Dear sirs,

the proposed development of over 100 new houses for east bridgford is completely inappropriate. The village is already struggling with
1. a primary school that is at capacity
2. dangerous traffic cut through
3. jammed roads between A46 and lowdham
4. unsafe parking due to unsufficient road infrastructure
5. neighbouring locations including Bingham, Radcliffe and the still unfinished Newton sites of over 2000 houses.

The councils have failed to plan to address any if these existing issues. There are no traffic wardens or police support to address the cut through road rage that we are already experiencing.

The traffic issues of the A52 take 50 minutes to reach nottingham in the morning.

Other appropriate sites would include Orston, Aslocton and Whatton, Car Colston and the vale of belvoir where schools have small class sizes and communities are suffering from a lack of services due to insufficient population.

However prior to this the existing earmarked locations need building and the impacts assessed before consuming further green field sites.

Jayne

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android
Dear Sirs,

The proposed development of over 100 new houses for East Bridgford is completely inappropriate.

The village is already struggling with:

1. a primary school that is at full capacity
2. dangerous traffic cut through with inadequate road infrastructure
3. congested roads between A46 and Lowdham
4. unsafe parking due to insufficient road infrastructure
5. neighbouring locations including Bingham, Radcliffe and the still unfinished Newton sites of over 2000 houses.

The councils have failed to plan to address any of these existing issues.

Other appropriate sites would include Orston, Aslockton and Whatton, Car Colston and the vale of Belvoir where schools have small class sizes and communities are suffering from a lack of services due to insufficient population.

Regards
Shaun

Shaun McCabe
w http://www.brownejacobson.com
Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find attached a copy of my response to your above consultation.

Yours Mary Mackie
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></th>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent’s Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Miss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Evelyn Mary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Mackie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title (where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Part B** (please use a separate Part B form for each representation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Organisation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**3a. To which document does your response relate?** (please tick one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version</th>
<th>Local Plan Part 2 Policies Map</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page no.</th>
<th>Paragraph no.</th>
<th>Policy ref.</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 c)</td>
<td>All vulnerable road users need to be included here not just pedestrians and cyclists i.e. equestrians to be included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.2 f)</td>
<td>Linkages to the Grantham Canal and Hollygate Park need to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
consider all vulnerable road users within this consideration of infrastructure.

Whilst stating that provision for a new primary school and a medical centre provision in East Leake this needs to be brought forward ideally before any more housing is built so that the necessary facilities are in place to relieve pressures on the already overstretched facilities within the Borough.

The former Cotgrave Colliery Mineral Line should be a truly multi-user route and not be catering for pedestrians and cyclists only it needs to be an equestrian route as well.

Support appropriate financial contributions towards education and health capacity improvements and as mentioned previously ideally this should be introduced prior to more housing being built.

4. Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2:
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.
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”).

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing sessions of the Public Examination? (please tick one box only)

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

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

- If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions of Public 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.
10. Please indicate if you wish to be notified that: (please tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notification</th>
<th>Ticked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Local Plan Part 2 has been submitted for independent examination.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The recommendations of the Planning Inspector appointed to carry out the independent examination have been published.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Local Plan Part 2 has been adopted</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date form completed

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 9911, or email at localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk

---

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

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

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

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

Representations will be available to view on the Borough Council’s website, but any signatures, addresses, email addresses or telephone numbers will not be included. However, as copies of representations must be made available for public inspection, comments cannot be treated as confidential and will be available for inspection in full.
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>Miss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Evelyn Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Mackie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title (where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Part B** (please use a separate Part B form for each representation)

**Name/Organisation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version</th>
<th>Local Plan Part 2 Policies Map</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3a. To which document does your response relate?** (please tick one)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page no.</th>
<th>Paragraph no.</th>
<th>Policy ref.</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 c)</td>
<td>Support the principle here although as with other developments across the Borough ideally these improvements and facilities need to be in place prior to any further house building being aware that the infrastructure and services are already stretched as it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4 c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This bridge needs to include equestrians as well as pedestrians and cyclists. It needs to be a truly multi-user facility for all vulnerable road users.

There is a considerable amount of equestrian activity in the area and their needs should be considered here as well.

Recognition of the varied character of the countryside is good. However currently the local MP is suggesting that the Vale of Belvoir is recognised as an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Melton Borough County Council recognise the Vale of Belvoir and an Area of Particularly Attractive Countryside and would welcome an acknowledgement of this aspect within the Borough of Rushcliffe including the Nottinghamshire Wolds.

