Please find attached the response from RNCSIG to the latest version of the Rushcliffe Local Plan

Chair - RNCSIG
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>Mr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Gordon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Dyne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (where relevant)</td>
<td>Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group (RNCSIG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title (where relevant)</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 1</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 2</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 3</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 4</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 5</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number</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: RNCSIG

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

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

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page no.</th>
<th>Paragraph no.</th>
<th>Policy ref.</th>
<th>Site ref.</th>
<th>Policies Map</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See attached</td>
<td>See attached</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2:

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

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

What makes a Local Plan “sound”?

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

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

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

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.

Click here to enter text.

### 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”).

Click here to enter text.

### 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

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.

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

Click here to enter a date.

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

RNCSIG is responding on the basis that the Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy emphasizes the importance of avoiding any further loss or damage to our remaining critical wildlife capital and to maintain the network of green infrastructure. We are also concerned that the scale of development in eating away at open countryside will further reduce areas of existing general habitats (hedgerow, pasture, arable) that support various species and also reduce the possibilities for habitat creation.

We welcome this document’s recognition of the Nature Conservation Strategy and also of the value of the Biodiversity Mapping Opportunity Exercise. But in a previous consultation RNCSIG noted that whilst the Core Strategy stated “The biodiversity of Rushcliffe will be increased over the Core Strategy period...” there were no details of positive mechanisms to make this increase happen. We again feel that this document talks about the concept of Net Gain in biodiversity but is still unclear as to how it will contribute to that objective. Previous local plans have also included policies to protect countryside and biodiversity, despite which both have continued to decline substantially. If all the mechanisms for protection of existing biodiversity were properly implemented, it should be possible to prevent further loss, but without details of mechanisms to create new habitat it is difficult to see how it will be increased.

RNCSIG is also very concerned that the original large sites were chosen for housing after much debate and that delays in building on them are distorting the process. We are very concerned that these less sustainable village sites will get delivered first, followed by the delayed major sites with the result that more land is taken than is strictly necessary.

RNCSIG would therefore feel that greenfield site allocation must be kept to an absolute minimum and any collateral damage or loss to our local wildlife capital (Local Wildlife Sites, Nature Reserves and Green Corridors) must be avoided. However if such sites are allocated any buffering or mitigation will need to be significant. But such mitigation is always second best, as once valuable sites are damaged or lost mitigation cannot guarantee fully replacing the lost biodiversity.

In terms of mitigation funding RNCSIG feel it far better to accumulate funds to undertake worthwhile nature conservation projects outside of a development by making existing wildlife sites better, bigger or more connected. Rather than putting small sums into onsite projects which are likely to be small and of little long term wildlife value. However we would insist that this is the last resort and would prefer to see valuable habitat protected by the Mitigation Hierarchy and not seen as an alternative.

RNCSIG would like to see the following issues addressed:

- Reference to Royal Institution of British Architects (RIBA) publication "Designing for Biodiversity technical guide for new and existing buildings" http://www.ribabookshops.com/item/designing-for-biodiversity-a-technical-guide-for-new-and-existing-buildings-2

Our responses to specific policies are as follows:

Sustainable Development

Policy 1 Development Requirements

In Core Strategy Policy 17c suggests that development will result in improved Biodiversity features. However there...
is no reflection of this statement in the Sustainable Development Policy other than a brief mention of there being no significant adverse effect on important wildlife interest, which is NOT the same as "improving Biodiversity features. We therefore feel that Policy 1 MUST be reinforced to reflect the intention of the Core Strategy and show a strong commitment to improving biodiversity as part of the development process.

We would strongly urge that the unexpected decision by the Planning Inspector to allow housing development on Asher Lane, Ruddington should lead to an adjustment in the allocated housing in this proposal. We would favour this "windfall" being used to remove a suitable sites adjacent to Local wildlife Sites from the plan, thereby reducing the wildlife impact.

Housing Development Allocations

Policy 2.1 Land rear of Mill Lane/Pld Park, Cotgrave

RNCSIG objects to this allocation unless there is adequate provision for buffering of the woodland area to the north. Policy 38 Non Designated Natural Assets applies. As with other locations where habitat protection/mitigation is promised the issue is going to be proper implementation and monitoring to ensure that planning consents are followed in every case.

