Planning Policy  
Rushcliffe Borough Council  
Rushcliffe Arena  
Rugby Road  
West Bridgford  
NG2 7YG  
25TH June 2018

Dear Sir,

I am writing to express my concerns with the draft LAPP published by Rushcliffe Borough Council.

I believe that the LAPP
- 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 the use of smaller sites and housing numbers.
- is unsound as it has not effectively evaluated alternative sites like those proposed in the Gotham Neighbourhood Plan.
- is unsound in that it unnecessarily removes land from the green belt which contradicts the Government’s Land and Planning Policies.
- 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 should be consulted upon before the land is allocated from the green belt, especially as it could involve the demolition of houses.

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 gives the housing targets for Rushcliffe at 600 new homes per year i.e. 10,200 new homes. Rushcliffe’s own Core Strategy states that housing allocations in villages such as Gotham should provide 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 states 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 the justification of any exceptional circumstances.

Rushcliffe Borough Council 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.

These plans are at variance with Gotham’s own Neighbourhood Plan which plans for less housing on smaller sites in an orderly manner over a longer period of time. They seem to be proposing development on far larger scale than is necessary.

I feel that the LAPP Policies Map for Gotham should be redrawn to include sites GOT1 and GOT3 within the inset boundary and that it should also be redrawn to remove GOT5a and GOT4 from the inset boundary.
To. The Planning Officer Rushcliffe Borough Council

After our residents meeting held on May 23rd, we were requested to put forward our views on this proposed development to the Parish Council and Rushcliffe Borough Council.

We have been resident in the Village for 45 years so feel qualified to comment. We are residents of Charnwood Fields so overlook the proposed site. As such you would expect us to object. However a development of this size would have major impact on every single household in the village. A plan of this size will increase the size of the village approx. 17.5%. As such it is bound not only to change the village beyond recognition but impact on every service in the village.

1. Firstly although the application is for 80 houses there is a very clear and well documented track record in place. What happens is the builders start work and then reapply for the original request for 140 houses saying the infrastructure and the constraints imposed in respect of social housing need that number of houses to make it pay! With that in mind my comments are based on the effect that 140 house will have. This is what we will end up with if this goes ahead. We are sure that you are aware of this.

2. Despite what the environment agency says the field is subject in the bottom 20% to severe flooding and recent photos are available to prove that point. If that land was used to comply with ‘open space requirement’ the housing density would be outside the current guidelines. At the last consultation meeting they were unaware that the stream that runs behind the houses in Charnwood Fields even exists. This in the last few weeks has caused flooding in houses at the top of the field into Charnwood Avenue and Charnwood Fields and at the bottom of Charnwood Fields

3. We are advised that there are 20 school places available at Sutton Bonington School, this is quite strange as just over 6 months ago we were told there were none. I accept as houses are sold and reoccupied that number will vary but I would suspect that by September and the start of a new school year that number of places available would be much reduced. However given 140 houses and say an average of 2 children per house that means 280 school places are needed. Assume
50% are senior school places so Sutton Bonington School needs to take 140! That is long way from the so called 20 places available. It is actually 4.5 full classes that need to be provided.

4. There is strong evidence, that the past parish council chairman will back up having had several recent blockages in the road by his house, that the current village sewer system from this end of the village is running at maximum capacity. Adding that number of houses would raise the capacity need close to 17.5%. That would be an extremely costly exercise given the length of pipework and the disruption it would cause down the main road in the village which would take many months to complete.

5. The completion of the fantastic DNRC unit will add considerably to the number of cars travelling along the A6006 each morning. We are given to understand some 2000 people will work there. It would not be unreasonable to think that another 500 cars will travel each way each day. This in turn would add to the issues in getting out of the village at peak times which is already a challenge. Add to this the new logistics centre at Junction 24 on the M1 which again will add to traffic on this road. This means that to use of spare current capacity at Normanton School is considerably less viable as junior school children could not walk to school across that road. At best they would have to be driven which again adds to the traffic issues.

6. Give 140 house it would be reasonable to expect to see over 200 cars on site. They would again add to traffic congestion at the junction. The other issue is getting out of the development. The council has spent money and time in making the entrance to the village very attractive and tree lined with what are now mature trees. Without doubt some trees will have to be removed to provide access. The blind corner stops access being granted closer to Charnwood Fields. Under current planning guidelines I very much doubt that the existing access to Charnwood Fields would have been granted.

7. There would be extra pressure on existing Services within the village, especially the Doctors surgery and this would impact on parking and availability to get an appointment.

8. One of the most important points is that if this development goes ahead then we will be much nearer to Normanton. There is every likelihood that the field at the other side of the A6006 will be put forward for
development, thus leaving us with the merger of the two villages. These fields are very much larger in size so are the gem in the mix and really what the developers are pursuing this development for. The two fields across the way have capacity for 200-300 houses and are the pot of gold at the end of the Rainbow. This would mean that Sutton Bonington and Normanton become one village and a real strip development which has always been something the council has not been happy with!

9. The public transport links from the village are not sufficient with 1 bus per hour that already runs late the majority of the time due to traffic congestion. To get to Nottingham by bus takes nearly 2 hours!

10. It is my view that there are better options to achieve the required building quota within the borough. There is no significant options for employment within the village other than the University which we understand have no plans for expansion. There are better sites in Cotgrave, Bingham, Gamston, Ruddington and Keyworth. All with much better public transport links and access to jobs.

We are sure that you know of the strong feeling among the residents of Sutton Bonington and we hope that you will give full and proper weight to the views of those who will be most effected.

Jean and Malcolm Peasnall,

LE12 5NP
Dear Sir,

I find that the draft LAPP published by Rushcliffe Borough Council,

- is **non compliant** in its duty to cooperate with the emerging Gotham Neighbourhood Plan and with existing and planned national policy
- is **unsound** as it has not followed existing and proposed national policy on use of smaller sites and housing numbers
- is **unsound** in that it is not effectively evaluated alternative sites
- is **unsound** in that it unnecessarily removes land from the green belt.
- is **non compliant** in that nothing has been mentioned in the Plan of the proposed access to the GOT5a site which we understand is to come off Leake Road. This should be consulted upon before the land is allocated from the green belt.

National policy has indicated that Rushcliffe housing targets are 30% higher than they should be according to the formula set out in the 'Planning for the right homes in the right places' which sets the housing targets for Rushcliffe at 600 per year, i.e. 10,200. Also Rushcliffe's own Core Strategy states that housing allocations in villages like Gotham should be for local needs only.

The LAPP Policies Map for Gotham should be redrawn to ensure that GOT4 remains in the Green Belt, i.e. outside the new inset line. National policy for the Green Belt says that land should only be removed from the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances. The LAPP Policies Map shows GOT4 removed from the Green Belt without any exceptional circumstances.

Rushcliffe should have taken note of the Housing Policy and Green Network policies in the Gotham Neighbourhood Plan and set out their plan to accommodate these.

- The LAPP Policies Map for Gotham should be redrawn to include sites GOT1 and GOT3 within the inset boundary
- The LAPP Policies Map for Gotham should be redrawn to remove GOT5a and GOT4 from the inset boundary

Yours sincerely

your signature

CAROLYN DIANE CROSSLAND-PEAT

ANTHONY HARRY PEAT
**Comment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Councillor Debra Pennington (1167172)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event Name</td>
<td>Local Plan Part 2 (Publication Draft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment by</td>
<td>Councillor Debra Pennington (1167172)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Date</td>
<td>26/06/18 10:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission Type</td>
<td>Web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**To which document does your response relate?**  
Local Plan Part 2 Policies Map

**Page number**  
Flintham Map

**Paragraph number**  
Local green Spaces

**Policy reference**  
Policy 33: Local Green Space

**Site reference**  
Policy 24: Redevelopment of former Islamic Institute, Flintham

**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).

The map is missing quite a bit of data for Flintham.

The entirety of Coneygrey Spinney - and associated Green spaces of 2 triangular pieces of land which are play areas; the Conservation Area in Flintham; Employment allocations development of RAF
syerston, part of the Parish and included in the Borough Policies map; Historical status for Flintham Hall (noted in other maps); Green Belt area around Flintham - noted in other maps;

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

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 current plan does not show the Employment Allocations development of RAF Syerston in the Parish of Flintham

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

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

Please update the Flintham map to show all of the missing elements to truly reflect the current status and developments within the Parish

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
Comment

Consultee: Councillor Debra Pennington (1167172)

Event Name: Local Plan Part 2 (Publication Draft)

Comment by: Councillor Debra Pennington (1167172)

Comment ID: 39

Response Date: 26/06/18 10:52

Status: Submitted

Submission Type: Web

Version: 0.1

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

Page number: 94

Paragraph number: 7.6

Policy reference: Policy 24: Redevelopment of former Islamic Institute, Flintham

Site reference: Policy 24: Redevelopment of former Islamic Institute, Flintham

Policies Map

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).

The housing trajectory for 90 houses is not realistic given the current situation with the site requiring demolition. Also, there is strong resistance in the village to 90 dwellings with a preference for 50 at...
most given the housing trajectories in the nearby locations adding to the stretch on the village resources (principally the school).

Plus as the gateway to the village the development needs to harmonise with the surroundings, respectful of the Conservation area.

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

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).

8.1.e Strongly agree that the development either side of Butts Lane in East Bridgford should be visually attractive. Also a rural atmosphere needs to be preserved with clear separation between Bingham and East Bridgford given the imminent development of Chapel Lane - plus the meeting of Newton and Bingham near the A46.

8.2.a Essential for more parking at the East Bridgford Medical Centre, but also a need for increased capacity at the Centre so that Flintham residents are not disadvantaged by the loss of / reduction of current service levels given the Newton and East Bridgford plans.

Policy 11 point 3 - Any housing in Flintham should not detract from the conservation area which Rushcliffe BC considers to be an important feature of the Borough, plus it should be sympathetic to the locality.

There are opportunities for increasing local transport networks.

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

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

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

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

Consultee: mr stephen peters (1163116)
Event Name: Local Plan Part 2 (Publication Draft)
Comment by: mr stephen peters (1163116)
Comment ID: 7
Response Date: 18/05/18 19:28
Status: Submitted
Submission Type: Web
Version: 0.1

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

Page number: 57
Paragraph number: all

Policy reference: Policy 10: Housing Allocation – Land north of Park Lane, Sutton Bonington
Site reference: Policy 10: Housing Allocation – Land north of Park Lane, Sutton Bonington
Policies Map: Yes

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

Do you consider this to be because it is NOT: (please tick all that apply)

Please indicate if you wish to be notified that: (please tick all that apply)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultee</strong></td>
<td>Mr Edwin Pettipher (1073966)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Event Name</strong></td>
<td>Local Plan Part 2 (Publication Draft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment by</strong></td>
<td>Mr Edwin Pettipher (1073966)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response Date</strong></td>
<td>27/06/18 09:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
<td>Submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submission Type</strong></td>
<td>Web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Version</strong></td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To which document does your response relate?</strong></td>
<td>Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy reference</strong></td>
<td>Policy 4.4: Housing Allocation – Hillside Farm, Keyworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site reference</strong></td>
<td>Policy 4.4: Housing Allocation – Hillside Farm, Keyworth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policies Map**