Welcome this paragraph to ensure that evidence is required to support that any operation/business is economically viable and that there is a long term need for the businesses within the area. In the past it has been seen as a way to gain approval for inapproariate development in the countryside.
4. Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4(1) Legally compliant</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(2) Sound</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(3) Complies with the Duty to Co-operate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→ 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>Condition</th>
<th>Ticked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positively Prepared</td>
<td>Justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Consistent with national policy</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.

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”).

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing sessions of the Public Examination? (please tick one box only)

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

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

• If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions of Public 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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notification</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Local Plan Part 2 has been submitted for independent examination.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The recommendations of the Planning Inspector appointed to carry out the independent examination have been published.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Local Plan Part 2 has been adopted</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date form completed**

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

- localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk; or
- Planning Policy
  Rushcliffe Borough Council
  Rushcliffe Arena
  Rugby Road,
  Nottingham
  NG2 7YG

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

If you have any questions, please contact the Planning Policy team by telephone on 0115 981 9911, or email at localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk
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.
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
BUSINESS SUPPORT UNIT
RECEIVED
27 JUN 2018
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></th>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent’s Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>MRS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Name</strong></td>
<td>LINDSEY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Name</strong></td>
<td>MAGN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job title</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postcode</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-mail Address</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone Number</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Part B (please use a separate Part B form for each representation)

Name/Organisation: ________________________________

3a. To which document does your response relate? (please tick one)

- Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version
- Local Plan Part 2 Policies Map

Other supporting document please state which: ________________________________

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

Page no. 33 | 34 Paragraph no. ____________________ Policy ref. 4.4

Site ref. Policies Map 4.4

4. Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2:

4(1) Legally compliant Yes. [ ] No [ ]

4(2) Sound Yes [ ] No [ ]

4(3) Complies with the Duty to Co-operate Yes [ ] No [ ]

If you have selected No to Question 4(2), please continue to Question 5.
In all other circumstances, please go to Question 6.

What makes a Local Plan “sound”?

Positively prepared - the plan should be prepared in a way that meets the need for housing and other development, including infrastructure and business development.

Justified – the plan should be based on evidence, and be the most appropriate strategy for the district when considered against other reasonable alternatives.

Effective – the plan should be deliverable; the housing and other development should be capable of being carried out.

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable sustainable development and be consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

5. If you consider the Development Plan is UNSOUND, do you consider this to be because it is NOT: (please tick all that apply)

- Positively Prepared
- Justified
- Effective
- Consistent with national policy

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

Keyworth needs more housing and has the infrastructure to support it. Therefore, I agree that at least an additional 600 dwellings (as proposed) can be sustained (paragraph 3.30).

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

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

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

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

- **Yes**, I wish to appear at the examination

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

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

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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

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

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

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

- The Local Plan Part 2 has been adopted

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

localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk; or

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

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

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

---

**Data Protection Notice**

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

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

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

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

---

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Comment

Consultee: Mr Darren maguire (1062569)
Event Name: Local Plan Part 2 (Publication Draft)
Comment by: Mr Darren maguire (1062569)
Comment ID: 3
Response Date: 16/05/18 18:03
Status: Submitted
Submission Type: Web
Version: 0.1

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

If you answered 'other supporting document' please state which document you refer to
Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2 - publication

Page number: 43
Paragraph number: 3.74
Policy reference: Policy 6.1: Housing Allocation – Land west of Wilford Road, Ruddington
Site reference: Policy 6.1: Housing Allocation – Land west of Wilford Road, Ruddington

Policies Map

Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2 to be legally compliant?
No
you have received 100's of complaints against this development yet you have completely ignored the wishes of the people of Ruddington, the council are there to represent us not dictate terms

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:  Justified

(please tick all that apply)

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

this will cause 100’s more cars on our small roads, more difficult to get a dr’s appt, more difficult to get a school place and it is completely unwanted by the people who live here

Do you consider that the Local Plan Part 2 complies with the Duty to Co-operate?  No

Please indicate if you wish to be notified that:  The Local Plan Part 2 has been submitted for independent examination.

(please tick all that apply)
I am against the local plan of building more houses in East Bridgford for the following reasons:

- Large site of new housing all in one area, extending the village outwards making it larger spreading it the old A46. It would upset the views and fields where duckponds run through & animals graze.

