Academy at East Leake. This was recognised by the Council in a document published in August 2017 as a result of the first public consultation when the Council then took the view that a proposed development on the same land should not be pursued.

**Access to GP and associated medical services.**

Access to GP and associated medical services is through the Sutton Bonington Surgery of the East Leake Medical Group; services are provided by the surgery for residents of surrounding villages too. A bungalow designed for domestic occupation is used as the surgery and its unsuitability for use as a surgery are well recognised. Nottinghamshire Clinical Commissioning group has stated that there are no available funds to improve the surgery and the proposed development will therefore serve to exacerbate existing problems.

**Transport.**

The provision of public transport is as follows:

- From Monday to Saturday only Trent Barton provide a service on the Nottingham/Loughborough/Nottingham Skylink route from around 7.30am to around 7pm, approximately, hourly. The journey to Nottingham takes around one and three-quarter hours, making it unsuitable for commuting.
- A publicly subsidised service, number 865, the frequency of which makes it unsuitable for commuting.
- There are two rail stations nearby at Loughborough and East Midlands Parkway. There is no direct public transport link to Loughborough Station and only infrequently through the 865 mentioned above to East Midlands Parkway.

There is no cycle path provided in the village area to any location, even the extremely busy A6006 passing south of the village close to the proposed development.
The inevitable outcome of the above if the proposed development goes ahead is increased use of private vehicles for commuting and domestic reasons. There will be well-known environmental outcomes as a result, exacerbated by reasonably predicted congestion at junctions covering access to the village; the most significant of these is the junction of Park Lane with the A6006 adjacent to the proposed development.

- 

Flooding.

Recent significant flooding in the village was caused by the appalling condition and maintenance of surface water drainage. The responsibility for the maintenance of such drains lies with a variety of land-owners for many of whom maintenance is not a priority. The site of the proposed development offers a significant balance to the risk of flooding albeit that the land itself is frequently flooded with surface water, in particular from the hills to the east of the village.

Comments.

As residents of the Rushcliffe Area we fully understand the pressure that the council is under from central government to increase additional housing in the borough; furthermore, we recognise the necessity and justification for such development. However, the council needs to exercise great care that in responding to such pressure it does not simply pass a problem on to its residents by allowing developments that will reduce the quality of life of its residents.

Stephen and Elizabeth Glynn
I live in Cropwell Bishop. Please accept the following representations in respect of the Local Plan Part 2:

1. Failure to identify Cropwell Bishop 'Centre of Neighbourhood Importance'

In the adopted Local Plan Part 1, Policy 6 states that the boundaries of Centres of Neighbourhood Importance are to be set out in the Local Plan Part 2 (Land and Planning Policies). These are to ensure that appropriate development takes place in those areas. In the Local Plan Part 2 released for comments, these are identified in Policy 26 ‘Development within Centres of Neighbourhood Importance’. However, only those in West Bridgford and one in Keyworth have been identified.

The proposed document fails to identify the centre of Neighbourhood Importance in Cropwell Bishop, which is needed because it has become a small town and will likely see further future development. Cropwell Bishop has been identified as having the capability to sustain 70 further dwellings. A centre needs to be identified to ensure relevant policies are applied equally and fairly to Cropwell Bishop. The village has suffered due to repeated increases in size over successive years without so far any proper regard to the additional needs this has created for the village centre. This is evidenced by the inadequate parking which is insufficient to even sustain the services presently provided in the village let alone any future development needs.

The villages services upon which this assessment will have been based include two pubs, a large doctors surgery, a school, shops including a co-op supermarket, a hairdresser, beautition, sandwich shop, independent butcher. The village serves not only its own residents but also those in the surrounding villages of Langar, Cropwell Butler, Tithby, Colston Bassett, Owthorpe, Kinoulton and even Hickling, whose residents often drive to Cropwell Bishop where their own villages do not provide these services.

2. Failure to recognise a requisite ‘Cordon Sanitaire’ around Cropwell Bishop Sewage Treatment Works (STW).

The Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Local Plan recognises what it describes as a ‘Cordon Sanitaire’ should be maintained around all STWs of between 25 and 400 metres. In identifying the whole of the area to the South of this STW (and right up to the boundary of the STW) as being suitable for housing, the proposed Local Plan Part 2 fails to respect this. In determining this plan, the suitable width of a ‘Cordon Sanitaire’ should be identified for the Cropwell Bishop STW and a band equiavent to this excluded from the area to be allocated to housing and instead be retained within the green belt. The STW is presently undergoing plans of significant improvements and will no doubt receive further waste from the proposed and future new house building, so that this Cordon Sanitaire should be sufficient to allow for future anticipated development at that site.