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

**What makes a Local Plan “sound”?**

- **Positively prepared** - the plan should be prepared in a way that meets the need for housing and other development, including infrastructure and business development.
- **Justified** – the plan should be based on evidence, and be the most appropriate strategy for the district when considered against other reasonable alternatives.
- **Effective** – the plan should be deliverable; the housing and other development should be capable of being carried out.
- **Consistent with national policy** – the plan should enable sustainable development and be consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

**Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2 to be sound?**  No
Do you consider this to be because it is NOT:  
(please tick all that apply)  
- 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).

The proposed development on this site is not consistent with the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan as agreed on 30 May 2018. Furthermore, the recent change in land use adjacent to Key 13 is not reflected in the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2. The erection of large agricultural buildings to house up to 450 animals will result in manure heaps and other agricultural waste adjacent to Key 13. This adds to the proximity of the existing sewage treatment works.

The neighbourhood plan contingency recommendations should be followed rather than use Key 13.

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 recommendations of the Planning Inspector appointed to carry out the independent examination have been published.
For the attention of:
Mr John King, Planning Policy Officer
concerning proposed building off Leake Road, Golitha
On behalf of:
Mr & Mrs A. Philbin,

We dispute your points in paragraph 3.98.
Traffic on Leake Road is a major problem now it certainly cannot accommodate any more.
We also disagree with your assumption that local schools, nursery, playgroup and the Doctors can cope with the would be demands of the development.

Access would be far easier and less disruption using Gypsum Way which was built to take heavy traffic away from the village. East Leake has been ruined by the amount of properties being built, please don't let Golitha go the same way.
Properties, homes are needed but please use options which cause the least disruption.
Dear Sirs

The latest IDP that I have been able to identify is 2014. Is there an updated plan that reflects the current strategy together with future allocations so that we can see how the infrastructure is to be developed to cope with the increased housing and employment loads?

I am conscious of the fact that the redevelopment of part of the Tollerton airport land by the inclusion of a private hospital and substantial industrial development failed to provide for adequate without infrastructure to support a transport policy that assumed 10% of all visits to the site would be by walking or cycling. The original planning conditions for the development included a section 106 pavement. The revised planning permission only included an isolated 30m strip of pavement between entrance and exit without any connected pedestrian/cycleways that cannot under any view support the stated transport policy accepted by the planners.

It will be delinquent not to assess the impact of proposed developments on villages and areas that will suffer from increased utilisation. Tollerton is such a village whereby internal road networks and the A606 will suffer substantial increases in traffic. Without a sustainable infrastructure plan this area of Rushcliffe will become chaotic.

Without an up to date and detailed IDP that visualises and caters for the cumulative impact the Local plan should not be adopted

Sent from my iPhone
Roy Pickavance
Email
Dear Sir,

I find that the draft LAPP published by Rushcliffe Borough Council,

- is non-compliant in its duty to cooperate with the emerging Gotham Neighbourhood Plan and with existing and planned national policy
- is unsound as it has not followed existing and proposed national policy on use of smaller sites and housing numbers
- is unsound in that it is not effectively evaluated alternative sites
- is unsound in that it unnecessarily removes land from the green belt.
- is non-compliant in that nothing has been mentioned in the Plan of the proposed access to the GOT5a site which we understand is to come off Leake Road. This should be consulted upon before the land is allocated from the green belt.

National policy has indicated that Rushcliffe housing targets are 30% higher than they should be according to the formula set out in the 'Planning for the right homes in the right places' which sets the housing targets for Rushcliffe at 600 per year, i.e. 10,200. Also, Rushcliffe's own Core Strategy states that housing allocations in villages like Gotham should be for local needs only.

The LAPP Policies Map for Gotham should be redrawn to ensure that GOT4 remains in the Green Belt, i.e. outside the new inset line. National policy for the Green Belt says that land should only be removed from the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances. The LAPP Policies Map shows GOT4 removed from the Green Belt without any exceptional circumstances.

Rushcliffe should have taken note of the Housing Policy and Green Network policies in the Gotham Neighbourhood Plan and set out their plan to accommodate these.

- The LAPP Policies Map for Gotham should be redrawn to include sites GOT1 and GOT3 within the inset boundary
- The LAPP Policies Map for Gotham should be redrawn to remove GOT5a and GOT4 from the inset boundary

Yours sincerely,
Good morning,

Please find the attached letter outlining my objections to this consultation.

Kind regards,
Dear Sir,

I find that the draft LAPP published by Rushcliffe Borough Council,

- is non-compliant in its duty to cooperate with the emerging Gotham Neighbourhood Plan and with existing and planned national policy
- is unsound as it has not followed existing and proposed national policy on use of smaller sites and housing numbers
- is unsound in that it is not effectively evaluated alternative sites
- is unsound in that it unnecessarily removes land from the green belt.
- is non-compliant in that nothing has been mentioned in the Plan of the proposed access to the GOT5a site which we understand is to come off Leake Road. This should be consulted upon before the land is allocated from the green belt.

National policy has indicated that Rushcliffe housing targets are 30% higher than they should be according to the formula set out in the 'Planning for the right homes in the right places' which sets the housing targets for Rushcliffe at 600 per year, i.e. 10,200. Also Rushcliffe's own Core Strategy states that housing allocations in villages like Gotham should be for local needs only.