- It would create extra car noise & car fumes, increasing pollution & upset the peacefulness of the village which attracted many house buyers in the first place.

- Ruining a conservation village, taking down trees etc effecting local wildlife & animals, plant & trees.

- Villages get bigger & bigger turn into small towns. (Where does it stop?!) Newton has still got lots of land that could be used if facilities were put in as planned when residents brought houses.

- Block views is unlikely when driving into the village.

- Busier for walkers, cyclists, horse riders, children & elderly.

- Village can not take the traffic as it is and the roads are in need of repair and pavements are terrible & dangerous esp.

Signed: [Redacted]
Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]

East Bridgford Residents Group Drop-In, 16th May 2018, East Bridgford Village Hall

[Redacted]
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, [Name]

[Signature]
East Bridgford Resident's Comments
To Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2

Please write your comments in the box below and sign.
(Name and address optional)

- Scale and vision of proposed development are too large and concentrated

- Extra traffic (and public transport) directed through the village and to the school

- Loss of green belt - threat to wildlife

- Why not further develop New Bas which needs more facilities and infrastructure and is not green belt.

- Keep our village a village and an extension of our green and lose its identity

Signed: [Signature]
Name: Joanna McDougal
Address: [Address]

East Bridgford Residents Group Drop-In, 16th May 2018, East Bridgford Village Hall
## Comment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultee</td>
<td>Mrs Joanna McDowell (1166933)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Name</td>
<td>Local Plan Part 2 (Publication Draft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment by</td>
<td>Mrs Joanna McDowell (1166933)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Date</td>
<td>24/06/18 10:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission Type</td>
<td>Web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To which document does your response relate?</td>
<td>Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy reference</td>
<td>Please select an option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site reference</td>
<td>Policy 8.1: Housing Allocation – Land between Butt Lane and Closes Side Lane, East Bridgford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

No

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

- Not legally compliant as the exception site to be built within 5 years to add to Rushcliffe housing allocation rides roughshod on all the current traffic issues within the village and has not been subject
- The sustainability survey is highly inaccurate. None of detracting points to the development are recognized within the proposal and no positive solutions proposed only references the visual appearance of the development

**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
- 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).

- For sites in Policy 8.1 and 8.2 and reference 3.91 and 3.95 points - makes no reference to the adjacent conservation area and how the properties frontage should tie in with the rest of the village conservation area and only that the 2 sites should mirror each others frontage.

- Policy 21 - refers to requiring to build on Green Belt in East Bridgford as an exceptional site. This contravenes Policy 11 as the developments will be within Open Countryside and will extend beyond the Identifiable Settlement boundary.

- Point 3.91 refers to an alternate link to Closes Side lane to relieve traffic issues. It is incorrect that traffic issues issues exist with Closes Side lane and an access road will serve to divert traffic through alternative routes within the village which become single Track road (Cherry Holt Lane).

- Point 3.91 The plan does not take into account the impact of traffic flow and the existing congestion issues within the Village of East bridgford. The very poor bus service and lack of any local employment development will result in a significant increase in traffic on Main street.

- The sustainability survey - there is no consideration for a Traffic survey and this is inconsistent with

- Policy 11 - There will a ‘loss of open space’ as the Springdale Millenium wood will be enveloped which will affect the character of the area and loss of open space.

- Local Plan 1 - East bridgford is excluded within the list of sites which will provide HIGH QUALITY housing

- The current site of RAF Newton remains uncertain - the addition of further housing in the primary school catchment of East bridgford St Peters is not sustainable when there is no commitment within 5 years to build primary school at Newton

- Excellent transport facilities referred to in the documents for selection of sites doe not apply to sites 8.1 and 8.2

- The sustainability assessment is neither robust or credible.

- There are reasonable alternatives - further development of RAF Newton

- Policy 1 - there should be no significant adverse effect on the traffic generated. There is no traffic survey to identify the impact of the 2 development sites. It should not be assumed that the residents would leave and enter the village by Butt Lane. There is no access to A46 to Newark that way and all villagers drive down Main street. Furthermore the increased development at Bingham will bring increased traffic through the village to avoid the Gunthorpe traffic build up - from those sites close by in this Local Plan Part 2. Means of access to the site not been given any consideration in the justification for this site
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).

