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Event Name: Local Plan Part 2 (Publication Draft)
Comment by: Mr and Mrs Stephen and Jo Jackson (1167388)
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Response Date: 27/06/18 21:33
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To which document does your response relate? Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version

Page number: ?
Paragraph number: 3.82
Policy reference: Policy 7: Housing Allocation – Land east of Church Street, Cropwell Bishop
Site reference: Policy 7: Housing Allocation – Land east of Church Street, Cropwell Bishop
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).

This has been railroaded through causing distress to peoples lives who are detrimentally and irreversably affected without adequate fair representation (by this we mean we are not planners or legal experts...
and therefore cannot possibly challenge the Council and Housing Agencies who have a myriad of solicitors, barristers and paid employees to push these plans through).

A rich local farmer who has already railroaded through a chicken farm and a biomass converter with little regard to the local population will now become even richer by managing to convince the Council that removal of centuries old green belt land is somehow advantageous. The guidelines around green belt seem clear that it should only have been removed under exceptional circumstances. There are already many brown belt sites in Rushcliffe and around the village including a site which has now somehow been miraculously allowed to accept waste/scrap metal. This site could have accommodated housing without having to impact on green belt or the local village structure.

There are other massive brown belt sites in Rushcliffe where housing was allocated but as the housing is not now being delivered on time the Council have taken upon themselves to remove green belt areas. Why not allow the builders who are going to be developing the green belt sites build on these other sites who have not met their obligations? It appears no one is being held to account.

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)
. Positively Prepared
. Justified
. Effective
. Consistent with national policy

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).

None of the above, this is a knee jerk reaction where the Council have taken the path of least resistance.

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).

As per previous comments we are not trained planners and legal experts and have no real idea what this means.

However what we do know is that our lives will be detrimentally and irreversibly affected.

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.

We have attended several local meetings where the Rushcliffe Council working hand in hand with the developers did or could not answer our questions e.g. around flood risk, carcinogenic dust from the development, school and doctors places. The Rushcliffe councillors could have been less helpful and interested but they would have had to have tried really really hard. One councillor had the temerity to look at his watch while we were talking to him.

Flooding: the land agent of the proposed development site - when presented with the fact that the field floods said that run off ponds would be built that would handle ‘all but a once in generation event’. Given that with climate change we are seeing ‘once in a generation floods’ frequently WHO will be responsible when my house which is directly adjacent to the field floods. Residents will tell you that Church Street floods from this field and I can guarantee my house will suffer the fall out long after the council and developers have left.

Schools/doctors - I can provide empirical evidence of at least 4 other developments where developers have made promises about supporting infrastructure that were not kept. The school is currently full and the developers may promise support but will obviously not deliver.

Carcinogenic dust: My house together with the school and other residents houses will be covered with carcinogenic dust for months if not years - I assume that parents at the school are unaware of this?

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.

Yes, I wish to appear at the examination

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.

We have submitted and previous comments all which have had lip service paid to them. We wrote an impassioned letter to the Council and when we asked if the inspector would see this we were told that only key points are summarised for the report and given that Rushcliffe Council are recommending the housing development it is obvious our views are of no relevance to them.

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
Dear Sir

We have considered the draft LAPP published by Rushcliffe Borough Council and believe that,

It is non-compliant in its duty to cooperate with the emerging Gotham Neighbourhood Plan and with existing national planning policy.

It is unsound as it has not followed existing and proposed national policy on the use of smaller sites and housing numbers.

There has been no effective evaluation of alternative sites in the village.

It is unsound in that it unnecessarily removes land from the green belt.

It is non-compliant in that nothing has been mentioned in the Plan of the proposed access to the GOT5a site, which I understand is to come off Leake Road. This must be consulted upon before the land is removed from the green belt.

National Policy indicates 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 place” which sets the housing target for Rushcliffe at 600 per year, further your own Core Strategy states that housing allocations in villages like Gotham should be for local needs only.

National policy for the Green Belts says that land should only be removed from a Green Belt in EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES. The LAPP policy Map shows GOT4 removed from the Green Belt without proving any consultation or any exceptional circumstance.

Rushcliffe do not appear to have taken any note of the Housing Policy or Green Belt Policy in the Gotham Neighbourhood Plan and they should accommodate these in their own plan.

Yours faithfully

Alan James, Janet Gunn

Planning Policy
Rushcliffe Borough Council
NG2 7YG
Planning Policy
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rushcliffe Arena
Rugby Rd
West Bridgford
NG2 7YG

Dear Sirs

We 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 has 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, ie. 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, ie. 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 plant 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 faithfully,

Ian and Elaine James
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From:</th>
<th>Phil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sent:</td>
<td>14 May 2018 21:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>Localdevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>Objection to the building on green land in East Bridgford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hi,
I would like to register my objection to the building of new houses on the green belt off Butt lane in East Bridgford. Will be emailing my local Mp (Robert Jenrick) as well.