The LAPP Policies Map for Gotham should be redrawn to ensure that GOT4 remains in the Green Belt, i.e. outside the new inset line. National policy for the Green Belt says that land should only be removed from the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances. The LAPP Policies Map shows GOT4 removed from the Green Belt without any exceptional circumstances.

Rushcliffe should have taken note of the Housing Policy and Green Network policies in the Gotham Neighbourhood Plan and set out their plan to accommodate these.

- The LAPP Policies Map for Gotham should be redrawn to include sites GOT1 and GOT3 within the inset boundary
- The LAPP Policies Map for Gotham should be redrawn to remove GOT5a and GOT4 from the inset boundary
Dear Sirs,

I currently reside at xxxxxx and I wish to comment as follows in regards to the proposed changes to the Gotham area of the Rushcliffe local plan part 2, in particular in the sites allocated for removal from the green belt and for possible housing.

I find that the draft LAPP published by Rushcliffe Borough Council;

- Is non-compliant in its duty to co-operate 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 other 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 GOTSA site which we understand is to come off Leake Road. This should be consulted upon before the land is allocated from the green belt
- Is non-compliant and unsound that the additional removal of GOT4 (Land to rear of Pygall Avenue/Hall Drive) is also not mentioned in the Plan, but is shown on the policy map as being removed. If this land is to remain a paddock due to the ridge and furrow I see little point in this being removed from the green belt, other than to potentially look to add additional, unnecessary housing to the village at a later date.

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 annually. Also Rushcliffe’s own Core Strategy states that housing allocations in villages such as 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, especially as the land is apparently to be left as a paddock only. Protection of this land is highly needed.

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 GO4 from the inset boundary.

Kind regards
Lisa Pitt
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Dear Sirs,

I currently reside at xxxxxx and I wish to comment as follows in regards to the proposed changes to the Gotham area of the Rushcliffe local plan part 2, in particular in the sites allocated for removal from the green belt and for possible housing.

I find that the draft LAPP published by Rushcliffe Borough Council;

- **Is non-compliant** in its duty to co-operate 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 other 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 GOTSA site which we understand is to come off Leake Road. This should be consulted upon before the land is allocated from the green belt
- **Is non-compliant and unsound** that the additional removal of GOT4 (Land to rear of Pygall Avenue/Hall Drive) is also not mentioned in the Plan, but is shown on the policy map as being removed. If this land is to remain a paddock due to the ridge and furrow I see little point in this being removed from the green belt, other than to potentially look to add additional, unnecessary housing to the village at a later date.

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 annually. Also Rushcliffe’s own Core Strategy states that housing allocations in villages such as 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, especially as the land is apparently to be left as a paddock only. Protection of this land is highly needed.

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 GO4 from the inset boundary.

Kind regards
Richard Pitt
June 25th 2018

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

Dear Sir / Madam,

**Rushcliffe Borough Council Local Plan Part 2**

As new residents to Keyworth we would like to raise our objection to the proposal for inclusion of Hillside Farm Key 13 as a suitable location for “removal of land from the greenbelt and allocated for housing development”

Rushcliffe Borough Council has in their Local Plan part 2 incorrectly included Hillside Farm Keyworth (Key 13) as suitable to be removed from the Greenbelt and designated it for housing development for 50 / 70 / 90 houses. Whilst we appreciate the arduous requirement on you to identify additional housing land, primarily due to the failure of the existing allocations made in your Local Plan Part 1 (which included the 450 new homes that Keyworth has already agreed to in preparing its Neighbourhood Plan) to satisfy your 5-year land supply requirements. This apparently scientific exercise has resulted in an incorrect conclusion that will very likely not even achieve the very minor (RBC quotation) contribution to RBC housing target.

It is very likely that the 3 major sites Key 4A, 8 & 10 which have numbers of 530 in the current local plan part 2 and similarly identified in the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan will actually come forward with proposed housing numbers from the developers that will satisfy Rushcliffe Borough Councils new assessment that Keyworth can and should sustainably support 590 new houses. Key 4a is already being promoted by the developers at a forthcoming exhibition with 160 homes. Rushcliffe also has a comfortable cushion built into its projected housing numbers in Local plan part 2 and additionally sites elsewhere in Rushcliffe not identified in this plan but being won on appeal by developers are also adding to their housing supply numbers.

Therefore no sites additional to Key 4A, 8 & 10 should be allocated for housing in in Keyworth in the Rushcliffe local plan Part 2 for the following reasons.

1. **Rushcliffe Borough Council need to follow the “Housing and other recommendations” contained in The Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan.**

This plan received overwhelming support by local residents in the referendum with numbers voting for it far in excess of any previous consultations or those submitting representations. If Rushcliffe insist that additional land in Keyworth is to be immediately allocated for housing, then it should be the safeguarded land identified in the now adopted Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan.

**Key Views in and out of the village. POLICY HC3** – Developments that affect Key Views into the village including those to the conservation area will be resisted. These Key Views include those
across Key 13 so when it came to planning any proposed development would be constrained by this policy.

2. **Not maintained an awareness of the implications of current developments on the very active farmstead at Hillside farm. It is incorrect of Rushcliffe simply to refer to the adjacent farm.**

There are now 2 very new Large Barns 10 M high with unrestricted permission to house 450 animals and farm machinery alongside a large farmyard in operation up to 20 hours a day located directly on the boundary of Key13 (the car in the picture is on Key13). These Barns will have associated manure heaps for the animal waste. Environmental health recommendations are that these should not be sited within 150m of residential properties so any subsequent planning application for Key13 would not be permitted to have housing within 150m of those heaps.

In addition to this, there are many harmful diseases from farm animals that kill up 2.2 million people per year including Bird flu, anthrax and Tuberculosis. Building communities around active cattle farmland will increase the risk to local people.

3. **Not properly compared Key 13 to all of the possible sites around Keyworth which would be much easier to develop and prioritising one purpose of Greenbelt above others**

Rushcliffe have dismissed out of hand “**to prevent coalescence of Stanton and Keyworth**” Key 1&2 (which were not ased as part of the Keyworth neighbourhood plan as technically located in Stanton) Stanton and Keyworth are already coalesced. Stanton Lane, Stanton is not a separate settlement is it a continuation of Nicker Hill Keyworth, it is more separate from the other parts of
Stanton than it is from Keyworth.

Their Justification for not including Key 9 (Land North of Debdale Lane) – identified as “recommended for safeguarded land” in the adopted Keyworth neighbourhood plan is “unsuitable due to urban sprawl”. Keyworth is a rural village not an urban centre and as such all development on its edge could be described as “urban sprawl” Key13 would be an identical protrusion into the countryside so should be unsuitable due to prevention of urban sprawl. With Key13 being additionally highly visible as it is on an approach to the village whereas Key 9 is accessed from the middle of the village and hidden by the contours of the land.

It ignores the important greenbelt issues that development of Key 13 would also mean the removal of High Grade Farm Land and impact upon the openness of the countryside The current landowner has over the past few years, sought to block off views across it, allowed hedges on Bunny lane to grow unrestrained and to use it to park an old car and other miscellaneous items on, however Key 13 Hillside Farm remains High Value Greenbelt Land

4. Failure to look at the proposed housing sites in total and appreciate that even if it were possible to make safe road access from the steeply sloping Key13 onto Bunny lane (where most of the traffic would be making a right turn) that such access would almost certainly impact upon any necessary access to the much larger and more important site Key10 (which should ideally have 2 access roads)

We have recently to Keyworth from Surrey living 20 minutes away from Heathrow airport and on the flight path. Dependent on wind direction, planes flew over our house at less than 2000ft every 30 seconds. Not even this has prepared me for the noise from the cows at 4.00am!! We are just over 150 metres from the barn, so the noise pollution to us is high, but to be even closer would be a challenging environment. It is also worth noting that with cows come flies, and more people, closer to the source could encourage more disease.

Keyworth is a beautiful village, and we are very supportive for growth and the need for additional housing, but it needs to be the right housing in the right location.

We urge Rushcliffe Borough Council to respect local democracy and follow the now adopted Keyworth Neighbourhood plan and its long considered and consulted upon recommendations in the creation of their Local Plan part 2.

Yours sincerely

Mark Plastow and Halina Waszczyszyn
Comment

Consultee: Mrs Rachel Polson (1073616)
Event Name: Local Plan Part 2 (Publication Draft)
Comment by: Mrs Rachel Polson (1073616)
Comment ID: 78
Response Date: 28/06/18 13:45
Status: Submitted
Submission Type: Web
Version: 0.1

To which document does your response relate? Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version
Policy reference: Please select an option
Site reference: Please select an option

Policies Map

Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2 to be legally compliant? No
What makes a Local Plan “sound”? 

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

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

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

 Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable sustainable development and be consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2 to be sound? No
Do you consider this to be because it is NOT: (please tick all that apply)

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

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.

I do not support the councils plan to continue to build more housing in the borough. There is insufficient infrastructure to cope with the additional traffic and the needs of those residents eg schools, doctors, social care.

The sites already being built on and the additional sites identified in this plan are spoiling the landscape of the borough, each village/area is becoming less distinct as the land in between is filled in. This also has an impact on the availability of fertile farmland for efficient food production, wildlife and drainage to minimise flooding.

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

22.06.2018

Your Ref – RM/875
Our Ref- 423579

RUSHCLIFFE LOCAL PLAN PART 2
STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT CONSULTATION

Dear Mr Mapletoft

We are pleased that Rudd11 has been removed from the draft plan for building of houses in Ruddington.

We would like to reiterate the comments made in our letter dated 14.03.2017 plus over 200 objection letters against the former proposed allocation of self-build housing on this historic area of green belt land. This would be very obtrusive on the hillside fields that can be viewed from afar.

Yours Faithfully

David & Carole Potter
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
West Bridgford
Nottinghamshire NG2 7YG

This form has two parts:

Part A – Personal details
Part B – Representation(s)

### Part A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postcode</strong></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

Representations are set out generally in e-mailed attachments: 414933A&B.docx and 414933Rep.docx.

Mr J Potter.

3a. To which document does your response relate?

- Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version
- Local Plan Part 2 Policies Map
- Other related documents

3b.

4. Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2:

4(1) Legally compliant
- Yes
- No

4(2) Sound
- Yes
- No
  Partially unsound

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

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

What makes a Local Plan “sound”?

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

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

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

**Consistent with national policy** – the plan should enable sustainable development and be consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
5. If you consider the Development Plan is partially unsound do you consider this to be because it is not:

- Positively Prepared
- Effective
- Justified
- 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.

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?

- 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.

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
9. If you wish to participate at the hearing sessions of Public Examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Please refer to 414933Rep.docx

**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:

- 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 27th June 2018

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

localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk; or

Planning Policy
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road
West Bridgford
Nottinghamshire 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

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
June 27th, 2018

Re, Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2

Ruddington: deep down I don’t think the village should increase in size; ‘do not agree with the overall-targeting of greenfield land; the - not good - 175 now at Asher Lane ought to prevent draft proposal policy 6.1 [RUD01], the relatively recent one-hundred at Pasture Lane ought to be counted now in the housing numbers; the Conservation Area isn’t always being upheld; ’not in agreement on some text/content re the sustainability appraisal report/appendixes.
   My representations on topics at earlier consultation rounds to this stage essentially stand.

Also of relevance, my recent planning responses on the: draft NPPF/PPG, Charnwood discussion paper, and Gotham Neighbourhood Plan.
Examples of adverse lighting: the stretch Wheatcroft’ to the Borough boundary [Willwell, A52]; Easthorpe House Ruddington.

Policy preventing deliberate land-degradation is still a somewhat unresolved issue.
It matters that ‘green infrastructure’ ( & ‘disagree on ‘urban fringe area’ map -) wouldn’t diminish for example: agricultural use therein that tranquillity, Nature. ‘Would like to see strong, Borough level and neighbourhood plan(s) level, planning policy protection against ‘fracking’ in the wider Moor area plus (a) countryside-landscape-scale buffer(s), certainly at these parishes: Ruddington, Bradmore, Bunny, Thrumpton, Barton in Fabis, Gotham.

West Bridgford ([south-]west map) ‘agree should have Green Belt fringe.

At Sutton Bonington, not-ideal narrowing the settlement gap there.

Within the time-frame planning uses and/or planning alternatives re e.g. Syerston[ Airfield] and Ratcliffe on Soar power station?

Will cash-wise Brexit put paid to tram-extension and hs2 in Rushcliffe.

Want to preserve Rushcliffe’s different, south-of-the-River identity? if so then, without them even realizing it, distance R.B.C. from - i.e. better yet get out of - their negative e.g.: combined-authority/-jpab/core-strategy...metro-strategy.

Mr J Potter
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>Mr</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Mervyn</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Powdrill</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (where relevant)</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title (where relevant)</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address</td>
<td></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number</td>
<td></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</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:**

- Click here to enter text.

### 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:

- Click here to enter text.

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

- Page no. 42
- Paragraph no. 3-69
- Site ref. Policy 6.3: Housing Allocation – Land opposite Mere Way, Ruddington
- Policy ref. Choose an item.

- Policies Map

- Click here to enter text.

### 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.

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

As a result of the Appeal allowing the Asher Lane planning application for 175 homes to go ahead, the targets both for the number of houses on Green Belt land and the additional sites being identified needs amending to reflect this. The Mere Way proposal is too large and out on a limb visually and for access to schools and village facilities. The Flawforth Lane proposal has similar access issues being on the wrong side of the A60. The Wilford Lane site despite a potential flooding issue could be viewed as an extension to an existing development and is closers to schools and facilities. Therefore if more development must be forced on to Ruddington exacerbating the existing traffic and infrastructure plus the expected pressures expected by the Asher Lane go-ahead, some compromise should be found.

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”).

As a household I don't feel qualified to comment on the legal compliance of the document and am responding regarding the potential damage to our village character and local business. The choice of Ruddington as a key settlement given its compact centre is already suffering from traffic congestion at peak times due to its position as a 'rat run' between the A453 to the west and the A52 to the east, exacerbated by the large nearby developments at Edwalton and the forthcoming large new development south of Clifton.
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)

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

If 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: 26/06/2018

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

localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk; or

Planning Policy
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rushcliffe Arena
Rugby Road,

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

(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.
Hi I would just like to voice my concerns about the proposed plans to build on rudd01 ... I think it is not a good idea to build on a zone 2 flood area as I’m sure it may/ could cause a problem for the surrounding houses should we have a lot of rain as we have had in the past few weeks. Also I think of the extra traffic through the village and I do not believe the infrastructure has been put in place to support all the extra new homes- schools/doctors etc. I am concerned about loosing the edge of the village ... if we are not careful we will join up with West Bridgford or Clifton and then we would no longer be s village... sadly.

Yours
Helen powell

Sent from my iPhone
20th June 2018

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

Dear Sir,

I believe the draft LAPP published by Rushcliffe Borough Council, is unsound for the following reasons;

- It does not comply with the duty to cooperate with the emerging Gotham Neighbourhood Plan and with existing and planned national policy nor with Rushcliffe's own Core Strategy which states that housing allocations in villages like Gotham should be for local needs only.

- it has not followed existing and proposed national policy on use of smaller sites and housing numbers

- it has not effectively evaluated alternative sites such as those proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan

- it unnecessarily removes land from the green belt.

- the proposed GOT5a site has not been shown to be viable as the proposed access off Leake Road has not been fully assessed. The site should be fully proven as capable of development before it is removed 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'

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 boundary

Yours sincerely,

D B Power
27 June 2018

Dear Sirs

Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2

As part of the consultation process we request that you take into consideration the following points.

We are displeased that there is an increase in the proposed allocation of new houses in Keyworth. The Parish Council consulted widely with local residents on possible sites for 450 houses within the parish before issuing the Village Plan. Extra sites were also proposed within the plan should there be an increase in the housing requirement. You seem to have disregarded the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan, which was passed recently by a majority of 83.4%. Surely the whole point of the extensive consultation and vote is to provide a framework for planning, in line with Government policy to give local communities a say in development. To ignore the plan is making a mockery of consultation.

All the proposed sites in Keyworth are on Green Belt land. The Chancellor in his Budget has stepped back from relaxing planning laws on Green Belt and wishes to take measures to stop "land banking". Releasing more land to developers does not equate to more houses being built, hence not solving the housing shortage. Building needs to be in areas of greatest need, with relevant employment. We therefore suggest it would be prudent for the Council to obtain clarification from the Government before allocating Green Belt for building because once it's gone it's gone. Where in the borough is Green Belt being allocated to compensate for the possible loss of Green Belt in Keyworth?

The Local Plan Part 2 includes an area (4.4 Hillside Farm) not in the Neighbourhood plan and describes an area (4.3) as south of Debdale Lane when, in fact, it is also north of Bunny Lane. If these areas were both developed then there would be severe access problems on Bunny Lane, congestion in Keyworth and congestion at the junctions with A60. Has this been considered?

For many years area 4.4 Hillside Farm has produced a variety crops including cereals and grasses. Recently maize has been grown two years consecutively, we believe, in an attempt to degrade the land. The land has now been left unattended and littered with odd items including an abandoned car to give the impression it is not good farm land. It is a subterfuge to hoodwink the planners.

It should be noted that 4.4 Hillside Farm now shares a boundary with a large livestock barn. Environmental Health recommendations state that any dwellings not associated with such farm activity should be at least a distance of 150 metres; this covers the majority of the site. The prevailing westerly wind exacerbates the situation.

We object to your proposals which are not supported by the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan. Please rethink your planning strategy for the Keyworth area to reflect the view of the local community.

Yours faithfully,

Richard and Christine Powers
Planning Policy
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rushcliffe Arena
Rugby Road
West Bridgford
NG2 7YG

Dear Sir,

I would be remiss not to point out 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.

I would point out that the draft LAPP published by Rushcliffe Borough Council is unsound because it has not followed existing and proposed national policy on the use of smaller sites and housing numbers. In addition, it is similarly unsound because alternative sites have not been effectively evaluated. Thirdly, it is unsound because it removes land from the green belt.

I find that the draft LAPP published by Rushcliffe Borough Council is non-compliant in that it makes no mention of the proposed access to the GOT5a site that I understand is to come off Leake Road. This should be consulted upon before the land is allocated from the green belt.

Rushcliffe Borough Council’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 within the green belt, i.e. outside the new inset line. Nation policy in respect of the green belt states 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,

Richard Priestley
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).

In order for the Plan to be legally compliant the information provided during earlier stages of the consultation and within the proposed Local Plan Part 2 must be materially factually accurate. If the information given to the public to enable them to be consulted, and/or the information which the Council
have used to inform their decision making and develop their planning policies is inaccurate then it renders the outcome of the consultation, and those policies, fundamentally legally flawed.

The plan of Keyworth shown on page 30 of the Local Plan Part 2 (labelled as Figure 3) is materially inaccurate in a way which is highly relevant the the proposed selection of the site referred to as 'Land South of Debdale Lane' (site ref 4.3) as a proposed development site, because it does not include the new development of houses known as 'High Court Drive' containing 9 houses directly adjacent to, and overlooking, the proposed site. This is not an isolated instance. The plan of Keyworth shown in the 'Policies Map' document which accompanies the proposed Local Plan contains the same error and does not show High Court Drive at all. In fact all of the plans of this site which have been issued during earlier consultations contain the same material inaccuracy, and none of the consultation documents even acknowledge the existence of this relatively new row of houses directly adjacent to the site.

This clearly indicates that the proposal and analysis of the impact of this site has neglected to consider the full facts or any consideration at all of:

(i) the impact which the development would have on those existing properties directly adjacent to the proposed development site and which would be most significantly affected by the proposals. For example, paragraph 3.40 states that the main adverse visual impact of Site ref 4.3 is 'when viewed from the West and the North' which shows that the authors of the Plan are clearly unaware that there is a new development of houses directly overlooking the proposed site, at a distance of about 10m from the eastern boundary of the site.

(ii) the impact which this unacknowledged existing development would have on the location of any access roads into the proposed new site. Any access road onto Bunny Lane would in reality need to be at least 30m west of the location which would have been considered as part of the traffic safety survey carried out based on the inaccurate plans which do not show the existence of High Court Drive.

This is a material factual error in the evaluation process and accordingly renders the site evaluation process invalid and unlawful. I request the Council to carry out a revaluation of this site using correct and up to date information about the directly surrounding environment.

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
- 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).

1. Policy 4.3 is inconsistent with national policies

1.1 Visual Impact

Policy 4.3 is inconsistent with national policies which require local planning policy to be designed so as to minimise the adverse visual impact of new developments. See for example paragraph 109 of
the NPPF which states that the planning system must 'contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by....protecting and enhancing valued landscapes......'

Out of all the potential sites around Keyworth, Site ref 4.3 has the highest ground in the surrounding area, and so will cause the most detrimental visual impact. This land is visible for many miles to the southwest, west and north, and is directly adjacent to a row of new houses which directly overlook the site no more than 10m from the eastern boundary, and no adequate visual impact assessment has been carried out. Any such impact assessment would clearly show the extremely negative impact of housing at this site. There is no way that the proposal to develop this site can be said to be consistent with the NPPF in this regard.

1.2 Traffic

Such a large new development would create a lot more traffic on Bunny Lane. Paragraph 143 of the NPPF states that: ‘In preparing Local Plans, local planning authorities should.....set out environmental criteria......against which planning applications will be assessed so as to ensure that permitted operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health, including from........traffic’

The additional traffic on Bunny Lane cause by proposed site ref 4.3 would be very dangerous - Bunny Lane is a narrow winding country road, is especially popular with cyclists, and has seen many serious accidents already in recent years. In contrast, the other main access roads to Keyworth to the north and east of the village would be far more suitable and link directly to the main A606 Melton Road.

In addition, the junction to the west of Keyworth with the main A60 Loughborough Road is already extremely congested at peak times. When leaving Keyworth to travel by car to Nottingham on a weekday morning it can often take 20 mins or more to queue to turn right onto the A60 northbound, with queues of 40+ cars. Adding yet more traffic to the westbound route out of Keyworth by building more houses would cause unacceptable further congestion.

There is no evidence at all that these traffic impacts of proposed policy 4.3 have been properly considered when preparing the Local Plan. Policy 4.3 is therefore inconsistent with the traffic mitigation policies set out in the NPPF.

1.3 Use of Green Belt Land

The site ref 4.3 uses green belt land. Current national government planning policy “Fixing our Broken Housing Market” (Feb 2017) stresses that:

“Green Belt boundaries should only be amended in exceptional circumstances when local authorities can demonstrate that they have fully examined all other reasonable options for meeting their identified housing requirements”

There is no evidence that there are any “exceptional circumstances” in Keyworth to justify giving up any existing green belt land for housing. In fact quite the contrary. The Council's own options appraisal showed that the proposed changes to the Green Belt boundaries scored worse against the option to retain existing Green Belt boundaries on all objectives except the 'housing’ objective - see page 28 of the 'Sustainability Appraisal Report' (Green Belt - revised inset boundaries’). The case needs to be made out far more clearly than it is at the moment, before any green belt sites are approved for housing development. Any such development without clearly setting out the exceptional need would therefore be contrary to national planning policy and therefore subject to legal challenge.

2. Policy 4.3 is Not Justified

The Local Plan is not 'Justified' because it is based on incorrect evidence, so as a consequence the proposals contained within the Plan may not be the most appropriate when considered against other reasonable alternatives.

The plan of Keyworth shown on page 30 of the Local Plan Part 2 (labelled as Figure 3) is materially inaccurate in a way which is highly relevant the the proposed selection of the site referred to as 'Land South of Debdale Lane’ as a proposed development site, because it does not include the new development of houses known as 'High Court Drive' containing 9 houses directly adjacent to, and overlooking, the proposed site. This is not an isolated instance in fact all of the plans of this site which have been issued during earlier consultations contain the same material inaccuracy.
This clearly indicates that the proposal and analysis of the impact of this site has been based on factually incorrect evidence so that there cannot have been an appropriate consideration of:

(i) the impact which the development would have on those existing properties directly adjacent to the proposed development site and which would be most drastically affected by the proposals. For example, paragraph 3.40 states that the main adverse visual impact of Site ref 4.3 is 'when viewed from the West and the North' which shows that the authors of the Plan are clearly unaware that there is a new development of houses directly overlooking the proposed site, at a distance of about 10m from the eastern boundary of the site.

(ii) the impact which this unacknowledged existing development would have on the location of any access roads into the proposed new site. Any access road onto Bunny Lane would in reality need to be at least 30m west of the location which would have been considered as part of the traffic safety survey carried out based on the inaccurate plans which do not show the existence of High Court Drive.

This is a material factual error in the evidence on which Policy 4.3 of the Local Plan has been based and accordingly that Policy is invalid and unlawful.

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.

Removing Policy 4.3 from the Local Plan and therefore removing proposed site 4.3 from the list of proposed development sites would resolve all of the issues identified above. Note that it would still be possible to achieve the stated objective of finding sites for 450 new houses in Keyworth as set out in Part 1 of the Local Plan, without including Site 4.3. This amendment would therefore not in any way frustrate the overall strategic objective of securing sufficient new development sites within Rushcliffe as identified in Part 1 of the Local Plan.

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.

The factual errors identified above clearly show that the officials charged with preparing the Local Plan do not have accurate and up to date information regarding the factual ‘position on the ground’ in the vicinity of proposed site 4.3. I would therefore like to participate in person at the hearing sessions to ensure any decisions taken are based on factually correct information.

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 refer to the draft LAPP published by Rushcliffe Borough Council.

- **is non compliant** in its duty to cooperate with the emerging Gotham Neighbourhood Plan and with existing and planned national policy.
- **is unsound** as it has not followed existing and proposed national policy on use of smaller sites and housing numbers.
- **is unsound** in that it is not effectively evaluated alternative sites.
- **is unsound** in that it unnecessarily removes land from the green belt.
- **is non compliant** in that nothing has been mentioned in the Plan of the proposed access to the GOT5a site which we understand is to come off Leake Road. This should be consulted upon before the land is allocated from the green belt.

National policy has indicated that Rushcliffe housing targets are 30% higher than they should be according to the formula set out in the 'Planning for the right homes in the right places' which sets the housing targets for Rushcliffe at 600 per year, i.e. 10,200. Also Rushcliffe's own Core Strategy states that housing allocations in villages like Gotham should be for local needs only.

The LAPP Policies Map for Gotham should be redrawn to ensure that GOT4 remains in the Green Belt, i.e. outside the new inset line. National policy for the Green Belt says that land should only be removed from the Green Belt in **exceptional circumstances**. The LAPP Policies Map shows GOT4 removed from the Green Belt without any exceptional circumstances.

Rushcliffe should have taken note of the Housing Policy and Green Network policies in the Gotham Neighbourhood Plan and set out their plan to accommodate these.

- The LAPP Policies Map for Gotham should be redrawn to include sites GOT1 and GOT3 within the inset boundary.
- The LAPP Policies Map for Gotham should be redrawn to remove GOT5a and GOT4 from the inset boundary.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Your name: Alison Putnar