Policy 2.2 Land south of Hollygate Lane, Cotgrave

RNCSIG objects to this allocation unless there is adequate provision for buffering the Grantham Canal as this is an important Local Wildlife Site and part of the Green Infrastructure, in line with Policy 36 Designated Nature Conservation Sites. As with other locations where habitat protection/mitigation is promised the issue is going to be proper implementation and monitoring to ensure that planning consents are followed in every case.

Policy 3 Land north of Rempstone Rd, East Leake

RNCSIG objects to allocation as it represents a significant intrusion into the wider countryside and because of it’s location being separate from East Leake will inevitably lead to pressure for further infill, which will result in the loss of farmland type habitats that will support a range of species.

Policy 4.1 Land of Nicker Hill, Keyworth

RNCSIG objects to allocation as this is adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site. If the allocation were allowed we would expect there to be significant mitigation and buffering in line with Policy 36 Designated Nature Conservation Sites. As with other locations where habitat protection/mitigation is promised the issue is going to be proper implementation and monitoring to ensure that planning consents are followed in every case.

Policy 4.2 Land between Platt Lane and Station Rd, Keyworth

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
No objection to allocation on significant wildlife issues.

Policy 4.3 Land south of Debdale Lane Keyworth

RNCSIG objects to allocation as this areas includes historical ridge and furrow and areas of woodland that should be conserved. Policy 38 Non Designated Natural Assets would seem to apply. If the allocation is allowed there must be adequate mitigation and buffering. As with other locations where habitat protection/mitigation is promised the issue is going to be proper implementation and monitoring to ensure that planning consents are followed in every case.

Policy 4.4 Hillside Farm, Keyworth

No objection to allocation on significant wildlife issues.

Policy 5.1 Land north Nottingham Rd, Radcliffe on Trent

RNCSIG objects to the allocation as it represents a significant intrusion into the wider countryside. which will result in the loss of farmland type habitats that will support a range of species.

Policy 5.2 Land adjacent to Grooms Cottage, R on T

No objection to allocation on significant wildlife issues.

Policy 5.3 Land of Shelford Rd, R on T

RNCSIG objects to this allocation as a significant intrusion into the countryside, which will result in the loss of farmland type habitats that will support a range of species.

Policy 5.4 Land off Grantham Rd, R on T

RNCSIG objects to the allocation as an intrusion into the countryside, which will result in the loss of farmland type habitats that will support a range of species.

Policy 5.5 72 Land Main Rd, R on T

No objection on wildlife related issues.

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Policy 5.6 Land The Paddocks, Nottingham Rd, R on T
No objection on wildlife related issues.

Policy 6.1 Land west of Wilford Rd, Ruddington
RNCSIG objects to allocation as this site represents a significant intrusion into the wider countryside, which will result in the loss of farmland type habitats that will support a range of species.

Policy 6.2 Land south of Flawforth Lane, Ruddington
RNCSIG objects to allocation as this site represents a significant intrusion into the wider countryside.

Policy 6.3 Land opposite Mere Way, Ruddington
RNCSIG objects to allocation as this site represents a significant intrusion into the wider countryside, which will result in the loss of farmland type habitats that will support a range of species.

Policy 7 Land east of Church Str, Cropwell Bishop
RNCSIG objects to the allocation as it represents a significant intrusion into the wider countryside.

Policy 8.1 Land between Butt Land & Closes Side, East Bridgford
No objection on wildlife related issues.

Policy 8.2 Land south of Butt Lane, East Bridgford
RNCSIG objects to the allocation as it will create problems for Springdale Wood and the adjacent wildflower meadow. Policy 36 and Policy 38 should be considered here and if development is allowed, adequate mitigation and buffering must be provided. As with other locations where habitat protection/mitigation is promised the issue is going to be proper implementation and monitoring to ensure that planning consents are followed in every case.

Policy 9 Land east of Gypsum Way/The Orchards, Gotham
RNCSIG objects to this allocation as it is adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site and represents an intrusion into the wider landscape. If the allocation was allowed we would expect significant appropriate mitigation and buffering of the LWS inline with Policy 36 on Designated Nature Conservation Sites. As with other locations where habitat protection/mitigation is promised the issue is going to be proper implementation and monitoring to ensure that

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
planning consents are followed in every case.

Policy 10 Land north of Park Lane, Sutton Bonnington

No objection on wildlife related issues.

Policy 12 Housing Standards

Rushcliffe has supported the promotion of inclusion of Swift boxes within new housing and we feel that this should become part of housing standards that at least a proportion of houses in a development should incorporate birds and bat boxes within the structure. But in addition the standards could also promote the use of hedgehog gaps within fencing on development and also grey water conservation schemes.

The policy should make reference to Royal Institution of British Architects (RIBA) publication Designing for Biodiversity technical guide for new and existing buildings http://www.ribabookshops.com/item/designing-for-biodiversity-a-technical-guide-for-new-and-existing-buildings-2

Climate Change, Flood Risk and Water Management

Policy 16 Renewable Energy

RNCSIG supports this policy, although consideration needs to be given to issues such as risk of bird strikes if location is near significant bird roosting areas, but also to the opportunities for "good" habitat in and around such features.

Policy 17 Managing Flood Risk

The principal Policy statement should contain specific mention of looking for biodiversity gains in creating flood risk mitigation proposals.

Policy 19 Development affecting watercourses

We strongly support the specific mention of biodiversity in this policy. But would make the following observations

Policy 19c should specifically mention a minimum 10 metre buffer zone around water courses as per 5.32 and 5.33

5.31 strongly support para on water quality.

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
5.33 Strongly support the recognition of the importance of buffer zones around a range of different natural and semi natural features.

**Green Belt & Countryside**

**Policy 20 Managing Water Quality**

RNCSIG supports this policy.

**Policy 22 Development in the Countryside**

RNCSIG wish to make the following observations about this policy

2e) Expansion of all businesses in rural areas - there should be a caveat in reference to activities being *appropriate* to the particular rural area and to the likely effects on local environment, including natural habitats. See statement 3a.

**Policy 23 Redevelopment of Bunny Brickworks**

Whilst welcoming the specific habitat protection promised in the policy for this site, RNCSIG are still concerned that the new development will create additional pressure on the nearby Bunny Wood Nature Reserve, which is one of Rushcliffes premier nature reserves and an example of ancient woodland. We also would want to see a proper and final solution to the dust problems that have plagued this area for years, arising from the presence of the incinerator ash. As with other locations where habitat protection/mitigation is promised the issue is going to be proper implementation and monitoring to ensure that planning consents are followed in every case.

**Policy 28 Protecting Heritage Assets**

RNCSIG supports this policy in particular to protecting both Registered and non Registered gardens.

**Policy 31 Tourism and Leisure**

Should not just regard the Landscape Character as something of value to tourism, but must also recognize the value

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
of biodiversity in promoting a "good" tourist environment.

**Policy 32 Recreation and Open Space**

Support this policy, providing it recognizes the provision for green infrastructure within and around such areas.

**Policy 33 Local Green Space**

RNCSIG supports the leaving/creation of such green spaces not only for it’s leisure value, but also in that it again provides useful opportunities to create some additional green infrastructure around and within such sites. We also feel such GI work also provides opportunities to support the National Pollinator Strategy.

**Green Infrastructure and the Natural Environment**

12.1 should include mention of both used and disused railways as part of GI

12.2 Support this comment

12.3 Major Transport corridors such as the railways A43 and A453 trunk roads also provide some opportunities for GI

12.4 RNCSIG believes that the PRIMARY purpose of Green Infrastructure must be to provide habitat and linkages for biodiversity, otherwise it can be seen as nothing more than a path with mown grassy edges. It must been seen as an opportunity to support both movement of wildlife and people in a pleasant environment.

12.5 Please to see specific mention of the Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy and the Rushcliffe Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Exercise.

12.6 Support the opportunities seen for improving the natural environment.

12.7 This paragraph seems to suggest that wildlife within Green Infrastructure is regarded as of less importance than human activities, yet it is fundamental to the concept of GI. So whilst we support the overall aim that development should at a minimum not adversely effect Green Infrastructure the policy must specifically recognize...
biodiversity and human activity as co-equals.

We also note that the GI map does not include the Great Central Railway as a significant corridor, which it certainly is, not the least for the opportunities it is providing for invertebrates like the rare Grizeled Skipper butterfly to spread.

Policy 34 Green Infrastructure and Open Spaces

RNCSIG supports a policy that promotes Green Infrastructure and Open Spaces, but we find some of the wording confusing and unclear as to what it is actually trying to say.

34.1) RNCSIG supports this policy item

34.2) "Development that protects, enhances, or widens their Green Infrastructure importance will be supported, provided it does not adversely affect their primary functions".

This policy statement appears to be confusing and we are unclear as to what it actually saying.

34.3) this policy statement does not acknowledge that loss of good habitat cannot be easily or quickly replaced through mitigation/habitat creation works.

34.4) "Planning permission will not be granted for development which would adversely affect access to open spaces and opportunities should be sought to protect or enhance the rights of way network and, where applicable, its open environment." Unclear what this statement actually means.

12.9) Support this

12.10) Support this

Such Green Space and GI also provides opportunity to support the National Pollinator Strategy, which should be recognized in the policy.

The policy should also recognize the value of traditional local orchards both as an interesting wildlife habitat of a particular kind, but also for it’s contribution to our natural (and human) heritage.
Policy 35 Green Infrastructure and Network and Urban Fringe

RNCSIG supports this policy in particular we are pleased to see reference to the Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy and the Rushcliffe Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Exercise in 12.15.

Biodiversity and Geodiversity

RNCSIG is pleased to see the recognition of the value of wildlife and biodiversity in these policies, and are particularly pleased to see that Local Wildlife Sites are included in the hierarchy of protection and are regarded as of "material consideration when considering planning applications".

But would observe that 12.20 " and that non-designated sites or wildlife corridors will only be permitted where there is overriding need" does not actually make sense and should actually read " and that development of non-designated sites or wildlife corridors will only be permitted where there is overriding need"

Policy 36 Designated Nature Conservation Sites

RNCSIG strongly supports the hierarchy provided for SSSI’s, Local Wildlife Sites, Local Geological Sites, Local Nature Reserves and irreplaceable habitats. We feel a level of protection to LWS’s is particularly important as they are the crucial component of Rushcliffes critical wildlife capital, as there are very few SSSI’s in Rushcliffe.

However we would make the following comments

4c - in Core Strategy Policy 17 there is a firm commitment that biodiversity of Rushcliffe will be increased over the Core Strategy period. However this policy only talks about no NET Loss and therefore is at odds with the Core Strategy.

Monitoring proposals

Natural England planning function is now very weak, applies only to SSSI’s so we are not convinced this is a meaningful target in anyway.
For targets RBC should look at

- loss /damage to SSSI’s, Local Wildlife Sites/GI etc to development
- level of net gain to wildlife habitat arising from development.

Policy 37 Trees and Woodlands

RNCSIG welcomes RBC’s commitment to promoting trees and woodland, both in existing towns and villages, as well as the wider countryside, but now also in the context of new developments. In particular we welcome the recognition that the protection of existing trees must be a priority and that the planting of new trees needs to be appropriate in terms of types of tree, impact on any existing habitat and also take into account Landscape Character.

The policy should also recognize the value of traditional local orchards.

Policy 38 Non Designated Biodiversity Assets and the Wider Ecological Network

RNCSIG welcomes this policy and the recognition of the value of the Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Exercises. In particular we endorse the need to recognize the range of different habitats identified and the areas of concentrated opportunity (BOA’s).

Environmental Protection

Policy 40 Pollution and Land Contamination

RNCSIG supports this policy with the following caveat.

Policy 40 1b) we welcome the inclusion of Light Pollution as an issue, but would also suggest that Sound Pollution should also be considered, as both can impact on wildlife.
Policy 41 Air Quality

RNCSIG supports this policy.

Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

Policy 43 Planning Obligation Threshold

RNCSIG supports the inclusion of Biodiversity Mitigation as part of the Planning Obligation Threshold and the setting of a minimum of 10 dwellings or 1,000 square metres per development floorspace for contributions.

We would however suggest that RBC must be committed to enforcing such obligations.