Regards,

Phil James
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
. Justified
The plan does not take current housing development in Cropwell Bishop into consideration. At the moment there is planning for 11 dwellings to be constructed. These will add to the infrastructure needs (health and education) and the traffic congestion within the village. If as is stated, Cropwell Bishop could sustain 70 dwellings then this should include the 11 houses already planned.

The plan is not realistic in its assessment of traffic issues within Cropwell Bishop. Cropwell Bishop is not on a transport corridor and therefore it is more likely that residents will use their cars. If each household has two cars then it is possible that an additional 158 cars will be accessing Church Street. This will add considerably to the already congested road. Traffic going towards Nottingham is likely to join Nottingham Road, another seriously congested route. The housing in Cropwell Bishop is focussed heavily on families and the current traffic moving through the village make any journey on foot with children a real safety issue.

The plan is not realistic in its assessment of educational need. The school would currently appear to be at capacity. The site provides an environment where children can access both inside and outside learning opportunities. This enables the school to provide its assessed ‘outstanding’ level of education. It would seem that any increase in school population could result in the need for additional classrooms which would encroach on the outside area and put stress on indoor areas. If the proposed house building goes ahead, provision should be made within the local plan for additional land to be allocated for any expansion of the school.

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

I object to Policies 61, 62 and 63 of the Local Plan Part 2.

The rationale for these policies has been altered since publication of the Plan by the decision of the Government Planning Inspector to grant Planning permission for 175 houses on Green Belt off Asher Lane, Ruddington. The Plan must be adjusted to reflect this change.

The Local Plan Part 2’s allocation of 350 new homes on the Green Belt in Ruddington should be retained. The new 175 homes on Asher Lane should be counted as part of this total, leaving Green Belt land to be found for a further 175.

The Planning Inspector challenged the assessment criteria in Local Plan Part 2 for Policy 61 which puts 130 houses on the Green Belt nearest other conurbations. With his reasoning, this site allocation should be deleted from Local Plan.

Using both the Local Plan and the Inspector’s criteria, Policy 62 should remain with 50 homes but Policy 63 should be adjusted down to 125 homes totaling the necessary 175. The Mere Way site should be restricted to that part nearest the A60 roundabout, removing a projecting piece of the site to the south-east to give a smooth new edge to the village.

Yours faithfully,

Peter Johnson-Marshall
I am against any further development that encroaches into the Green Belt area around East Bridgford. I feel it will:

1. Make us a Newton part of Sinclom.
2. Spoil our unique village feel.
3. Affect our surrounding wildlife, fauna & flora.
4. Increase the traffic flow thro' an already overloaded main street.
5. Be against the majority view of villagers as expressed in the village plan.
6. Deviate from the already promised extra houses & facilities to be built in Newton.

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Comment

Consultee: Mrs Jacqueline Jones (1167153)
Event Name: Local Plan Part 2 (Publication Draft)
Comment by: Mrs Jacqueline Jones (1167153)
Comment ID: 41
Response Date: 26/06/18 12:19
Status: Submitted
Submission Type: Web
Version: 0.1

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

Page number: 6
Paragraph number: 8.1
Policy reference: Policy 8.1: Housing Allocation – Land between Butt Lane and Closes Side Lane, East Bridgford
Site reference: Policy 8.1: Housing Allocation – Land between Butt Lane and Closes Side Lane, East Bridgford

Policies Map: 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).

Building in green belt

What makes a Local Plan “sound”? 

Powered by Objective Online 4.2 - page 1
. **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

**(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).**

> Cummmity consultation viwes not taken into consideration.

**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).

> Show how it used the community view in it’s decision.

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: Jon Jones  
Sent: 25 May 2018 17:10  
To: Localdevelopment  
Subject: Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2 HOUSING ALLOCATION – THE PADDOCKS, NOTTINGHAM ROAD , RADCLIFFE ON TRENT

Sir,

I am astounded that this piece of land is still part of the local plan after it has been considered and REJECTED on at least two occasions in the last few years.

Why on earth is it part of the local plan given its history?

With reference to the document - Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2 - and in particular Policy 5.6 - The Paddock, Nottingham Road, Radcliffe-on-Trent

Floodplain:
My main concern is that this land is regularly affected by surface water running off nearby fields (see diagram taken from the Environment Agency website). As you can see from the diagram the ‘extent of extreme flooding’ (light blue area) shows how this field is also affected by non-surface water flooding. Whenever it rains heavily the ditch between our houses and the field fills with water; the water then runs under Nottingham Road and via convoluted underground culverts down to the Trent. If there is any blockage at all, which prevents the water escaping, then the water in the ditch comes over the top and floods our gardens and the field.

The field has been farmed by a tenant farmer for years and he advised me that the ditch, running on the opposite side of the field to our road, also floods whenever the rain is heavy and he is most concerned that there will be severe flooding if a large number of houses are built on this land.

I believe that the flooding of this field by surface water will only get worse. If it floods now with every opportunity for the water to drain away then we can all imagine what it will be like with 70+ roofs, driveways, patios etc. reducing the area of drainage.

These pictures of the flooding on and around the piece of land being referred to as ‘The Paddocks’ indicate one very good reason why this piece of land is totally unsuitable for building homes (see end of e-mail). This is not water from the river; it rises up from the water table underneath the field.

Noise:
I find it hard to believe that the Council is encouraging anyone to build houses on a plot of land surrounded by two roads which suffer from such dreadful noise problems; this is not a good place to build homes. A report from the previous application advises that “Road traffic noise levels are dominant at this location.”

“Government advice to local authorities was summarised in circular 10/736 published in 1973. This circular
recommends that new developments should not normally be allowed in areas exposed to high levels of noise”. “Current government advice to local authorities is summarised in Planning Policy Guidance Note (PPG) No. 247 published in September 1994 and is a review and update of the earlier Circular 10/73.” This allows developers to assess noise levels and propose ways of mitigating that noise. The report goes on to advise that some noise levels on this plot are ‘Category C’ - “for proposals in this category planning permission would not normally be granted. Where it is considered that permission should be given, for example because there are no alternative quieter sites available, conditions should be imposed to ensure a commensurate level of protection against noise”.

The recommendations in this report include the construction of a 5m high mound as a barrier. This would be a massive blot on the landscape; over 16 feet high and wide enough to support that height so one can only imagine what this will look and feel like to those homes nearest to it. In practice, there will need to be a similar barrier at the south west end of the plot, along Lees Barn Road, in order to block the noise from the A52. “The footprint of such a mound would be substantial and would therefore reduce the number of housing units that would be able to be fitted on to the site. The screening barrier needs to be a substantial height because of the busy nature of the A52 in the proximity of the site”.

The report goes on to suggest other steps that will be necessary to make living in one of these homes bearable. The design of houses nearest to the A52 will be modified so that ‘rooms that are not frequently inhabited’ such as bathrooms and kitchens will be located closer to the noise to try to protect living rooms and bedrooms from the worst of it. The report is cynical enough to acknowledge that “if bedroom windows were to be opened particularly during the night the total façade sound insulation would be reduced to approximately 12dB (A) and the internal criteria from BS8233:1999 would be exceeded. This would, however, be at the choice of the occupiers of the property”.

“Since windows need to be closed to provide adequate façade attenuation and if the dwellings are not air conditioned, it may be prudent for the developer to consider fitting passive acoustic ventilation louvers to any dwellings with bedrooms facing out on to the A52 Grantham Road and Nottingham Road”. It goes on to suggest that as the nearest existing residential properties on St. Lawrence Boulevard do not possess such ventilators no precedent has been set! This seems to ignore the obvious point that those houses were built mainly in the 1950’s when road noise was not a significant issue.

In conclusion I believe this site is totally unsuitable for housing and trust that Rushcliffe Borough Council’s Planning Office will reject the application.

I have also attached your own document (see below) advising that the land is unsuitable. Quote:
1. It has not been demonstrated that satisfactory measures can be taken to mitigate against possible flooding as required by PPS 25 and policy WET 2 of the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan.
2. An air quality study has not been submitted and it is not, therefore, possible to fully assess the impact of the development and determine if the development could in itself result in the designation of an air quality management area (AQMA) due to the introduction of new receptor locations adjacent to the A52(T) or whether the granting of planning permission would conflict with, or render unworkable, elements of the Rushcliffe Borough Council's Air Quality Action Plan, as required by PPS 23.

Kind regards,
Jon Jones
NOTICE OF REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMITION

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

Service Director For Property (Notts County Council)
c/o Vincent & Gorbing
Sterling Court
Norton Road
Stevenage
Hertfordshire
SG1 2JY

REFERENCE NO: 08/0020/OUT
APPLICANT: Service Director For Property (Notts County Council)
DEVELOPMENT: Residential development with related open space and infrastructure
LOCATION: Land North East Of Lees Barn Road Radcliffe On Trent
Nottinghamshire

RUSHCLIFFE BOROUGH COUNCIL having considered an application, which was validly submitted on 4 March 2008, for the above development hereby in pursuance of their powers under the above-mentioned Act,

REFUSE OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION

to the development described in the application for the reasons set out below-

1. It has not been demonstrated that satisfactory measures can be taken to mitigate against possible flooding as required by PPS 25 and policy WET 2 of the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan.

2. An air quality study has not been submitted and it is not, therefore, possible to fully assess the impact of the development and determine if the development could in itself result in the designation of an air quality management area (AQMA) due to the introduction of new receptor locations adjacent to the A52(T) or whether the granting of planning permission would conflict with, or render unworkable, elements of the Rushcliffe Borough Council's Air Quality Action Plan, as required by PPS 23.

Authorised Officer on behalf of Rushcliffe Borough Council

3rd June 2008
The first part of the Local Plan was approved in 2014. It identified Radcliffe as a ‘key settlement’ where a minimum of 400 new homes should be built during the plan period (2011 to 2028).

During 2016 and early 2017, the Council consulted residents and others on the level of development that would be appropriate at Radcliffe on Trent and the possible housing sites on the edge of the village that could deliver this development.

Following this consultation the Council has determined that around 820 new homes should be built on the edge of Radcliffe on Trent and proposes that six sites should be allocated for housing development within the Local Plan (see map above).

RAD1 (Land north of Nottingham Road) is identified as a mixed-use allocation that includes employment development west of the powerlines.
Do you agree that the Local Plan should allocate greenfield land for housing development at Radcliffe on Trent for around 820 homes in total?

Yes  
No  

I do not agree

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.

We live and have done so since 2010 other than RAD03 at no point have you ever received anything via mail about the sites mentioned in this letter that I down loaded. In rush hour it can take over 6 mins to try and get out of our street. If alone the length of time it will take with all the new houses are removing our village, devaluing our homes and over population what is a beautiful village. The village is too small and all this building is going to turn the village into an estate that is no longer special. I disagree seriously!

Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following sites at Radcliffe on Trent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site RAD01 – Land north of Nottingham Road</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(estimated capacity around 150 homes, with employment to west of the powerlines)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site RAD02 – Land adjacent to Grooms Cottage</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(estimated capacity around 50 homes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site RAD03 – Land off Shelford Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(estimated capacity around 400 homes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site RAD05a – Land north of Grantham Road (south of railway line) (1a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(estimated capacity around 140 homes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site RAD06 – 72 Main Road
(estimated capacity around 5 homes)

Site RAD13 – The Paddock, Nottingham Road
(estimated capacity around 75 homes)

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers.

For each of the proposed housing sites, you may like to give your views on what development should look like, in terms of the design, mix and layout of new housing and other uses (for example, open space) on site.

We bought our home because of our views and we are now going to be forced in. No one cares about the existing homes so long as the building goes ahead. We don't matter! Our voices are not heard!

Who is going to protect existing home owners against traffic, noise, dust, over populating our village and turning us into slums instead of a beautiful village we love to live.
The Local Plan Part 2: Preferred Housing Sites consultation document is available to view and comment on at www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy. However, if you want to make any general comments in the box below please do so.

OTHER ISSUES

FURTHER INFORMATION
Please provide your details below and hand them to one of the Council officers here today.

Alternatively email your comments to us at localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk – you need to include your name and address with your comments. Or send written comments to us at: Planning Policy, Rushcliffe Borough Council, Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road, West Bridgford, Nottingham, NG2 7YG. We will also contact you about future consultations.

Consultation on the Preferred Housing Sites will run until Monday 27 November. To view more details about the consultation please visit our website: www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Name</th>
<th>Michelle Jones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data protection: The details you submit to the Borough Council will be used in the Local Plan preparation and associated processes. Please note that comments and personal details cannot be treated as confidential and may be available for public inspection both physically and/or through the Borough Council's website. We may publish addresses and comments received, including on our website. We will use our best endeavours to not natures, personal telephone numbers or email addresses.
From. Mr Maxwell Jordan

Dear sir

The proposed development of up to 70 new houses will impact directly on me as the service road is situated immediately next to my rear fence.

We have lived in this peaceful village since 1988 when our development was built and enjoyed a quiet time over that period. I have seen a proposal for the new development which appears to remove a 12 foot conifer hedge adjacent to my rear fence. The retention of this hedge would reduce what will undoubtably be road noise from the access road adjacent to my property and feeding the 70 properties.

Whilst I appreciate the need for more houses in this village as part of a wider plan, I would strongly object to the removal of the hedge and would ask you to bear this in mind in your consultations and deliberations.

Max Jordan

Sent from my iPad