Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies Publication Version

Representation Form

Please return by 5pm on Thursday 28 June 2018 to:

Rushcliffe Borough Council
BUSINESS SUPPORT UNIT
RECEIVED
27 JUN 2018
Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road
Nottingham
NG2 7YG

This form has two parts:

Part A – Personal Details

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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>PETER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>SANKEY</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: Mr Peter Silver

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: Policy to Housing Land North of Park Lane, Seaburn

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

Page no. 55-57 Paragraph no. Policy ref.

Site ref. Policies Map

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.
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.

The main issue with the plan is the influx this will have on the current site surgery due to the increased demand. The surgery is not large enough to cope with a potential increase of possibly 160 extra consultations per week. This would lead to waiting times being increased. Otherwise the surgery is not designed for this purpose. There are problems with patients parking to attend the surgery.

Another area of concern is the influx of vehicles parking around the school entrances. Most parents drop their children to school as they are going on to their places of work and currently during drop off and pick up times the road is blocked with cars. The new development would cause similar issues as it will significantly increase the number of vehicles in the village.

Finally, the area proposed is a known flooding area and even with rainfall is subject to the defence of safety flooding at the top of Pak Lane. How will 80 new houses help with this problem when just this year residents along Cranwood Fields had flooding damage inflicted on their properties. Also will this increase in vehicles leaving the village?

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
during peak times will impact on the already over crowded Melton Road.
I feel this proposal is not justified and has not taken into account how the village and the current villages will be affected.

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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”).

[Handwritten notes]

- We are better connected since the Rushcliffe area that already have wider ranges of services and facilities therefore would be less of an impact on the area.

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)

[ ] 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:

(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.
Date form completed 25/06/18

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
Kugby 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.
The Local Plan Part 2, with regard to the area being put forward for development, has not been the subject of extensive public consultation. and there has indeed been no opportunities for this to be discussed. At a last public consultation in November 2017 residents were only shown four separate
sites to be considered for development. At no time was it made public that a larger, more comprehensive site was to be put forward for development. On this basis I would certainly question the legality or the soundness of it.

What makes a Local Plan “sound”?

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

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

Do you consider this to be because it is NOT: (please tick all that apply)
- Positively Prepared
- Justified
- Effective

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

1. It has not been part of a public consultation exercise. 2. There has been no sustainability appraisal or feedback given to residents. Traffic is a major issue within the village already. The parish council have voted to apply to close one road out of the village to determine if this would ease congestion. Accidents have happened outside of school and there have been many instances of incosiderate and potentially dangerous parking especially near the medical centre and areas proposed. Closing one road and increasing traffic from new homes would add to the current problems. I would question if there has been a traffic survey done to monitor this situation. The bus service for those residents who do not have a car is wholly inadequate having one bus per hour and none on Sundays. The size of the development suggests that there may be an increase in two cars per household again adding to the current traffic concerns.

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.

Provide further opportunities for public consultation with local residents. Be clear about what is being proposed and who is responsible for these proposals. Provide evidence that traffic surveys have been done, impact assessments have been done on schoolplace availability, service provision at the medical centre can cope with extra patients and other facilities are to be improved within the village and for the use of local residents such as an improved bus service and domestic facilities ie shops.

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

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
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be considered by the independent Planning Inspector by way of written representations.

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

- The Local Plan Part 2 has been submitted for independent examination.
- The recommendations of the Planning Inspector appointed to carry out the independent examination have been published.
- The Local Plan Part 2 has been adopted
Dear Sir,

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely

[Signatures]

SUSAN SCARBOROUGH

JOHN SCARBOROUGH
Hello – I wish to make the following comments on the Local Plan Part 2:

I have been unable to find any reference to the provision of genuinely affordable housing to buy or social housing for rent. Rushcliffe is an increasingly expensive area to live in and it is important that the Council makes provision for those who have backgrounds or relatives in the Borough but can’t afford to live here. It is also important that more is done to combat homelessness.

At present, it appears that Council policy is to discourage people on average and below average incomes from living in Rushcliffe. This would be quite outrageous if true and explicit policies are required urgently to house everyone who wishes to live here in accommodation that is both affordable and suitable for their needs.

Michael Scott
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)

Andrew Seager.

We object to the plans as follows:

1) The capacity of the local infrastructure is full. Roads, Parking, School, etc. It will have a detrimental effect on the local community and environment.

2) Newton should be developed further to include, Schools, Shops, Pub to support the Community. There is more land available by using the airfield.

3) Loss of greenbelt + wildlife Species

4) Loss of Village Identity

Signed: [Signature]
Name: Andrew Seager
Address: [Address]

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

I am writing to object to the proposal to build an additional 125 houses in East Bridgford as per the Rushcliffe Plan.

1) Green Belt – This is now under a serious threat of being significantly reduced further at both Bingham and East Bridgford.

The greenbelt is being squeezed in to a much smaller area. We are now witnessing the unrestricted urban sprawl of built up areas and we are in danger of merging Bingham with East Bridgford and Newton. Surely we must protect the countryside from further encroachment. It is essential that we preserve the setting and character of these historic towns.

2) Traffic, Parking & Transport – At the moment traffic congestion through the village is at unacceptable levels. The surrounding roads are often gridlocked along the A6097 stretch of road between Lowdham, Gunthorpe and Bingham. As a result people are using East Bridgford as a cut through. There is a 30 mph speed limit in the village and I observe that this is being exceeded. The problem with this is that Main Street in East Bridgford has a significant amount of parked cars along one side, reducing visibility and blocking road space, thereby making it a dangerous journey for local people. I am aware that there has been an increase in accidents. Furthermore by increasing the housing only increases cars in the immediate area with the potential increase in harmful air pollution and unwanted noise levels.

3) Village Capacity – Clearly the amenities (School, Doctors etc) will become full and likely over subscribed as a result of the increases in housing. I am concerned for two issues, Firstly that no additional capacity will be created and we will have to squeeze the additional in to the same space. Secondly, This could lead to a reduction in the quality of service from the health provision and school education, when these services are already under a great deal of pressure.

4) This leads me on to the Village of Newton where there are no amenities for the people who live there. This is a failure of the recent construction community and authorities to adequately provide for their needs. I am concerned because if we see something like this happening in East Bridgford then it would be totally unacceptable.

5) What are the plans to develop Newton further? It looks like the builders have got away with providing a school, community centre, shops, pub, playing areas. Why can’t there be more focus on Newton to complete it properly before moving on to something else?
6) Protecting wildlife habitats – The surrounding areas provide habitats to a rich variety of wildlife, it is essential that we protect these to ensure the survival of our Mammals, birds and amphibians etc. Building more houses will destroy their habitat and will not support their existence. As I write this email I can see Bats flying in the twilight of my back garden. If we go through with the additional housing I suspect that the habitat will have disappeared and also our magnificent wildlife.

Regard
To Whom it may concern,
Please see attached representation form.

Regards
Andrew Seager

The data contained in, or attached to, this e-mail, may contain confidential information. If you have received it in error you should notify the sender immediately by reply e-mail, delete the message from your system and contact +44 (0) 3301235850 (Security Operations Centre) if you need assistance. Please do not copy it for any purpose, or disclose its contents to any other person.

An e-mail response to this address may be subject to interception or monitoring for operational reasons or for lawful business practices.

(c) 2017 Rolls-Royce plc

Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2:  
Land and Planning Policies  
Publication Version  

Representation Form  

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

This form has two parts:  
Part A – Personal details  
Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate part B for each issue/representation you wish to make.  

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent’s Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Name</strong></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Name</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job title</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 3</strong></td>
<td>s</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postcode</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-mail Address</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone Number</strong></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: Andrew Seager

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. 49
- Paragraph no. 3.88 - 3.89
- Policy ref. Policy 8.1: Housing Allocation – Land between Butt Lane and Closes Side Lane, East Bridgford
- Site ref. Policy 8.1: Housing Allocation – Land between Butt Lane and Closes Side Lane, East Bridgford
- Policies Map Click here to enter text.

4. Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2:

- 4(1) Legally compliant
- 4(2) Sound
- 4(3) Complies with the Duty to Co-operate

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

**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
- [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.

**Green Belt** – This is now under a serious threat of being significantly reduced further at both Bingham and East Bridgford. The greenbelt is being squeezed in to a much smaller area. We are now witnessing the unrestricted urban sprawl of built up areas and we are in danger of merging Bingham with East Bridgford and Newton. Surely we must protect the countryside from further encroachment. It is essential that we preserve the setting and character of these historic towns.

**Traffic, Parking & Transport** – At the moment traffic congestion through the village is at unacceptable levels. The surrounding roads are often gridlocked along the A6097 stretch of road between Lowdham, Gunthorpe and Bingham. As a result people are using East Bridgford as a cut through. There is a 30 mph speed limit in the village and I observe that this is being exceeded. The problem with this is that Main Street in East Bridgford has a significant amount of parked cars along one side, reducing visibility and blocking road space, thereby making it a dangerous journey for local people. I am aware that there has been an increase in accidents. Furthermore by increasing the housing only increases cars in the immediate area with the potential increase in harmful air pollution and unwanted noise levels.

**Village Capacity** – Clearly the amenities ( School, Doctors etc ) will become full and likely over subscribed as a result of the increases in housing. I am concerned for two issues, Firstly that no additional capacity will be created and we will have to squeeze the additionals in to the same space. Secondly, This could lead to a reduction in the quality of service from the health provision and school education, when these services are already under a great deal of pressure. This leads me on to the Village of Newton where there are no amenities for the people who live there. This is a failure of the recent construction community and authorities to adequately provide for their needs. I am concerned because if we see something like this happening in East Bridgford then it would be totally unacceptable.

What are the plans to develop Newton further? It looks like the builders have got away with providing a school, community centre, shops, pub, playing areas. Why cant there be more focus on Newton to complete...
it properly before moving on to something else.

Protecting wildlife habitats – The surrounding areas provide habitats to a rich variety of wildlife, it is essential that we protect these to ensure the survival of our Mammals, birds and amphibians etc. Building more houses will destroy their habitat and will not support their existence. As I write this email I can see Bats flying in the twilight of my back garden. If we go through with the additional housing I suspect that the habitat will have disappeared and also our magnificent wildlife.

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”).

n/a

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

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

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

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

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 25/06/2018

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,
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.
To whom it may concern,

I am writing to challenge the proposal to build an additional 125 houses in East Bridgford as per the Rushcliffe Plan.

I live at 8 Bridle Ways, East Bridgford, Notts, NG13 8PT. My phone number is 01949 20756.

Before I get into my rationale for why I challenge the proposal I would like to confirm that I understand the need for more housing and agree that all communities have to accept some houses, my challenge is with the quantity and the grouping of the houses in one section at the village. A smaller number of houses which are speak around the village would be more in keeping with the village and also not has much impact on the point raised below.

My challenge for 125 houses at one end of the village is based on 8 reasons:

1. Green belt – the proposed sites are directly on designated green belt and if we keep changing the status of
green belt so that it can be built on it will be to the detriment of wildlife and conservation in our area.

2. With the choice of location at one end of East Bridgford and the recent start of building in Bingham,
overtime as more houses are built I can see that East Bridgford as a village community will cease to exist and
we become a suburb of Bingham

3. Traffic – The volume of traffic within the village will rise to dangerous levels. The traffic on main street is
already creating massive issues, with more incidents of children being hit by cars (I know of three this year
alone), accidents outside of the Doctors surgery, and numerous ‘grid lock’ situations as the road is just too
busy. An additional 125 homes, will mean at least an additional 230 cars within the village and the road
network simply cannot cope.

4. School – Our school has capacity for up to 300 children and I know that we are not there yet, but an
additional 125 homes will certainly take us above that limit and what will happen then? Incidentally the 300
pupil limit has been set on the school due to the increased traffic levels that this would cause and East
Bridgford does not have the capacity for more vehicles.

5. Doctors Surgery – Again our Doctors surgery is running well currently, I have spoken to the Practice
Manager about the new proposals an in isolation the surgery could accommodate residents from an
additional 125 homes. However given the residents of the additional homes in Bingham will need a new
Doctors surgery and the Bingham surgery is already running at capacity and has an AWFUL reputation,
where do you think that the residents of the new Bingham estates will go? Therefore East Bridgford Doctors
surgery will NOT be able to cope with the new residents from Bingham and the new residents from East
Bridgford.

6. Drainage – the drains on main street and parts of the village near the doctors surgery do already not cope
when it rains hard – how will they cope when they are working with an addition 125 homes? Constant
overflow on the road within our village?

7. Newton – Newton has been half built and NONE of the provisions promised have been delivered. How can
we possibly plan MORE new homes when you have not yet finished the job that you started in another area
which is LESS than 2 miles away?

8. The approach to consultation has been absolutely awful. We were consulted on one plan by Rushcliffe at
the end of 2017 (not this plan) and our village gave clear feedback and a view on the proposals. This
feedback has been ignored and what you have in this plan is very different to what was consulted on, so
how is this appropriate to now put forward this plan that we have not been asked given to our opinion on
before now.
I hope that our village concerns will be listened to and we get the opportunity to have a conversation on our views. I look forward to a response.

Kind regards,

Helen Seager
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><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>Mrs</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Name</strong></td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Name</strong></td>
<td>Seager</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation</strong></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job title</strong></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 1</strong></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 2</strong></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 3</strong></td>
<td>s</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 4</strong></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 5</strong></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postcode</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-mail Address</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone Number</strong></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: Helen Seager

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. 49
Paragraph no. 3.88 - 3.89
Policy ref. Policy 8.1: Housing Allocation – Land between Butt Lane and Closes Side Lane, East Bridgford
Site ref. Policy 8.1: Housing Allocation – Land between Butt Lane and Closes Side Lane, East Bridgford
Policies Map Click here to enter text.

4. Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2:

- Legally compliant
- Sound
- Complies with the Duty to Co-operate

4(1) Yes No
4(2) Yes No
4(3) 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”? 

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

Green belt – the proposed sites are directly on designated green belt and if we keep changing the status of green belt so that it can be built on it will be to the detriment of wildlife and conservation in our area. With the choice of location at one end of East Bridgford and the recent start of building in Bingham, overtime as more houses are built I can see that East Bridgford as a village community will cease to exist and we become a suburb of Bingham.

Traffic – The volume of traffic within the village will rise to dangerous levels. The traffic on main street is already creating massive issues, with more incidents of children being hit by cars (I know of three this year alone), accidents outside of the Doctors surgery, and numerous ‘grid lock’ situations as the road is just too busy. An additional 125 homes, will mean at least an additional 230 cars within the village and the road network simply cannot cope.

School – Our school has capacity for up to 300 children and I know that we are not there yet, but an additional 125 homes will certainly take us above that limit and what will happen then? Incidentally the 300 pupil limit has been set on the school due to the increased traffic levels that this would cause and East Bridgford does not have the capacity for more vehicles.

Doctors Surgery – Again our Doctors surgery is running well currently, I have spoken to the Practice Manager about the new proposals an in isolation the surgery could accommodate residents from an additional 125 homes. However given the residents of the additional homes in Bingham will need a new Doctors surgery and the Bingham surgery is already running at capacity and has an AWFUL reputation, where do you think that the residents of the new Bingham estates will go? Therefore East Bridgford Doctors surgery will NOT be able to cope with the new residents from Bingham and the new residents from East Bridgford.

Drainage – the drains on main street and parts of the village near the doctors surgery do already not cope when it rains hard – how will they cope when they are working with an addition 125 homes? Constant overflow on the road within our village?

Newton – Newton has been half built and NONE of the provisions promised have been delivered. How can we possibly plan MORE new homes when you have not yet finished the job that you started in another area?
which is LESS than 2 miles away?
The approach to consultation has been absolutely awful. We were consulted on one plan by Rushcliffe at the end of 2017 (not this plan) and our village gave clear feedback and a view on the proposals. This feedback has been ignored and what you have in this plan is very different to what was consulted on, so how is this appropriate to now put forward this plan that we have not been asked given to our opinion on before 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.

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

n/a

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

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

Yes, I wish to appear at the examination

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

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

Click here to enter text.

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

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

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
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 25/06/2018

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,  
Nottingham  
NG2 7YG

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

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

---

**Data Protection Notice**

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

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

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

Your data protection rights are not absolute and in most cases are subject to the Council's
Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.

demonstrating compliance with other statutory legislation, for further information see http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/privacy/

Representations will be available to view on the Borough Council’s website, but any signatures, addresses, email addresses or telephone numbers will not be included. However, as copies of representations must be made available for public inspection, comments cannot be treated as confidential and will be available for inspection in full.
Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies
Publication Version

Representation Form

Please return by 5pm on Thursday 28 June 2018 to:
Rushcliffe Borough Council
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>First Name</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Sewell</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. 33 / 34

Paragraph no. 

Policy ref. 4.4

Site ref. 

Policies Map 4.4 (c.10)

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positively Prepared</th>
<th>Justified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Consistent with national policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Site reference 4.4 (Hillside Farm) is the closest to Keyworth amenities, making it a good site for the elderly and young families. We support this proposed site for housing.

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').

\[ N \setminus \mu \]
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:**

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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

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

- [ ] The Local Plan Part 2 has been submitted for independent examination.
- [ ] The recommendations of the Planning Inspector appointed to carry out the independent examination have been published.
- [ ] The Local Plan Part 2 has been adopted

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

localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk; or

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

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

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

---

**Data Protection Notice**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
[Name]
Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies Publication Version

Representation Form

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

This form has two parts:
Part A — Personal details
Part B — Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate part B for each issue/representation you wish to make.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent’s Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Shehton</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.
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.
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)

1. THE CURRENT INFRASTRUCTURE IS NOT
CAPABLE OF SUSTAINING THE ADDITIONAL
VOLUME OF TRAFFIC. BEARING IN MIND THE
ROADS AT PRESENT ARE REDUCED IN WIDTH WITH
PARKED CARS

2. THE LOCAL SCHOOL IS UNABLE TO ABSORB
ANY MORE PUPILS - THE CLASSES ARE UP AND
ABOUT THE 40 MARK DESPITE RECENT
EXTENSIONS

3. THE DOCTORS SURGERY IS GETTING TO MAXIMUM
CAPACITY

4. WE ARE A VILLAGE AND DON’T WANT TO BE
ABSORBED BY BINGHAM WHICH IS EXPANDING
AT A RAPID RATE.

5. AROUND 1600 HAS TO 1800 HAS THE ROADS
MAIN STREET / TRNT CLRACE ARE COMPLETELY
GRID LOCKED.

6. GREEN BELT LAND WAS DESIGNATED FOR A PURPOSE
LET US / RBC MAINTAIN THAT PURPOSE

Sign: 
Name: [REDACTED]
Address: [REDACTED]

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

I am writing in respect of planning 8.1 and 8.2; proposed developments in East Bridgford. I realise new houses are required but I outdoor question the building of these in a rural village.

There are a number points I would like to make:

* The local school is already extremely full and so many new houses would seriously add to this. At the start and end of the school day the traffic in the village is substantially increased especially close to the school and as a resident I try and avoid entering or leaving the village anywhere near the crossroads at these times.

* The medical centre is obviously under pressure as far as numbers go because it is not easy to get an appointment for a particular day with a particular doctor. An increase in patients would not ease these pressures.

* Traffic in the village has increased since the new A46 was completed. Much of this traffic comprises ‘rat runners’ trying to reduce delays at the traffic lights. As such they do not comply with speed restrictions. There are times when I would doubt any emergency services vehicle could get through the village.

* The infrastructures in the area do not support the current level of housing. Bus services are poor. There is no rail or tram link easily accessible. The roads into Nottingham are prone to traffic jams at many times of the day.

Yours faithfully

Sent from my iPad
Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2:
Land and Planning Policies
Publication Version

Representation Form

Please return by 5pm on Thursday 28 June 2018
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>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Simmlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (where relevant)</td>
<td>N/A</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. 33 34
Paragraph no. 
Policy ref. 4.4

Site ref. Policies Map 4.4

4. Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2:

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

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

What makes a Local Plan “sound”? 

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

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

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

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

This Plan is Perfect, which includes the best sites for housing in Keyworth, in particular, to the west of Keyworth (south of Bunny Lane) especially 4.4 (Hillside Park).

I use the gym in Keyworth and this will disrupt the traffic the least. Please contact me if required.

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

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

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

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

Yes, I wish to appear at the examination

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

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

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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

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

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

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

The Local Plan Part 2 has been adopted

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

localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk; or

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

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

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

I write to register my view on the latest proposal to the Rushcliffe cove strategy as it affects the village of East Bridgford.

Overall I feel the proposals to include a large development of domestic dwellings between Bolt lane and closes side lane would cause irreparable damage to the nature of the village.

Principally my objections are as follows:

Traffic
The construction of 125 dwellings would increase the traffic flow through the village, the roads of which are already at breaking point, to an intolerable level. The dangers of a high traffic flow through the narrow streets can lead to frustration and anger to pedestrians.

Environment.
The loss of new green belt becomes a reduction of the "soul" of the village and could reduce the volume of wildlife and encroachment of their habitat.

Gleadthorpe.
There are already plans for a substantial amount of housing at the edge of Birmingham and these new proposals continue to remove the green buffer between Birmingham and East Bridgford village. This proposal would give a green light to removing the buffer and lead to further overdevelopment of the green belt.

Signed: [Redacted]
Name: Davio Simmons
Address: [Redacted]
Dear Sir,

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely

T.C.L. Simpson (Mr.)

Kim Cooper-Simpson (Mrs.)
My comment is made with reference to all proposed developments written under the section 'Housing Allocations at Ruddington' (there is no option to list all Policy/Site references; therefore I have selected only 'Land west of Wilford Road, Ruddington' from the given drop-down menus). Although I agree in
principle with the provisions for housing proposed in Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2. I am concerned that there might be successful additional applications for building developments on sites other than those proposed, which would increase the number of homes beyond RBC’s projected figures. I believe this would have a detrimental effect on the village, particularly from the resulting increase in traffic. My concerns have increased since the recent success of the planning application to build 175 homes on Asher Lane.

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

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 adopted
Comment

Consultee: Dr David Sleeman (1167160)
Event Name: Local Plan Part 2 (Publication Draft)
Comment by: Dr David Sleeman (1167160)
Comment ID: 36
Response Date: 26/06/18 09:44
Status: Submitted
Submission Type: Web
Version: 0.1
Files: D.Sleeman Objection letter.docx

To which document does your response relate?: Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version
Page number: 55-57
Paragraph number: 3.103-3.107
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

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)
- 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).

1 Urban Sprawl

Sutton Bonington is a small village of approximately 2000 residents and the proposed development could realistically increase the population by 10-20%, as well as the footprint of the village. This is clearly too large an increase for the small village not to be compromised in several ways (detailed further below) and is likely to have an effect with regard to maintain the rural nature of the village. Whilst there is a reduction in the proposed number of houses from last year this is clearly no reduction in density and the small section of land not proposed may quickly be added to the current proposed development.

The other effect this will have is an almost merging of neighbouring village, Normanton-on-Soar, in very real terms. If this development were to go ahead this is a very real possibility and would leave a mere one field (200m between buildings from each village) separating two villages with very different feel & character. This is unacceptable and demonstrates a complete lack of attempt to preserve rural character in the Soar valley, and indeed the county.

2 Transport

Sutton Bonington is situated next to the busy A6006, which is undoubtedly going to become even busier with current plans for the proposed freight terminal and DNRC Interserve.

It currently serves M1, A6 & indeed A453 traffic, which culminates in heavily congested roads, particularly in & out of the entrance to the village on Park Lane. Given the limited options for an entrance to the proposed development, it is highly likely that this short stretch leading out of the village will become congested to a dangerous level. This may not be such an important consideration for other sites, however limitations with public transport would dictate that all those buying in the proposed housing would be entirely dependent on private transport (i.e. cars), which is not a reasonable or safe increase in demand for road space.

At a more fundamental level the entrance to the site would have to be set back from the A6006 and would therefore be situated on a blind bend into main road through the village- the implications of the danger this presents do not need spelling out in this letter. Alteration of speed limits is not an appropriate solution given traffic has to leave the A6006 in a timely fashion to avoid adding to the present congestion at the junction.

Public transport links are not fit to accommodate any form of development in Sutton Bonington. A weekly bus service takes passengers to Nottingham hourly, at an impractical duration of 1.5hrs. Increasing the provision of services is unlikely to be a cost-effective solution from any perspective. Volunteers supplement this by running a local service, however this is not a reasonable solution given the scale of proposed developments. Other proposed sites in the local plan offer vastly improved transport links further afield, most importantly into Nottingham. This is particularly relevant for those who would be investing in affordable housing on the development.

3 Employment
There are little to no meaningful employment options in the locality, meaning that there is no contribution to the local economy in this suggested development. It also means that transport is essential for buyers into the new development. Another way of considering this point is that those unable to transport themselves are likely find themselves geographically very isolated.

1  **Flooding**
As with other parts of the village, the proposed site is in Flood zone 1, and this end of the village in particular has a reliable tendency to flood. There is currently no map of drainage in the village and has proved a complex site from drainage in the past. Our property is situated along the end of the field and we have experienced flooding in our garden along with most of the rest of the houses in the row. Flooding is off the Greenfield suggested for the Policy and the drainage currently in place is often ineffective. The field is low lying and situated next to a zone of increased flooding - it clearly would not take much to worsen local flooding, despite any attempts to incorporate drainage & run-off into a development. I certainly would be incredibly frustrated (to a point of pursuing legal action) should I have to deal with excess flooding as a result of development).

1  **Schooling**
There are currently two primary schools in the locality, with one situated in the village itself. Although there are provisions to increase future places in the Sutton Bonington school this is for a very small proportion of the likely increase in population that has been suggested. There is no obvious scope for significant increase in size or provision for the school. This will require the use of the Normanton school in the next village. Whilst technically ‘walkable’ it is across the busy A6006 previously detailed. This is completely unreasonable to expect of current and future residents of the village, and if this is suggested as a solution could be viewed as negligent. I certainly would not be happy with my children crossing this road at rush hour, no matter what provisions were made available (it would obviously be unsafe to stop lorries travelling at 50mph in order to allow small children to cross the road).

1  **Local services & amenities**
There is currently a shop & a GP surgery in the village (which is part of the wider East Leake group). There is no capacity for increasing and so need for future residents (in particular those who would move into new residences in the proposed development) will not be met. Given that the proposed housing will be high density it seems completely unrealistic to suggest that this could be met by providing amenities onsite, and so once again a detrimental effect will occur on the village, and well as ineffectively providing for new residents.

1  **Effect on future residents**
I have already detailed other negative effects for new residents (both in the new housing and in the established village). I just want to emphasise that these plans are not in the best interests of those looking to purchase new housing in the future. Sutton Bonington is not in a position to provide for such a dramatic increase in population and traffic. Parking can already be incredibly troublesome in the village (particularly at school times when congestion in the centre of the village is especially bad) and this will only worsen the situation. Clearly high-density building is popular at present given the need for housing and this is absolutely not appropriate for the village. Aside from the university campus (completed sympathetically & to the benefit of the village), the church & the stately halls, there are no such residences in the village at present. It is also a small site and unlikely to provide well enough for those looking to buy in the development.

It is also very close to a busy railway, which will have an effect on new residents and is very close the controversial Hatherware industrial estate that I am informed has been subject to on-going investigations by the Environmental agency with regard to burning of waste. The potential for future health problems is here.

Please add any supporting files (if applicable)  D.Sleeman Objection letter.docx
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.

80 (-140) properties is a huge proportion of the current village, however is unlikely to have such an effect in some of the other suggested sites in the local plan should provision be made there (less than 1% of RBC targets).

Other sites, such as Bingham or Cotgrave, or larger established towns such as Ruddington or Keyworth are surely more appropriate (in terms of effect on rural villages and also for amenities/transports links).

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 Bridgeford  
Nottingham, NG2 7YG

Dear Sir or Madam,

Re: Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2, Policy 10 (Land north of Park Lane, Sutton Bonington)

I am writing to you with objections to the proposed site in Sutton Bonington, detailed with Policy 10 of the local plan. I was involved in the previous proposal and objected to this as well, and still believe it to be a wholly unsuitable site for the following reasons:

1. **Urban Sprawl**
Sutton Bonington is a small village of approximately 2000 residents and the proposed development could realistically increase the population by 10-20%, as well as the footprint of the village. This is clearly too large an increase for the small village not to be compromised in several ways (detailed further below) and is likely to have an effect with regard to maintain the rural nature of the village. Whilst there is a reduction in the proposed number of houses from last year this is clearly no reduction in density and the small section of land not proposed may quickly be added to the current proposed development. The other effect this will have is an almost merging of neighbouring village, Normanton-on-Soar, in very real terms. If this development were to go ahead this is a very real possibility and would leave a mere one field (200m between buildings from each village) separating two villages with very different feel & character. This is unacceptable and demonstrates a complete lack of attempt to preserve rural character in the Soar valley, and indeed the county.

2. **Transport**
Sutton Bonington is situated next to the busy A6006, which is undoubtedly going to become even busier with current plans for the proposed freight terminal and DNRC Interserve. It currently serves M1, A6 & indeed A453 traffic, which culminates in heavily congested roads, particularly in & out of the entrance to the village on Park Lane. Given the limited options for an entrance to the proposed development, it is
highly likely that this short stretch leading out of the village will become congested to a dangerous level. This may not be such an important consideration for other sites, however limitations with public transport would dictate that all those buying in the proposed housing would be entirely dependent on private transport (i.e. cars), which is not a reasonable or safe increase in demand for road space.

At a more fundamental level the entrance to the site would have to be set back from the A6006 and would therefore be situated on a blind bend into main road through the village- the implications of the danger this presents do not need spelling out in this letter. Alteration of speed limits is not an appropriate solution given traffic has to leave the A6006 in a timely fashion to avoid adding to the present congestion at the junction.

Public transport links are not fit to accommodate any form of development in Sutton Bonington. A weekly bus service takes passengers to Nottingham hourly, at an impractical duration of 1.5hrs. Increasing the provision of services is unlikely to be a cost-effective solution from any perspective. Volunteers supplement this by running a local service, however this is not a reasonable solution given the scale of proposed developments. Other proposed sites in the local plan offer vastly improved transport links further afield, most importantly into Nottingham. This is particularly relevant for those who would be investing in affordable housing on the development.

3. **Employment**

There are little to no meaningful employment options in the locality, meaning that there is no contribution to the local economy in this suggested development. It also means that transport is essential for buyers into the new development. Another way of considering this point is that those unable to transport themselves are likely find themselves geographically very isolated.

4. **Flooding**

As with other parts of the village, the proposed site is in Flood zone 1, and this end of the village in particular has a reliable tendency to flood. There is currently no map of drainage in the village and has proved a complex site from drainage in the past. Our property is situated along the end of the field and we have experienced flooding in our garden along with most of the rest of the houses in the row. Flooding is off the Greenfield suggested for the Policy and the drainage currently in place is often ineffective. The field is low lying and situated next to a zone of increased flooding- it clearly would not take much to worsen local flooding, despite any attempts to incorporate drainage & run-off into a development. I certainly would be incredibly frustrated (to a point of pursuing legal action) should I have to deal with excess flooding as a result of development.

5. **Schooling**

There are currently two primary schools in the locality, with one situated in the village itself. Although there are provisions to increase future places in the Sutton Bonington school this is for a very small proportion of the likely increase in population that has been suggested. There is no obvious scope for significant increase in size or provision for the school. This will require the use of the
Normanton school in the next village. Whilst technically ‘walkable’ it is across the busy A6006 previously detailed. This is completely unreasonable to expect of current and future residents of the village, and if this is suggested as a solution could be viewed as negligent. I certainly would not be happy with my children crossing this road at rush hour, no matter what provisions were made available (it would obviously be unsafe to stop lorries travelling at 50mph in order to allow small children to cross the road).

6. Local services & amenities
There is currently a shop & a GP surgery in the village (which is part of the wider East Leake group). There is no capacity for increasing and so need for future residents (in particular those who would move into new residences in the proposed development) will not be met. Given that the proposed housing will be high density it seems completely unrealistic to suggest that this could be met by providing amenities onsite, and so once again a detrimental effect will occur on the village, and well as ineffectively providing for new residents.

7. Effect on future residents
I have already detailed other negative effects for new residents (both in the new housing and in the established village). I just want to emphasise that these plans are not in the best interests of those looking to purchase new housing in the future. Sutton Bonington is not in a position to provide for such a dramatic increase in population and traffic. Parking can already be incredibly troublesome in the village (particularly at school times when congestion in the centre of the village is especially bad) and this will only worsen the situation. Clearly high-density building is popular at present given the need for housing and this is absolutely not appropriate for the village. Aside from the university campus (completed sympathetically & to the benefit of the village), the church & the stately halls, there are no such residences in the village at present. It is also a small site and unlikely to provide well enough for those looking to buy in the development.

It is also very close to a busy railway, which will have an effect on new residents and is very close the controversial Hathernware industrial estate that I am informed has been subject to on-going investigations by the Environmental agency with regard to burning of waste. The potential for future health problems is here.

8. Personal grievances
While I am under no illusions that my personal feelings on the matter will be considered from a planning perspective, I still wish to make my feelings known. Our house looks out over the proposed site and so our beautiful view will be spoilt. Whilst the mere suggestion of this field as a policy suggests that maintaining rural character is not high on the agenda for the local plan, it is for residents. Our house specifically was renovated to focus views into the field and so should a development go ahead we can at best look forward to staring at a row of trees, and at worst another poorly thought-out new build. The effect on our wellbeing needs no description, however the effect on our careers does. My wife is due to start specialist Anaesthetics training which means she will cover out-of-hours shifts regularly over the next decade. Any building work is likely to
have a physical & psychological effect on the both of us, but may have a significant negative effect on her health during this time. The effect on existing house prices is clearly difficult to suggest however we are keen to avoid anything that may significant reduce the value of our first-time property.

9. Alternative sites
80 (-140) properties is a huge proportion of the current village, however is unlikely to have such an effect in some of the other suggested sites in the local plan should provision be made there (less than 1% of RBC targets). Other sites, such as Bingham or Cotgrave, or larger established towns such as Ruddington or Keyworth are surely more appropriate (in terms of effect on rural villages and also for amenities/transports links).

I hope that you consider the objections raised in this letter with regard to a clear negative effect on the village, a poor choice for development and (in the unfortunate event of proceeding) for those who choose to live here in the future.

Yours faithfully,

Dr David Sleeman
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

21 JUN 2018

This form has two parts:
Copies sent to

Referred to

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>First Name</td>
<td>MRS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>ANGELA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (where relevant)</td>
<td>SMEETON</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: ANGELA SHEETON

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

- Local Plan Part 2
- Local Plan Part 2 Policies Map
- Other supporting document: please state which:

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

- Page no. 33 - 34
- Paragraph no.
- Policy ref. 4.4

Site ref. Policies Map 4.4

4. Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2:

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

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

What makes a Local Plan “sound”?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

   Excellent Plan.
   All 4 housing sites are appropriate and are a good balance around Keyworth.
   Hillside Farm site is more amenable than any of the others. So don’t let NIMBYism detract from this excellent site.

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”).

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.
Date form completed 20 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,
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.
Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2:  
Land and Planning Policies  
Publication Version

**Representation Form**

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

This form has two parts:  
Copies sent to:  
Personal details referred to:  

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>Personal Details</th>
<th>Agent's Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>MR ANTHONY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>SMEETON</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:**

A SHEETON

---

**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. 4.4
- Policy ref.
- Site ref.
- Policies Map

---

**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 AM PLEASED TO SEE THE RECOMMENDED HOUSING DEVELOP FOR KEYWORTH IN THE RUSHCLIFFE LOCAL PLAN. MY FAMILY AND I OFTEN VISIT KEYWORTH AND WOULD VERY MUCH LIKE TO MOVE HERE ONE DAY. HOWEVER, THERE IS A SIGNIFICANT SHORTAGE OF AVAILABLE HOUSES (FAMILY HOMES) IN KEYWORTH. THEREFORE I AM PLEASED TO SEE THIS BEING ADDRESSED WITH THE HOUSING ALLOCATION. I AM PARTICULARLY PLEASED TO SEE THE LAND SOUTH OF BUNNY LANE AT HILLSIDE FARM INCLUDED BECAUSE NOT ONLY IS IT THE CLOSEST SITE TO THE VILLAGE CENTRE, BUT IT ALSO BALANCES THE ADDITIONAL HOUSES AROUND KEYWORTH WHICH LIMITS THE VOLUME OF ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC GOING THROUGH THE VILLAGE.

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 “No: applicable”).

**NOT APPLICABLE**
8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing sessions of the Public Examination? (please tick one box only)

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

[ ] Yes, I wish to appear at the examination.

N/A.

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.
Date form completed 23/6/18

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.
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  
Borough Business Support Unit  
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>Mrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Isla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Emerton</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. 4.4
Policy ref.

Site ref.

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positively Prepared</th>
<th>Justified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Consistent with national policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Having grown up in Kenworth, it is clear that it can easily sustain a significant number of new houses. The site south of Birming Lane are particularly appropriate as they are closest to the village centre, where traffic flows from the village and allow for easy access to the main A60 into Nottingham (and also to other major towns).

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 "No: applicable").

Not Applicable
8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing sessions of the Public Examination? (please tick one box only)

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

Yes, I wish to appear at the examination

N/A

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

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

localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk; or

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

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

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.
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>First Name</td>
<td>Mrs. JENNY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>SMEETON</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. 9 33 34  
Paragraph no.  
Policy ref. 4.4  
Site ref.  
Policy ref. 4.4 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.
5. If you consider the Development Plan is UNSOUND, do you consider this to be because it is NOT: (please tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positively Prepared</th>
<th>Justified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Consistent with national policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

I fully support the local plan part 2 and the fact that it is representing the views of local residents in Keyworth. It is crazy that the Keyworth Parish Council have not included Hillside Farm as their recommendations as it is the closest site to the village centre and with good access to the A60. It is ideal for young families and the elderly alike and slopes away from the rest of the village and so new housing there would not impinge on any views. The maximum number of homes possible should be built on this site to best serve the needs of the villagers who need more homes close to all the amenities.

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”).

Not Applicable
8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing sessions of the Public Examination? (please tick one box only)

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

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

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

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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

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

- [ ] The Local Plan Part 2 has been submitted for independent examination.
- [ ] The recommendations of the Planning Inspector appointed to carry out the independent examination have been published.
- [ ] The Local Plan Part 2 has been adopted

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

localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk; or

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

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

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.
Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies Publication Version

Rushcliffe Borough Council

Representation Form

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

This form has two parts:

**Part A** – Personal details

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent’s Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mr</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Thomas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Smeeton</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job title</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postcode</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-mail Address</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone Number</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Name/Organisation: 

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

Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version

Local Plan Part 2 Policies Map

Other supporting document please state which:

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

Page no. 33 + 34

Paragraph no. 

Policy ref. 4.4

Site ref. Policies Map 4.4 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.

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 believe the Local Plan Part 2 is a very well thought out plan which is a credit to Rushcliffe’s planning department. In particular, in relation to Keyworth the 4 sites recommended make perfect sense keeping new homes close to the existing houses and giving balance between East and West. Credit really is due for including the site South Bunny Lane (Hillside Farm) in spite of this not being included in the Parish Council Plan.

Myself and many other Keyworth residents can not understand why the Parish Council continue to ignore this site which merits far outweigh any of their recommendations.

P.T.O

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
South Bunny lane benefits from being the closest site to the Village Centre, shops and medical practice. Slopes away from the main road to avoid any highway flooding and has existing houses on 3 of the 4 sides.

I fully support the Local Plan Part 2.

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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").

N/A

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.
Date form completed 20/6/18

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 '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.
Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies Publication Version

Representation Form

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

This form has two parts:

Part A – Personal details

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent’s Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Smeeton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address – line 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:  

Thomas Smeeton

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

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

Other supporting document please state which:

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

Page no. 33-34  Paragraph no.  Policy ref. 4.4

Site ref. Housing Development  Policies Map 4.4

4. Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2:

4(1) Legally compliant  Yes  No

4(2) Sound  Yes  No

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

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

What makes a Local Plan “sound”?

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positively Prepared</th>
<th>Justified</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Consistent with national policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

Site reference 4.4 (Hillside Farm) is the closest site to Keyworth amenities making it the best site for the elderly and young families.

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.
Date form completed

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

localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk; or

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

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

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

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.
Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies Publication Version

Representation Form

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

This form has two parts:
Part A – Personal details
Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate part B for each issue/ representation you wish to make.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent’s Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Name</strong></td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Name</strong></td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation</strong></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job title</strong></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 1</strong></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 2</strong></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 3</strong></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 4</strong></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 5</strong></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postcode</strong></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-mail Address</strong></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone Number</strong></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:**

| Name/Organisation: | Christopher Smith |

---

**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)

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

**Site ref.**

- Choose an item.

---

**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.
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.

See attached letter

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”).

Not applicable

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

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

I am happy to be represented by Aslockton Parish Council. However, if the Parish Council does not wish to participate then I would like to

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 21/06/2018

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,
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

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: Christopher Smith

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: Sustainability Appraisal Report Publication Draft

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

- Page no. See attached letter
- Paragraph no.
- Policy ref.
- Site 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.
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.

   See attached letter

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”).

   Not applicable

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

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

   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.
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:

I am happy to be represented by Aslockton Parish Council. However, if the Parish Council does not wish to participate then I would like to

**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: 21/06/2018

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,
  - Nottingham
  - NG2 7YG

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

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

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:  Christopher Smith

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: Identification of Additional Settlements Background Paper

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

Page no. See attached letter  Paragraph no.  Policy ref.  Policies Map

Site ref. Choose an item.  

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.
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.

See attached letter

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”).

Not applicable

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the hearing sessions of the Public Examinations? (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.
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:

I am happy to be represented by Aslockton Parish Council. However, if the Parish Council does not wish to participate then I would like to

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: 21/06/2018

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,
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

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rushcliffe Arena
Rugby Road
Nottingham
NG2 7YG

Dear Sir

Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2 & Supporting Sustainability Report & Additional Settlements Background paper – Comments for consideration by the Planning Inspector at the Inquiry

I have lived in Aslockton for some forty years and write primarily to express my support for the Borough’s proposed policy 22 and its application to Aslockton (Local Plan Part 2 pages 88 – 90). This will ensure that there is no further development in Aslockton beyond the 75 houses presently under construction.

In this letter I comment on the ‘Boroughs Sustainability Appraisal Report Publication Draft’ and also matters covered in its ‘Identification of Additional Settlements Background Paper’. I offer further detailed data on the sustainability of Aslockton.

Aslockton is already over scheduled for development

The 2011 census states that Aslockton has 885 residents (excluding inmates of HMP Whatton) living in 387 households. Small developments completed since 2011 have added a further 18 houses to date and Aslockton has coped without objection to this 5% growth. However Aslockton is now having to cope with 75 more houses through the development on Abbey Lane; a 9 house development on Cliff Hill Lane and 7 other houses on infill sites. By the time this pipeline of 91 houses is complete Aslockton will have grown by 24% since January 2016. Surely this is more than enough for any community to cope with for quite a few years. See appendix 1.

Aslockton is remote from Nottingham and not a sustainable location. Permitting further development in it will not help resolve Nottingham’s housing problem but it will ruin Aslockton.
Combining Aslockton with Whatton

According to the 2011 census the populations of the so called ‘third tier villages’ are:-

- Aslockton 885 (excluding prison inmates)
- Cropwell Bishop 1,853
- East Bridgford 1,814
- Gotham 1,563
- Sutton Bonington 2,202
- Tollerton 1,883

As can be seen Aslockton has around half the population of the other settlements classed as ‘medium sized’. Notable settlements that are considered by the Borough to be less than medium sized include Langar with a population of 980 and Bunny with a population of 689. On the basis of the data above Aslockton on its own cannot be considered a medium sized settlement.

The Borough seems to be turning Aslockton into a medium sized settlement by considering it together with Whatton as a single settlement and I wish to point out that Aslockton and Whatton are in fact separate settlements each with its own church, parish council, hall, clubs and other organisations etc. The people who live in the villages certainly consider them to be separate and I do not believe that the Borough should be ‘lumping’ them together to create what it terms a medium sized settlement. The need to avoid coalescence of Aslockton with Whatton has been identified in previous reports, but if this line is to be pursued then there are several other opportunities to create medium sized settlements in the Borough. For instance; Cropwell Bishop could be combined with Cropwell Butler; Plumtree with Normanton - on - the – Wolds; Bunny with Costock and so on.

Aslockton Public Transport

Aslockton has poor public transport which fails to support commuting for all but a few and fails completely to support travel away from the village for the evening activities.

Aslockton Train Services

Aslockton has a railway station on the Nottingham to Grantham line but the service is too infrequent to support commuting for all but a few people.

Monday to Saturday two trains arrive in Nottingham between 07.00 and 09.00 and one train to Grantham which arrives at 08.12.

Return trains leaving Nottingham at commuting times (16.30 to 18.30) depart at 16.45 and 17.34. A direct return train departs from Grantham at 17.45. There are a couple of indirect services which involve changing trains but their duration is over an hour.

A survey was carried out on Monday 5th October 2015 to determine how many Aslockton residents commute by train. The survey outcome is in the table at appendix 2. In summary fourteen Aslockton people caught trains to Nottingham. Of those five were travelling to school or college and were
probably too young to drive or did not have access to a car. Three Aslockton people travelled to the station by car.

The single service towards Grantham in the peak period on the survey day was used by just two school pupils. The outcome of the survey confirms that commuting by train from Aslockton is not practical.

Trains run at roughly two hourly intervals through the middle part of the day. The last train back to Aslockton from Nottingham departs at 20.51 and so the service fails to support evening activities such as trips to the cinema or meal out in Nottingham etc. Sunday service presently (June) comprises two trains to Nottingham one 12.03 and the other at 13.09 with return services leaving Nottingham at 16.23 and 17.36. Services are fewer during winter.

A return journey to Nottingham for one adult costs £6.70 and £20.10 for two adults with two children.

**Aslockton Bus Services**

Aslockton’s bus services have been severely reduced in recent years and there is no longer a direct bus service to Nottingham. The 822 bus service now terminates in West Bridgford where passengers have to change to reach Nottingham. The first bus is at 09.08 and runs hourly until the last bus at 15.08. The journey time is 50 minutes with perhaps a further 15 minutes to reach Nottingham from West Bridgford. The last bus back from West Bridgford to Aslockton leaves West Bridgford at 15.00.

An alternative is to catch an 822 bus going in the other direction to Bingham and change there to a Nottingham bound Rushcliffe Mainline bus. The service from Aslockton to Bingham starts at 07.00 and if the change of buses in Bingham goes smoothly one can reach Nottingham by around 08.05. The last bus back to Aslockton from Bingham leaves Bingham at 18.10 so the last bus back from Nottingham to Bingham would realistically have to be the 17.10 departure from Nottingham. Through the day the 822 service to Bingham is hourly but the last bus departs Aslockton at 15.50.

There is a service to Newark but this only runs three times each day in each direction and takes one hour and ten minutes. The first service departs for Newark at 09.20 and the last at 13.20. With the first return departing Newark at 09.40 and the last at 13.40. The maximum time one can spend in Newark without an overnight stay is three hours.

There are no bus services at all on Sundays

The vast majority of bus users in Aslockton are pensioners using their bus passes to go shopping in Bingham because our bus services does not support commuting, an evening out etc.

Almost all Aslockton residents consider cars to be the primary form of transport for work, shopping and leisure for them and their families. Indeed for evening entertainment and socialising car use is essential because there simply isn’t any public transport at all. In particular this can present difficulties for teenagers and consequently Aslockton parents are very accomplished taxi drivers!
Other Third Tier Settlements Transport Services

Cropwell Bishop has a direct bus service to Nottingham during the morning peak period and back from Nottingham during the afternoon peak period. Journey duration is 40 minutes and frequency is at 30 minute intervals. The first bus to Nottingham departs at 06.43 and last the last bus back from Nottingham departs at 17.55. For the middle of the day there is an hourly service of 25 minutes duration to West Bridgford. Passengers for Nottingham can either change there or at sooner at Cotgrave. There is no Sunday service.

East Bridgford is on a bus route between Bingham and Nottingham. It therefore has a direct bus service to Nottingham of 43 minutes duration (Villager 2). Peak period frequency is around 35 minute intervals and hourly through the middle of the day. The first bus to Nottingham departs at 06.22 and last the last bus back from Nottingham departs at 18.30. East Bridgford is also on the Bingham to Newark Route. The service is not very frequent, only seven per day but there are a couple of services early morning (06.18 and 0723 form East Bridgford) and a couple of late afternoon services (17.00 and 18.20 from Newark). There are no Sunday services to East Bridgford.

Gotham is on a bus route to Loughborough and has a direct bus service to Nottingham of 35 minutes duration. Peak period frequency is around 15 minute intervals and 20 minutes through the middle of the day. The first bus to Nottingham departs at 04.54 and last the last bus back from Nottingham departs at midnight. There is a half hourly Sunday service.

Sutton Bonington: I have found it a little difficult to present a comprehensive picture of the bus services to this settlement from the internet without a bit of ‘local knowledge’ because the position is clouded by the presence of a University Campus. There is a University supports ‘Hopper Service’ which runs between this campus and the University of Nottingham’s main campus on the edge of the city. From here people can change to the tram or other bus service for the short journey Nottingham’s city centre. This service can be used by members of the public. The journey to the main university campus takes 17 minutes. Frequency is half hourly in term time and hourly out of term time. The first bus departs at 07.30 and the last returns at 23.45 with a service every two hours on Sundays. There are also hourly services to Nottingham and Loughborough by ‘Sky Link’ service whose primary purpose is to serve East Midlands Airport. There also appears to be some village link services to this Sutton Bonington.

Tollerton is on the Nottingham - Keyworth bus route and therefore has a direct bus service to Nottingham of 20 minutes duration. Peak period frequency is around 15 minute intervals and 20 minutes throughout the day. The first bus to Nottingham departs at 06.13 and the last bus back from Nottingham departs at 23.30 with additional services in the early hours of Saturday for those staying out very late. There is an hourly/ half hourly Sunday service. Tollerton is also on the bus route between Nottingham and Melton Mowbray. The service runs throughout the day though it is not frequent.
Aslockton Village Amenities

Aslockton has a post office which provides post office services only. It is open for 28.5 hours per week.

There is a church with a hall attached. The hall has a capacity of 100. There are no other public buildings in Aslockton. There is no separate village hall scout hall, old school hall, WI hut, pavilion etc.

There is one public house.

There is a primary school but its facilities are not shared with the wider community. The school is also home to a pre-school.

There is a sports field with a small playground located in Whatton which is easily reached from Aslockton.

There is a hairdressing salon.

A very small shop was located in the same room as the post office counter but it has recently closed. It used to open for 30 hours a week. It offered newspapers to order, a few greetings cards, a little confectionary and a very limited range of essentials such as bread and milk and eggs. It did not offer fresh meat, fish, vegetables etc.

Aslockton does not have any medical facilities beyond a defibrillator mounted on the church hall wall.

Other Third Tier Settlements Village Amenities

Schools

All of the third tier settlements have a primary school.

Post offices

All of the third tier settlements have a post office.

Health services

Cropwell Bishop, East Bridgford, Gotham and Sutton Bonington all have doctor’s surgeries/health centres. Whilst Tollerton does not, this short coming is mitigated for residents who have a either a six minute bus journey to West Bridgford or a seven minute bus journey to Keyworth where health centres can be found. Most importantly the service frequency is 15 minutes.

If the level of access to health care enjoyed by the other ‘third tier settlements’ is compared with Aslockton’s where bus frequency dictates that a twenty minute appointment takes around 2 hours by bus and potentially much longer if a train is used then Aslockton is clearly the very poor relation. Indeed, several settlements considered less sustainable than ‘third tier’ have much better access to health care than Aslockton.
Shops and services *(data from internet search)*

Cropwell Bishop has: a co-op convenience supermarket which is open 7 days a week and evenings until 22.00; a butcher (who also sells bread produced in the village bakery); a creamery/cheese makers shop; a cake shop; a café and a couple of hairdressing salons.

East Bridgford has a grocers and general store which is open 7 days a week and early evenings co-located with the post office. There is also a newsagents/convenience store and a hairdressing salon. Three quarters of a mile outside the village is a large garden centre with numerous retail outlets from green grocery to gifts along with a restaurant and café etc.

Gotham has SPAR convenience store. which is open 7 days a week including evenings until 21.00. It offers fresh fruit, vegetables and meat along an in store bakery and takeaway hot food service. It includes an off licence and is co-located with the post office. There is a library and hairdressers.

Sutton Bonington has a convenience store which is open 7 days a week including evenings until 20.00. It offers a wide variety of stock including fresh food and has an off licence. The separate post office also offers products and services beyond post office counter services. There is a library, hairdressers and beauty salon.

Tollerton has a MACE general store co-located with Tollerton Post Office. It is open from 06.30 to 17.30 Monday to Friday and Saturday and Sunday mornings. Tollerton has a Shell service station which incorporates a shop that is open from 06.30 until 22.30 PM. Tollerton has a hair salon, health and beauty shop and a café. As already identified Tollerton enjoys fast frequent public transport links to the vast wealth of shops and services available in West Bridgford.

**Pubs and restaurants*(data from internet search)*

Cropwell Bishop has two pubs

East Bridgford has one hotel and one pub

Gotham has three pubs

Sutton Bonington has a hotel and two pubs

Tollerton has one pub and one restaurant

**Church and Village Halls etc**

Cropwell Bishop has two community halls, the memorial hall and the old school hall

East Bridgford has a village hall, a WI hut, a scout and guide hall

Gotham has a village hall which incorporates a library and a scout hut

Sutton Bonington has a village hall and a pavilion. Additionally the University of Nottingham’s campus in the village makes some of its facilities, such as meeting rooms and a sports hall, available for hire.
Tollerton has its Parish Rooms, a Methodist Church, St Peter’s Church Centre and a scout hut. All venues have kitchens and are available for hire.

Public open spaces

Meaningful data is difficult to gather from the internet. Aslockton does not have any public open space, but does have access to a sports field in adjacent Whatton. The pavilion is very dilapidated wooden affair from the 1960s. From a cursory look the other tier three settlements seem somewhat better equipped as they generally have brick built pavilions and perhaps a bowling green etc.

Settlements the Borough Assesses Too Unsustainable to Reach Tier 3 Status

These are too many of these for me to research but I have researched a few so that they can be compared with Aslockton

Orston lies a couple of miles east of Aslockton. It has a railway station but a worse service than Aslockton because there is effectively only one train per day in each direction. It shares the same Bingham to Nottingham bus service as Aslockton (the 822 service). Additionally Orston has very occasional services to Lowdham (via Bingham) Bottesford and Newark. It has a school, a village hall, sports field, village green, a pub and a delicatessen which incorporates a café. Like Aslockton it does not have any health services.

Flintham is also in the east of the Borough lying close to the A46 trunk road which connects Nottingham with Newark and Lincoln. It does not have a railway station but has a fast and frequent direct bus services to Nottingham and Newark albeit from the edge of the village. The service to Nottingham is of 45 minutes duration. Peak period frequency is around 30 minute intervals and hourly throughout the day. The first bus to Nottingham departs at 07.08 and last the last bus from Nottingham departs at 22.20. There is a two hourly Sunday service. The journey time to Newark is 15 minutes. Peak frequency is around 30 minute intervals and hourly throughout the day. The first bus to Newark departs at 08.20 and last the last bus from Newark departs at 21.30. There is a two hourly Sunday service. It has a school, a village hall, sports field, a pub and a community shop. Like Aslockton it does not have any health services.

Further afield Bunny and Costock both enjoy a rapid direct bus service to Nottingham. The journey time from Bunny is 20 minutes whilst from Costock it is 24 minutes. Peak period frequency is around 15 minute intervals and 30 minutes throughout the day. The first bus to Nottingham departs from Costock at 06.16 and last the last bus from Nottingham departs at 23.10. There is an hourly Sunday service. Both Costock and Bunny have a school, village hall and pub. Bunny has a Londis convenience store open from 06.00 until 23.00 and an ATM both co-located with its petrol station. Like Aslockton neither village has any health services, however, residents of these settlements have a very frequent bus service to the health centre, wide range of shops, post office, library, ATM, dentist, vets etc in Ruddington. The journey time is 4 minutes for Bunny people and 8 minutes for Costock people.

Comparing Aslockton to Bunny I find it difficult to accept that a village which has a post office but poor public transport and no shop is considered more sustainable than a village with very good transport links and a convenience store which is open 17 hours per day along with a service station and ATM.
Accessible Settlements Study for Greater Nottingham 2010

I became aware of this study during the 2015 appeal and my gut feeling was that it did not ring true for Aslockton.

I accessed some of the worksheets that support the report in order to better understand its findings. I also met with one of the report’s authors who told me that the report was jointly written by a planning officer from a remote borough (who retired shortly after its publication) and himself, a statistician.

He was surprised to see me as he thought the report had long been forgotten, pointing out that it was very out of date indeed. He was also surprised that important decisions were being made based upon it when it could be rewritten using up to date data and software.

The primary data sets include:-

- The 2001 population census - now 17 years old
- Public transport routes and timetables for 2009 – unrecognisable from what exists today. Aslockton no longer enjoys a direct bus service to Nottingham and journeys take over an hour. A new main line railway station has opened elsewhere in the Borough and the Greater Nottingham Tram System has been extended into the Borough.
- Aslockton’s village shop has closed since the report was written.
- Neighbourhood data for doctors, dentists, nurseries etc was from 2006.
- The report was run on a Department for Transport software package which was current in 2008 but which has long since been replaced.

Aslockton’s accessibility assessment is very distorted by one of the report’s acknowledged limitations in that access scores are based on fastest journey time between 07.00 and 09.00. The report admits in paragraph 10.4, “The methodology takes fastest overall travelling time, so a train linked village can score well, even though the train service may have a lower frequency than a slower bus service” Thus, when it comes to matters such as access to health and retail the four minute journey time by train to Bingham is taken into account but the poor frequency of the service is ignored. In practice a resident with a twenty minute appointment at the doctors, dentist, optician etc between say 09.15 and 10.30 would need to catch the 09.00 train from Aslockton and arrive back at Aslockton station at 11.03. Given this acknowledged limitation I doubt any reasonable person would consider this method of measuring the accessibility of Aslockton capable of delivering a valid result.

The format of the 2001 population census and the use made of it also creates a big issue accuracy issue for Aslockton. I exchanged correspondence with both the report’s author and the Office for National Statistics and established that the prison population is eligible to take part in the ten yearly national census. As a consequence an artificial picture of Aslockton’s working population, the work it does and the means by which it gets to work has developed. For instance, the accessibility study says that there is a single employer in Aslockton with over 500 jobs, which must be the prison. Back in 2001 the prison was significantly smaller and I guess it would have housed about 300 prisoners who must have been included in the job count to get to 500 plus jobs because they do work within the prison.
According to the current 2011 census there are 1742 people living in Aslockton, of which 885 live in a household and 857 live in a communal establishment. The census shows that 918 jobs are held by Aslockton residents. If the prison is ignored it means that the 505 residents of the village aged between 16 and 65 have 1.8 jobs each! The census data also says that 320 residents walk to work!

Clearly there is something very wrong here. The numbers simply do not stack up because the prison distorts the picture. Unfortunately the Accessible Settlements Study for Greater Nottingham 2010 uses the 2001 census information and interrogation of its data and common sense adjustments were not made. I should add that the data sets from the 2001 census are different to those of the 2011 census and drilling down on the 2001 data is more difficult.

This perceived, but unreal access to employment drives Aslockton up the accessibility table. In the study five weighted themes define a settlement’s accessibility; these are:-

- Accessibility of education
- Accessibility of employment
- Accessibility of health
- Accessibility of retail
- Accessibility of community facilities

In appendix 3 I have shown on a single piece of paper the contribution that is made to Aslockton’s overall accessibility score by theme and this confirms that the biggest single contributing theme is accessibility to employment. Yet the jobs counted are only available to convicted criminals or their jailers!!

It is not difficult to see how this contribution has positioned Aslockton far higher up the accessibility chart than there is justification for.

A further mystery is the whereabouts of the four open spaces that appear in the tables which support the feasibility study. When I asked about those I was told by the County Council that the Borough Council had supplied the figure and I should direct the question to it. When I did that the Borough had no idea where it had got the figure came from and like the residents could not name a single open space in the village, although it was that suggested the privately owned grassed area outside the OAP bungalows might count. Again there could be confusion with the prison which I understand has sports pitches etc. for use by prisoners.

I agree with the report’s author that it has long since ceased to be current and requires re-running by the County Council on up to date data and software and I would add a plea for good deal of sanity checking of the core data by the Borough Council before the report is compiled if the output is to be of any value.

Given the age of the data used to compile this report and its reliability regarding Aslockton in the first place I ask that the inspector gives no weight to it.
The Borough’s View of Aslockton’s Sustainability as Set Out in Its Draft Sustainability Report and Identification of Additional Settlements Background Paper

After taking account of the data above I have to say that I do not agree with the Borough’s view that Aslockton is what it terms a ‘third tier settlement’ because when it is compared with the other villages identified as third tier settlements (Cropwell Bishop, East Bridgford, Gotham, Tollerton and Sutton Bonington) Aslockton simply does not have their amenities and services and when it comes to public transport Aslockton is the poor relation despite its railway station. Additionally, based on the evidence I do not believe Aslockton is as sustainable as villages such as Bunny and Costock which are considered by the Borough to be less sustainable. Overall Aslockton has much more in common with the likes of Flintham and Orston than the other third tier settlements or the likes of Bunny and Costock. I would therefore like the Borough to review its assessment of Aslockton in its draft Sustainability Appraisal Report with a view to removing Aslockton from its schedule of third tier settlements. Should this not be possible at this stage I ask that the Planning Inspector takes full account of the above evidence when deciding Aslockton’s fate.

HM Planning Inspectors Judgments on Aslockton’s Sustainability

In the two most recent planning appeal judgments the inspectors essentially found that Aslockton does not have sufficient accessibility to be considered sustainable enough to support further development. Since these judgments were reached Aslockton’s direct bus service to Nottingham has ceased and its shop has closed.

Accuracy of Individual Site Assessments in the Sustainability Report

This issue is of lesser importance but never the less I feel it needs to be raised.

From pages 78 and 79 of the Sustainability Appraisal Report I have noticed that both of the potential sites in Whatton are on the bus route. WHA01 is circa 510 metres from the railway station and WHA02 is 880 metres from the station. Both sites are marked red denoting a significantly negative impact for access to transport. If I turn to the Aslockton sites then there are four potential sites. ASL01 is 620 metres from both the railway station and the bus route. ASL02 is 480 metres from both the railway station and the bus route. ASL03 is 420 metres from both the railway station and the bus route. ASL04 is on the bus route and 500 metres from the railway station. All the Aslockton sites have been classified amber denoting a modestly negative impact for access to transport. I cannot understand from the documentation how the Borough has arrived at these differing designations and would like it to take another look at these site assessments for transport.

Planning Issues Likely to Arise if the Proposed Local Plan Part 2 Is Amended

As I understand it the Borough is committed to providing 13,150 new homes by 2028 with a target of circa 5,000 by 2021. Outline planning applications have now been made for all large strategic sites identified in our Local Plan Part 1 except Gamston.

Despite never failing its year on year housing trajectory the Borough has recognised that it presently does not have a five year supply because of some delays with the strategic sites. It is therefore increasing the number of homes to be provided in Part 2 of the Local Plan by 900 homes to cover the shortfall to a total of circa 2,500. After due consideration and consultation with the residents and
other interested parties the Borough has decided where it believes houses should be delivered by Part 2 of the Local Plan.

It is unfortunate that developers have been slow to take up and progress the strategic sites thus making 900 extra houses necessary under part 2. The developer’s slow response to the strategic sites designated under the Local Plan Part 1 is in my view due to the level of commitment in time and cost involved in providing the infrastructure these sites require. Over the past few years it has become evident that given the opportunity developers prefer to pursue sites in areas which are specifically excluded from development in the Local Plan because these sites are the most commercially attractive. If more sites are designated under Part 2 than the Borough is proposing then I cannot see how the core strategy sites will move forward in a timely manner. There is a risk that developers rather than the planning authority and citizens of the Borough will be in control of development in Rushcliffe and I therefore urge the planning inspector to endorse our Local Plan Part 2 as proposed.

Yours faithfully

Mr Chris Smith

Mrs Lyn Smith
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date validated</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Dwellings built or building</th>
<th>Dwellings to start</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 December 2017</td>
<td>17/02871/OUT</td>
<td>Land to North of Cliff Hill Lane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 October 2017</td>
<td>17/02488/FUL</td>
<td>West of 41-43 Meadow Close</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 August 2017</td>
<td>17/01883/FUL</td>
<td>Hill Top Farm Cliff Hill Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 June 2017</td>
<td>17/01420/FUL</td>
<td>York House Chapel Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 March 2017</td>
<td>17/00450/FUL</td>
<td>Adjacent 2 Field Bungalow Chapel Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 January 2017</td>
<td>17/00088/FUL</td>
<td>Adjacent Foxborough House Abbey Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 December 2016</td>
<td>16/03096/FUL</td>
<td>Manor House Main Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 May 2016</td>
<td>16/01222/OUT</td>
<td>South East of Long Acre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 December 2015</td>
<td>15/03075/OUT</td>
<td>Moorends Chapel Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 August 2015</td>
<td>15/01877/FUL</td>
<td>Aslockton Grange Barn, Grantham Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 April 2015</td>
<td>15/00680</td>
<td>Adjacent 17 Abbey Close</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 June 2014</td>
<td>14/01181/FUL</td>
<td>The Stables Dawns Lane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 March 2014</td>
<td>14/00480/OUT</td>
<td>Land South of Abbey Lane Aslockton</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 January 2014</td>
<td>14/00020/LBC</td>
<td>The Old Greyhound Inn Main Street</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 September 2013</td>
<td>13/01885/FUL</td>
<td>West of Belvoir House Abbey Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 March 2013</td>
<td>13/00185/FUL</td>
<td>Abbey Farm Bungalow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 January 2013</td>
<td>13/00102/FUL</td>
<td>Barn adjacent The Cottage Mill Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 January 2013</td>
<td>13/00085/FUL</td>
<td>Rear of Acacia House Abbey Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 June 2012</td>
<td>12/00982/COU</td>
<td>Workshop rear of The Cottage Chapel Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 December 2010</td>
<td>10/02122/TF</td>
<td>Elm House Abbey Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 August 2009</td>
<td>09/01564/FUL</td>
<td>Adjacent The Spinney Cliff Hill Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 July 2008</td>
<td>08/01389/FUL</td>
<td>South of The Walnuts Chapel Lane</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 February 2008</td>
<td>08/00141/FUL</td>
<td>Land South of Abbey Lane</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 March 2006</td>
<td>06/00274/FUL</td>
<td>Former Village Hall Main Street</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 May 2005</td>
<td>05/00573/FUL</td>
<td>Aslockton Hall New Lane</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Survey of passengers leaving Aslockton station on Nottingham bound trains on Monday 5th October 2015

#### 07.27 Train Towards Nottingham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of journey</th>
<th>Means of reaching station</th>
<th>Travelled from</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Car</td>
<td>Aslockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>Aslockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>Aslockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>Aslockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>Aslockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Car</td>
<td>Orston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Car</td>
<td>Scarrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Car</td>
<td>Scarrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td>Car</td>
<td>Whatton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Car</td>
<td>Whatton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>Whatton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>Whatton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>Whatton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 08.18 Train Towards Nottingham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of journey</th>
<th>Means of reaching station</th>
<th>Travelled from</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>Aslockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>Aslockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>Aslockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>Aslockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>Aslockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Cycle</td>
<td>Aslockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>Aslockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Car</td>
<td>Aslockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Car</td>
<td>Aslockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Car</td>
<td>Flawborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Car</td>
<td>Flintham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Car</td>
<td>Whatton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>Whatton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Aslockton people catching trains toward Nottingham is 14
Total Aslockton people walking or cycling to station is 11
Total Aslockton people travelling by car to station is 3
Comment

Consultee: Ms Dawn Smith (1143783)
Event Name: Local Plan Part 2 (Publication Draft)
Comment by: Ms Dawn Smith (1143783)
Comment ID: 16
Response Date: 10/06/18 18:09
Status: Submitted
Submission Type: Web
Version: 0.1

To which document does your response relate? Other supporting document

If you answered 'other supporting document' please state which document you refer to
Summary of consultation, main issues raised and responses Regulation 22 (c)(i-iv) Statement

Page number: 19; 20 and 21 and 306
Paragraph number: Housing Tar; RAD002 and RAD003
Policy reference: Policy 1: Development Requirements
Site reference: Policy 5.3: Housing Allocation – Land off Shelford Road, Radcliffe on Trent

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).
To be legally compliant the council should comply with the Local Plan Legal Compliance Checklist (April 2013) and it does not. It cannot respond favourably to section 4, part 2 of the checklist which states "Are you taking into account representations made?"

Firstly - representations have not been sought with respect to 920 houses being built in Radcliffe. The proposal that people have been invited to make representations on concerns 820 homes. For example - Highways England in its response refers to 820 houses in Radcliffe - it has not commented on 920 and therefore the consultation for Radcliffe is flawed - the council cannot respond appropriately to representations if representations have not been sought on the decision it has reached.

Secondly - whilst there is a response to some of the points made in the consultation, there are some omissions and furthermore, where a response is given the response cannot be relied upon because it is ambiguous.

For example, on page 306 of the summary on the consultation, it is acknowledged that "Several responses were concerned that the consultation document states 1,000 houses are needed for a new school; but only 820 houses are proposed". The response to this point is not made in the consultation response document - instead the response repeats the illogical conclusion that over 1000 homes are needed for a school to be viable and yet 920 are proposed. 920 is closer to the target than 820 it can be argued but if it is not enough to fund a school then the school will not be built. This will place an intolerable strain on existing facilities that will have to cope with increased numbers and no new school. A physical building and land allocated to build one is not sufficient. On this point the council has failed to take account of representations made - or it has acknowledged the point made and not come up with a logical response.

Page 20 summarises the main responses concerning RAD03 as follows "The main concerns highlighted during consultation focused on loss of Green Belt countryside, unsafe access, and congestion and safety on Shelford Road (requires direct access onto A52)." The response on page 20-21 states that "Advice from the Highways Authority and evidence within the submitted planning application for the site indicates that access can be achieved. Congestion issues are not considered significant enough to prevent the allocation of this site. RAD03 is therefore allocated for development within Policy 5.3 of Local Plan 2. