Dear Sir,

I have found that the draft LAPP published by Rushcliffe Borough Council,

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

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

- is unsound in that it is not effectively evaluated alternative sites

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The LAPP Policies Map for Gotham should be redrawn to remove GOT5a and GOT4 from the inset boundary

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

[Date]
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,

M. F. Raven

15/06/2018
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>Title</th>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent's Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Raynor</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>
<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>

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. 30-34  
Paragraph no.  
Policy ref. 4.1 - 4.11  
Site ref.  
Policies Map p.30  

4. Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2:

4(1) Legally compliant Yes No  
4(2) Sound Yes No  
4(3) Complies with the Duty to Co-operate Yes No  

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

What makes a Local Plan “sound”?

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

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

Effective – the plan should be deliverable; the housing and other development should be capable of being carried out.
Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable sustainable development and be consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

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

- 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.

My daughter lives in Keyworth and I welcome new housing so I can move closer to the site proposed.

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 20 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 2013. 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). 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.

---

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

I\'ve found 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 act 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,

[Nicholas Richardson FRICS]

your name
With reference to the Local Plan Part 2 produced by Rushcliffe Borough Council for East Bridgford, please see my comment below. Sites/Policy 8.1 and 8.2

1. Ruschcliffe Borough Council have not followed guidelines and the site 8.1, Butt Lane to Closes Side Lane, has not been consulted on, this large development of 85 houses over the original smaller sites shown at each consultation is not acceptable. This is no longer adding small development sites to our village but an extremely large estate that the village were never asked about at either consultation.

2. 8.2, is proposed to be built next to the Millennium Woods. The site has a right of way across the field to the woods and is a sanctuary for wildlife, to bust houses alongside the wood is unacceptable as this was voted on the community plan as one of the villages best assets that should be protected.

3. The roads at the end of the village often flood with sewage, more houses will create a further impact on this.

4. The destruction of wildlife habitats that exist on the edge of our village, when this wildlife lost area when the A46 was introduced, to loose more would be disastrous. The village has already lost green belt area from the side of the village that plans have been made due to the new A46 moving closer to the village. We have retained deer and badgers but this would be lost building so close to the A46 side, pushing the wildlife elsewhere.

5. Where any brownfield sites are available and these should be considered over the greenbelt sites.

6. Traffic using the roads makes turning out onto Main Street difficult, especially since the introduction of the new Garden Centre on the edge of the village. Rushcliffe Borough Council responded that most cars will turn out of the village which will never be the case to access any school or access to the roads leading to City hospital and burton joyce.

7. The rural approach and views entering the village from the A46 bridge will change dramatically and will spoil the village scene.

8. In 8.2 it states extra parking for the doctors yet no survey has been done which would show the car park is never fully occupied, always around 50% full at all times!

9. East bridgford public transport cannot assist commuters and therefore bring at least another 100 cars into our village on already congested roads

The infrastructure and public transport cannot sustain another 120 plus houses and our green belt land to this side of the village should be left, smaller in fill sites could be used instead.

Smaller developments away from the millennium wood would be a preference and to be consulted on larger developments would have shown our village is strongly against this.

The lack of consultation on the larger site, 8.1, is not acceptable and villagers could not give their views on the site when it was never in the consultation. Site 8.2 would completely change the village approach and endanger the millennium wood and the wildlife including badgers and deer which are precious to the this area.

Kind regards
I wish to make comment regarding the Local Plan Part 2 produced by Rushcliffe Borough Council for East Bridgford. Sites/Policy 8.1 and 8.2

- The latest plan now includes a new site running from Butt Lane to Closes Side Lane (8.1). This field facing to the front was consulted upon but the new area which now makes this site suitable for over 80 houses was in neither consultation that was presented to the village.
- The village has already lost green belt area from the side of the village that plans have been made due to the new A46 moving closer to the village.
- The smaller of the two sites, 8.2, is proposed to be built next to the Millennium Woods. The site has a right of way across the field to the woods and is used daily by villagers.
- The wildlife and animals that live in this area would be pushed further away and the noise of having residential houses neighbouring the wood would spoil one of the villages highly regarded and used spaces.
- Brownfield sites are available and these should be considered over the greenbelt sites, the villagers on this side should not see more of the green belt disappear.
- Having lived in the village for over 10 years, the increase in traffic using the roads makes turning out onto Main Street difficult. Rushcliffe have responded that most cars will turn out of the village, To use the school facilities, shops, doctors and access the road to Burton Joyce linking to Nottingham, the cars will turn through the village, therefore increasing the level of traffic.
- The school was extended to cope with increased numbers and now a class of 30 in year 1 has become a class of 42 in year 6 and my daughter has not been able to access the year 6 class and has been mixed with younger years. The school gained funds to extend with a clause of maximum numbers, this will be exceeded with more houses in the village.
- The public transport is poor and the buses stop at 3pm to the local town of Bingham. There is no facility to enable commute to the local town of Bingham or Nottingham regularly so cars would be the only option for new residents making the roads busier.
- The East Bridgford Garden Centre has recently been open on the edge of the village, with many more cars using the village and cutting through to access this, being one of the largest garden centres in the UK, East Bridgford has seen enough development.
- Over 1200 houses are to be built at Bingham and the second phase of Newton is to be built. The builders have not been encouraged to use the Newton site due to the money and infrastructure they are asked to provide before beguiling phase 2. Using our green belt will become more lucrative for developers and the nearby Newton site will remain.
- The rural approach and views entering the village from the A46 bridge will change dramatically and will spoil the village scene.
- For the land in 8.2, it states that that doctors surgery would be provided additional parking. The car park is 50% full at any time and therefore to suggest this would be a benefit is not factually correct.
- The destruction of wildlife habitats that exist on the edge of our village, deers, bats, badgers to name but a few, is unacceptable when this wildlife lost area when the A46 was introduced, to loose more would be detrimental.

Please reconsider these sites, the infrastructure and public transport cannot sustain another 120 plus houses and our green belt land to this side of the village should be left, smaller in fill sites could be used instead. A smaller development within the village, would be more acceptable than building two large sites on greenbelt land next to one of the villages most prized assets, the millennium wood.

The last point I would like to strongly make is the lack of consultation, the larger site, 8.1, was never consulted on, this was always going to be a smaller site not stretching all the way to closes side lane. At the last consultation someone offered the rest of the land to Rushcliffe to be considered, this is not acceptable that as villagers we could not then give our views on the site. Site 8.2 would completely take away the tranquil walk through our wood in the village with houses built alongside.
Kind regards
Planning Policy  
Rushcliffe Borough Council  
Rushcliffe Arena  
Rugby Road  
West Bridgford  
NG2 7YG

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

[Signature]

Sandra I. Riley
Phillip W. Riley
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)

We object to the development of 125 new houses for the reasons below:

1) No consultation on the new location
2) The development would conflict with one of the 5 purposes of the Green Belt
3) There are alternatives to achieve the overall housing target for Rushcliffe, i.e., Newton
4) The development conflicts with the Neighbourhood Plan for the area, it is clear and consistent with it.
5) Traffic and transport within the village will be impacted upon, i.e., increase traffic, public transport in Rushcliffe (the village already struggles). The focus of a new development should be in an area that is better suited for public transport for non-motorised.
6) The development will have an impact on the local wildlife - the wildlife should be protected.

Signed:

Name: 
Address: 

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

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

Dear Sir,

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely
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
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>Title</th>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent’s Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freda</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td></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>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 2</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 3</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 4</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 5</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</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: [redacted]

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

Photographs of localised (Charnwood Avenue) land flooding, which has been happening since July 2007 to the most recent 3 times over 9 day period around Easter 2018. Parish Council has notified Rushcliffe Council, Network Rail and local land owners but problems has not been solved or stopped.

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

Page no. 55-57
Paragraph no. 3.103 - 3.107
Policy ref.
Policy 10: Housing Allocation – Land north of Park Lane, Sutton Bonington

Site ref. Policy 10: Housing Allocation – Land north of Park Lane, Sutton Bonington
Policies Map Sutton Bonington Page 56 Figure 9

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.

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

- [ ] Positively Prepared
- [x] Justified
- [x] 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.

Totally unsuitable site because of local land flooding (see attached photographs in Charnwood Avenue). Limited spaces at two nearby local primary schools. Doctors premises unable at cope with current village residents needs. Only one small shop plus post office. Roads and sewage systems already insufficient for resident requirements. Very limited public transport.

This development would change both Sutton Bonington and Normanton (nearby village) into a combined larger location. Not two self contained villages as they are now.

---

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.

---

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
(If you are suggesting that the Local Plan Part 2 is legally compliant or sound please write “Not applicable”).

If all of the points in Q6 were given true consideration then it must be obvious that this is totally the wrong location for 80 new homes.

Therefore it is necessary to choose a more appropriate development area than land north of Park Lane, Sutton Bonington.

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 heard 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:

n/a

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 10/06/2018

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
Kugoy 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.

---

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
(8 sand bags at back door)  March 2016
Water passed under bungalows to front garden

March 2016
Planning Policy
Rushcliffe Borough Council,
Rushcliffe, Dona, Rugby Rd,
West Bridgford,
Nottingham NG2 7YC

PROPOSED PLAN FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

REF: CB15 CHURCH ST. CROPWELL BISHOP

3rd June 2018

RUSHCLIFFE BOROUGH COUNCIL
BUSINESS SUPPORT UNIT
RECEIVED
- 7 JUN 2018

Copies sent to
Referred to

Dear Sir / Madam,

I wish to register my objections to the above
for the following reasons:

1. Access on a dangerous corner, prone to flooding,

2. Amount of extra traffic through the
middle of the village, especially at
peak times.

I hope you will give these points your
serious consideration.
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)

- Very disappointed these changing plans have not been properly consulted and communicated for residents view.
- The public transport links in and out of the village are already not good enough, which will lead to a greater use of personal cars and increased pollution.

The scale of the proposed development is the problem.
- EB will find it difficult to retain Mod-High development.
- Smaller development is more suited to the village dynamic and let the village grow organically over time, along with its infrastructure. This looks like too much stress in one hit.
- The attraction of the village includes its Greenbelt. This would sacrifice a large area of this and impact on EB appeal, character and beauty. Such goes against the fabric of the village.
- The traffic on the Main Street is already an issue (too much volume and too fast a speed). Any proposed could need to include any traffic calming measures to make it attractive.
- High paths and rights of ways that exist through existing fields must be protected with a suitable alternative or retained.
- This could be the part of something even bigger. And encourage more development of more of the Greenbelt. The infrastructure cannot support it!

Signed

Name:
Address:

East Bridgford Residents Group Drop-In, 16th May 2018, East Bridgford Village Hall
Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2:
Land and Planning Policies
Publication Version

Representation Form

Please return by 5pm on Thursday 28 June 2018 to: Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road
Nottingham
NG2 7YG

This form has two parts:

Part A – Personal details

Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate part B for each issue/representation you wish to make.

Please read the Representation Guidance Notes (available separately) and the Data Protection Notice (see below) before completing the form.

Part A (Please complete in full; in order for the Inspector to consider your representations you must provide your name and postal address).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent’s Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Mr. Cameron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Ross</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>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Name/Organisation:

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. 38-34

Paragraph no. 

Policy ref. 4.1-4.4

Site ref. 

Policies Map 30

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.

I AGREE WITH THE BOROUGH COUNCIL'S DECISION TO INCLUDE SITE SOUTH OF BUNNY LANE

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Protection Notice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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.

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

[Signature]

John Malcolm Fraser Royce
Dear Sir,

I have found 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 now 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,

WENDY MAY ROYCE
Comment

Consultee: Mr Michael Rutherford (1134743)
Event Name: Local Plan Part 2 (Publication Draft)
Comment by: Mr Michael Rutherford (1134743)
Comment ID: 45
Response Date: 26/06/18 20:51
Status: Submitted
Submission Type: Web
Version: 0.1

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

Page number: 33
Policy reference: Policy 4.4: Housing Allocation – Hillside Farm, Keyworth
Site reference: Policy 4.4: Housing Allocation – Hillside Farm, Keyworth

Policies Map: Yes

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

What makes a Local Plan “sound”? 

1. **Positively prepared** - the plan should be prepared in a way that meets the need for housing and other development, including infrastructure and business development.
2. **Justified** – the plan should be based on evidence, and be the most appropriate strategy for the district when considered against other reasonable alternatives.
3. **Effective** – the plan should be deliverable; the housing and other development should be capable of being carried out.
4. **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).

As residents of Keyworth we strongly object to the inclusion of Hillside Farm, Site Key13 (Hillside Farm) as a suitable location for “removal of land from the greenbelt and allocated for housing development”

The local Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan produced by Keyworth Parish Council took a number of years to develop; it allowed a comprehensive review of potential sites for new homes, with consultation and discussion. Site Key13 (Hillside Farm) was not included in this plan. A massive 83.5% of the votes cast in the referendum did not think that Site Key13 was a suitable site to allocate for housing development. The number of residents voting in favour of the Local Neighbourhood Plan was far in excess of any previous consultations or those submitting representations.

I therefore urge Rushcliffe Borough Council to respect local democracy by following the housing and other recommendations listed in the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan, as agreed on 30 May 2018. By including Site Key13 the Keyworth section of the Rushcliffe Borough Council Local Plan Part 2 conflicts with the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan and the view of at least one of its Councillors.

Councillor Upton (Portfolio Holder for Housing) at the Rushcliffe Borough Council meeting of 26 April was championing Neighbourhood Plans and the associated decision making at a local level. The Rushcliffe Borough Council Local Plan Part 2 and its plans for housing development should mirror that of the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan.

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 Council’s new assessment that Keyworth can and should sustainably support 590 new houses.

However should the developers be unable to deliver 590 homes, then the neighbourhood plan contingency recommendations to use safe guarded land should be followed and not the allocation of Key 13 Hillside Farm.

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.

To remove Site Key13 (Hillside Farm) as a suitable location for “removal of land from the greenbelt and allocated for housing development” for reasons stated in the section "What makes a Local Plan sound"

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 allocation of housing is a key decision that will be non-reversible for future generations. I think it's important that the residents are given the opportunity to explain the issues to the Planning Inspector.

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.