3. Failure to update for additional Infrastructure requirements

Local Plan part 1 Policy 18 Infrastructure requires that 'new development must be supported by the required infrastructure at the appropriate stage', and critical Infrastructure requirements were set out in Appendix C. Subsequently the Local Plan Part 2 has been amended to include certain villages including Cropwell Bishop which were not anticipated in Part 1, and and so this needs to be reviewed and updated to reflect this change.

For example, most additional housing in Cropwell Bishop of this type is used by villagers commuting to adjoining areas and in particular Nottingham for employment. At present there is no reliable and usable bus service from Cropwell Bishop to Nottingham so that all these residents commute by car to employment and to use any other local Authority provided facilities and services. The bus service is very limited, takes an age to get to Nottingham and keeps being withdrawn anyway so that its availability cannot be relied upon by house buyers.

To take account of this, further work and resources is needed to identify and provide additional infrastructure for the affected roads and for the possibility for providing park and ride facilities from Bingham. In particular the only connection from Cropwell Bishop towards Nottingham is along Nottingham Road which within the village is often clogged by parked cars because no other parking is available. This is now causing rat running along How View Road,
and through Cropwell Butler. This route along Nottingham Road cannot cope with greater traffic without the provision of appropriate improvements and this needs to be acknowledged and addressed in this Policy.

Jonathan Good
To whom in may concern.

We do not think that inclusion of a fourth site, Hillside Farm, Key 13 is a sound decision. The Council needs to respect local democracy as this is why the neighbourhood plan was created. They should follow the housing and other recommendations listed in the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan, as agreed on 30th May 2018.

The recently erected agricultural buildings are now very visible from Bunny lane and will house 450 animals together with associated manure heaps and other agricultural waste.

Environmental Health recommendations state that housing should be not within 150 metres, which covers most of Key 13 of animal waste, due to potential health risks.

The Council will be aware that Bunny Lane is a main traffic route in and out of the village. It undulates and despite attempts speed limits cannot be restricted.

There is now limited car parking alongside the Health Centre and the likelihood of vehicles being parked on both sides of nearby roads. Vehicles parked on the pavements are a hazard to the many pram and dog walkers, also those residents who are dependent upon the use of mobility scooters. This is also a popular route for cyclists.

It is anticipated that another 80-90 cars will have to negotiate a steep gradient onto Bunny Lane and in difficult traffic conditions.

We do not think that any additional sites should be allocated in Keyworth as the three sites that are in both the Neighbourhood Plan and the Local Plan Part 2, will almost certainly be promoted by the developers with the number of housing nearer to 590 than 450.

If additional land is to be allocated, then the neighbourhood plan contingency recommendations to use safe guarded land should be followed and not allocation of Hillside Farm Key 13.

Mr Rex Gooding & Mrs Christine Gooding.
This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the intended recipients. If you are not an intended recipient you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. E-mail transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error-free as information could be intercepted, corrupted, lost, destroyed, arrive late or incomplete, or contain viruses. The sender therefore does not accept liability for any errors or omissions in the contents of this message, which arise as a result of e-mail transmission. If verification is required please request a hard-copy version.
Please find below (and attached) my objections to the Local Development Plan, as it concerns Ruddington. Could you please confirm receipt of this email.

Thanks

8 June 2018

Dear Sir

Ref: Local Plan Part 2 Consultation

I wish to object to the inclusion of RUDD1 (Land off Wilford Road) in the development plan for Ruddington for the following reasons:

This area is prone to flooding and part of the area is in Flood Zone 2. If the development goes ahead, there is a clear danger to homes nearby.

It is part of the Green Belt on the edge of the Ruddington and any building here would reduce further the open space between Ruddington and the City and West Bridgford as well as having a detrimental effect on the wild life in this area.

It would add further to the already bad congestion of traffic along this road and through the village.

This part of Ruddington has seen a great deal of housing development over the last few years: Pasture Lane; Old Station Road, the development off Camelot Street and the current development off Camelot Street on the old lace factory site.

As planning permission has been given to the Pasture Lane site, there is no need for development on RUDD1 as the Pasture Lane site will more than make up for the potential loss of the 130 houses proposed for RUDD1.

Yours faithfully

Pat Green
8 June 2018

Dear Sir

Ref: Local Plan Part 2 Consultation

I wish to object to the inclusion of RUDD1 (Land off Wilford Road) in the development plan for Ruddington for the following reasons:

This area is prone to flooding and part of the area is in Flood Zone 2. If the development goes ahead, there is a clear danger to homes nearby.

It is part of the Green Belt on the edge of the Ruddington and any building here would reduce further the open space between Ruddington and the City and West Bridgford as well as having a detrimental effect on the wild life in this area.

It would add further to the already bad congestion of traffic along this road and through the village.

This part of Ruddington has seen a great deal of housing development over the last few years: Pasture Lane; Old Station Road, the development off Camelot Street and the current development off Camelot Street on the old lace factory site.

As planning permission has been given to the Pasture Lane site, there is no need for development on RUDD1 as the Pasture Lane site will more than make up for the potential loss of the 130 houses proposed for RUDD1.

Yours faithfully

Pat Green
30 May 2018.

Re: RUSHCLIFFE Local Plan Part 2.
SUTTON BONINGTON

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find below my reasons for objecting to a proposal to build 80 houses off Park Lane in Sutton Bonington:

Sutton Bonington is a small village, we have a general store and a Post office, due to their road situation parking outside of either is often very difficult. Our already over busy Doctors surgery is in a converted small bungalow on a narrow road at the back of the village, the residents of this area make frequent complaints concerning the parking of cars blocking the road and their drives when people visit the doctors. We also have a village school some classrooms for which are already held in portacabins. We no longer have a bus service through the village after 7.00pm or on a Sunday. The field in question does flood and hold surface water after heavy rain.

The new development being proposed would, because of the number of people/cars involved, put an extra burden on the structure of the village.
In an urban area 80 houses would maybe not have too much adverse effect but here in our village it would be huge.

We do not have the infrastructure to cope with this influx of people and, as many people on Park Lane know to their cost, despite frequent attempts to keep it moving our ancient sewerage system frequently blocks up. In addition to which the extra road traffic generated would mostly exit onto the Park lane/A6006 junction which is already difficult to navigate at busy times of the day.

Please look at your plans again, Sutton Bonington is very much a small self contained village, a development of this kind tacked onto the end of the village is just not desirable for the reasons above. I have lived in the village for 45 years and would hate to see it spoilt in this way.
30 May 2018.

RE: RUSHCLIFFE LOCAL PLAN 2.
SUTTON BONINGTON.

SUTTON BONINGTON

Sutton Bonington is a long narrow village originally Sutton and Bonington, it now has a lovely tree lined entrance off the A6006.

Building in the field bordering the A6006 would extend the envelope of the village towards the village of Normanton on Soar only one field away. The field is also subject to frequent lying water after heavy rain.

Entry onto the A6006 is already dangerous and subject to many accidents. There is also a blind corner at the entrance to Chainwood Fields.

The village itself could not sustain the extra sewerage added to the present Victorian system. The school and the Doctors facilities are already over stretched with capacity and parking spaces.

Suggested other building site within the Parish envelope would be:

Land to the south side of Landcroft Lane adjacent to the village bowling green and tennis courts opposite to the University, - these fields are on high levels and would not be subjected to flooding – also with access to a more modern sewerage system off the University. This land has previously been offered for building approximately 30 houses with no impact on other properties.

It is important the Sutton Bonington remains a pleasant village and does not become over populated in an urban sprawl towards Normanton on Soar and Zouch.

John Griggs

RUSHCLIFFE BOROUGH COUNCIL
BUSINESS SUPPORT UNIT
RECEIVED
- 5 JUN 2018
Copies sent to ........................................
Refereed to ........................................
Dear sir,
I would like to object to the new houses proposed in East Bridgford. Building on green belt land should be undertaken when no other alternatives are available. I feel other areas of Rushcliffe may be better placed for development that are not green belt.

Having lived in East Bridgford for almost 30 years, I have gradually watched the loss of bus services which puts more strain on the village because of the high number of cars. This will worsen with this development. I was also involved with the planting of the Millenium/Springdale wood. It has turned into a haven for wildlife. I walk in it daily and see a large number of birds including Barn and Tawny owls, Sparrow Hawks, Kestrels, Buzzards, Jays, Whitethroats, Skylarks and Green Plover. I have also seen Hares and Badgers and many other smaller mammals.

If the proposed development goes ahead, East Bridgford will be very close to merging with both Bingham and Newton. Not really what village life is all about.

I realise that homes must be built, but feel that this development is a knee jerk reaction to bad generalised building policies.

Regards,

Ian Grindrod
Planning Policy  
Rushcliffe Borough Council  
Rushcliffe Arena  
Rugby Road  
West Bridgford  
NG2 7YG

Dear Sir,

I 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 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

J.K. Guerin
Dear Sir,

I 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]

P.T. Guerin
Dear Sir,

I feel 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]

[Name]

MR S. R. GUY.