Following the 3rd formal consultation stage in October 2018 further sites were identified within East Bridgford which then became policy 8.1 and 8.2. This was a significant change in the location, scale and mass of sites and the number of houses was increased from 100 m (stage 3) to the current 125. The sustainability survey has not considered this increased scale and mass of houses. The EB parish council were consulted but not the public. This therefore means the Local Plan Part 2 has not met its obligations of a Duty to Co-operate.

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.

- Repeat of Formal stage 3 Consultation
- removal of sites 8.1 and 8.2 as incorrect to state they are within the boundary/envelope of the village
- already referred to as ‘edge of village’
- reference to Basic facilities yet similar sized sites to 8.1 and 8.2 have more enhanced facilities

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.
Dear Sir,

I/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,

[Signatures redacted]

Roy E. Meakin, C. Eng.
Jons Meakin
See attachment.
Thank you
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></th>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent’s Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Mr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Meyerhoefer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part B (please use a separate Part B form for each representation)

Name/Organisation: P Meyerhoefer

3a. To which document does your response relate? (please tick one)

Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version [x] Local Plan Part 2 Policies Map

Other supporting document [x] please state which: Rushcliffe Green Belt Review PART 2 (b)

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

Page no. 18 Paragraph no. 2.16 Policy ref. Choose an item.

Site ref. RUD1 Policies Map Click here to enter text.

4. Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2:

4(1) Legally compliant [x] No

4(2) Sound [ ] No [x]

4(3) Complies with the Duty to Co-operate [x] No

→ If you have selected No to Question 4(2), please continue to Question 5.
→ In all other circumstances, please go to Question 6.

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
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)

- Positively Prepared [X]
- Justified [X]
- Effective [ ]
- Consistent with national policy [X]

---

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.

The document still refers to RUD1 and RUD2 as sites to be considered. In the light of a recent planning permission or a large development in RUD7, RUD1 should be removed from potential building sites as not to further impact infrastructure and unsustainable growth in Ruddington.

---

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan Part 2 legally compliant or sound, having regard to your responses to Questions 5 and 6. You will need to say why this change will make the Local Plan Part 2 legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you could put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

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

---

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

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

[ ] Yes, I wish to appear at the examination

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

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

Click here to enter text.

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

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

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

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

[ ] The Local Plan Part 2 has been adopted

Date form completed

28/6/18

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

RUD7, RUD1 should be removed from potential building sites as not to further impact infrastructure and unsustainable growth in Ruddington.
Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.

localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk; or

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

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

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

Data Protection Notice

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

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

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

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

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

I cannot regard the Planning System as being fair. I accept space has to be found for an increasing population and our community has got off lightly, but we are faced with a complex procedure a design problem. We need impartial advice on handling our side of the negotiation.

As an architect I am deeply concerned at the quality of design & have written a "Place Making Guide" which I hope our planning department will pass to the development designers.

Access to an expert/adviser or a panel would greatly help to achieve a fairer balance to the whole development proceede. Can you help please?

Yours Faithfully,

28/6/2018

1141022
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,

P.S. The amount of traffic down Hall Drive is dangerous to school children. I see this from my window as they dash across!
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,

[Signatures]

Gus Panmiers

Scott Mills
East Bridgford Resident's Comments
To Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2

Please write your comments in the box below and sign.
(Name and address optional)

I have 2 main concerns with these planned developments:

1) Our local school is over subscribed. Last September I had to appeal to get my daughter into the school even though it is less than a minute walk from our house.

2) The traffic on Main Street is already unbearable. Our house is a historical building & it shares with passing traffic as it is.

On my daughter's first day of school another child was run over outside the school.

Having spoken to a Rushcliffe Councillor I am not satisfied that plans are sufficient to handle these concerns.

Signed: [Redacted]
Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]

East Bridgford Residents Group Drop-In, 16th May 2018, East Bridgford Village Hall
East Bridgford Resident's Comments
To Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2

Please write your comments in the box below and sign.

(Name and address optional)

Firstly I feel that the whole approach to the extra development has been cloak and dagger. It seems the amount of houses are increasing but e.g. villas are not being consulted or updated with this.

I have no problem with extra houses being built but the infrastructure of the village cannot cope with 12 more houses. The school is virtually to full capacity, I imagine that the doctor's surgery is too. But more worryingly is the amount of traffic going through the village. It currently is a big problem so with more houses it's only going to get worse. I live on Main St and the flow of traffic has increased dramatically in the last few years. Parking is a nightmare. Also outside the village going towards Gunthorpe Bridge coupled with the new estate on Chapel Lane, travelling to Nottingham or Newark is only going to get worse.

Signed: [Redacted]

Name: [Redacted]

Address: [Redacted]
ON A PERSONAL LEVEL, WE MOVED TO THIS VILLAGE BECAUSE OF THE BEAUTIFUL SURROUNDING GREEN BUT THIS WILL BE DESTROYED & THE WHOLE DYNAMICS OF THE VILLAGE WILL UNFORTUNATELY CHANGE. THAT IS A REAL SHAME & WILL MOST LIKELY FORCE EAST BRADFORD RESIDENTS TO MOVE ELSEWHERE.

LATEST INTERVENTION: ARRIVAL OF NEWLY ORGANIZED OFFICIALS TO PERFORM THEIR DUTIES OF CLEANING
Dear Sir,

I’ve 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

J. H. Moore
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).

It does not properly take into account the Radcliffe-on-Trent Neighbourhood Plan.

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

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).

The plan does not Properly take into account the transport requirements. Development of land for housing has to be carried out in parallel with development of transport infrastructure including highways. As far as I can ascertain the transport aspects are only covered in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which, in paragraphs 4.4 to 4.15, makes it clear that the A52 already has major congestion issues. These have not been mitigated by the work done in 2017 and the depth of Highways England's reservations are highlighted by the concern they express, in para 4.12, about traffic having direct access onto the A52. Nevertheless, the plan proposes the building of 920 homes in Radcliffe-on-Trent as opposed to the target of about 400 homes approved in the Neighbourhood Plan.

**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).

These plans are in breach of the previously adopted Neighbourhood plan. In summary:- The Neighbourhood Plan states that 'residential development sites should be located where there is reasonably good access to the strategic highways network (specifically the A52 Nottingham Road) without causing congestion to the village roads'. Developing land off Shelford Road would be in breach of this unless a bridge were to be built over the railway line to give access directly on to the A52. It was made clear to us at the consultation meetings which we attended, that the expense of such a bridge precludes this and Highways England have already expressed their reservations about any new development having direct access to the A52.

There seems to be some resistance to accept that the increased volume of traffic on Shelford Road would cause congestion or safety issues for pedestrians and road users. As a pedestrian, who uses this road, I can confirm that at certain times of the day, it is almost impossible to cross the road safely, and where the pavement is narrow, large vehicles passing are very intimidating. Over the period of development, large lorries and construction vehicles will increase in number on the A52, through Radcliffe-on-Trent and along Shelford Road in particular. There is no solution to this situation, other than refusing development, or finding the funding to put a bridge over the railway to produce an additional access point, which Highways England appear to object to.

- The Neighbourhood Plan 'encourages the clustering of retail, commercial and community services within, or adjacent to the village centre'. The Local Plan ignores this.
- The Neighbourhood Plan states that new developments should aim to provide the required number of houses over a number of sites so that the direct impacts of development are spread across the village.
- The Neighbourhood Plan states that schemes which form a new edge to the settlement MUST ensure that densities are commensurate with the surrounding townscape and landscape character and may result in lower densities. It suggests that high density schemes should be restricted to the village centre and adjacent to arterial routes and be of lower density adjacent to open countryside. By no stretch of imagination could the proposed development off Shelford Road, next to open countryside, be regarded as 'lower density'.

**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
Dear Sir,

I am concerned 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,

[Signatures]

Mrs. S. Morley
Policy 6.1

I am writing to oppose the building of houses on Boulter Road west of Wilford Road. This should be removed from the local plan part 2 now that it has been passed for a large number of houses to be built on Asher Lane. This village can not cope with any more large estates and traffic that this brings. This would spoil the entrance to our village too and we do need to keep some green belt land for the end of the village on we are soon to be joined up with the city. There are also lots of small builders going up which never get counted. It is sad that people who don't live here get to choose what they think is best for us. This site has flooded for many years.

Mrs. Valma Morley
Dear Sir/madam

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the local new housing plans for the Ruscliffe area.

As a resident of Cotgrave I am somewhat alarmed at the lack of "affordable homes" (10%) which you cite in the proposals which will put most of the new housing well beyond the reach of local people - just the very people you need to attract. I understand that in these matters it is often a matter of compromise between what planners want and what building companies wish to provide, since there is more profit associated with higher level housing, but surely you as County Council are very much in the driving seat and can demand a much higher level of affordable homes than you are currently settling for. In the current housing crisis, from what I understand, it is the gross shortage of affordable housing (compounded I might add by high rents) that is the biggest problem which this plan does not come close to addressing.

In my opinion this figure should at least be 30% if you are truly going to go anyway near meeting the needs of the people whom you serve. You have a great opportunity here to help meet a very urgent and dire local need and I do hope for once people are put before profit and you can negotiate a much higher percentage of affordable housing than the somewhat woeful figure of 10% you mention.

Yours faithfully

Graham Morrell
Dear Sirs,

I wish to register our objections to Rushcliffe Borough Council’s proposal for housing developments in Ruddington on the basis of volume and the irrevocable loss of green belt. I have detailed below our specific objections and the reasoning for each:

Objection 1.
It was recommended by the Buildings Inspector at the EIP any proposed increase in the number of dwellings should be revised in a collaborative manner, with partner authorities – this has not happened additionally RBC has failed to disclose any evidence that this has happened. As a result, further green belt land has already been taken for development (Edwalton, Tollerton and Gamston) and now further green belt is at risk of loss to the east of Loughborough Road in Ruddington/Flawforth Lane.

Objection 2
We object to the loss of greenbelt through the construction of dwellings to the East of Loughborough Road Ruddington as the housing requirement (250) has now been satisfied on windfall sites at Asher Lane Ruddington and at Rempstone Road, East Leake. In total these two sites will deliver 410 dwellings (reference APP/P3040/W17/3185493). We trust that RBC will now review its plans and not to unnecessarily remove land from the Green Belt in particular, the elements applying to Ruddington.

Objection 3
Lack of infrastructure for increased capacity and increased burden on existing infrastructure and services.
- There is limited capacity in both for schooling within the area,
- No further capacity for additional street or off-road ‘public’ parking, within central Ruddington.
- Increased congestion and road traffic hazards on Loughborough Road/Flawforth Lane
- At present (and without further development of land to the East of Loughborough Road,) the existing daily traffic situation is serious traffic congestion from the village of BUNNY and BRDMORE queuing to the traffic lights in Ruddington and on to the “Nottingham Knight” island on the A52. Additionally traffic is backed-up and queuing the LENGTH of Flawforth Lane – as traffic is bottle-necked into a system is already can’t cope

Objection 4
Rushcliffe Borough Council has ignored Government Policy to attach great importance to Green Belts and the five fundamental purposes of the Green Belt set out in the NPPF. (Para 80)
The NPPF states that development within the GB should only be permitted in `Exceptional Circumstances` and states that unmet housing need for new homes is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the very special circumstances justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt.

**Objection 5**

As stated above, development of RD05 and RD13 could only result in further intensification of existing logistical and strategic problems PLUS the loss of greenbelt. We feel they should be removed from the plan.

Site RD5 (South of Flawforth Lane) has misguidedly been referred to (by Ruddington Parish Councillors and others) as a `brownfield site` (n.b. it does not appear on the Council’s register of brownfield sites). This site is established for agricultural/horticultural use within the defined Green Belt.

The Inspector handling the Asher Lane appeal supported residents views in his critical analysis of the Borough Council’s preferred options (RD 05 and RUD 13)

Shockingly, the Parish Council opted to support the draft allocations at RD 5 and RD13 largely on grounds that “fewer people would be affected”. As a resident whose home is bang IN THE MIDDLE – surrounded to the left, the right and all along the back, we find this a totally unprofessional approach to make such a critical decision. Please look at the plans and see the location.

**Objection 6**

The Council has failed to consider on a site specific basis the impact of sites RD5 and RD 13 on the openness and visual impact their loss would have to the landscape value of the Green Belt

- We believe RBC has failed to take into account recent planning appeal decisions which contain critical comments from appeal inquiry inspectors.
- Shown complete contempt for the importance of the Green Belt and the Councils own policy statements to protect it.

In previous correspondence with your selves (supported with photographic evidence) we stated that development of the proposed site on Flawforth Lane would exacerbate water flooding problems - ditches already overflow after one heavy rain fall.

In conclusion, as Members of Rushcliffe Borough Council are the custodians of borough’s countryside and green belt for future generations, please don’t authorise and be responsible for its loss. It can’t ever be re-gained.

S. L. Laughton-Mote and Margaret Mote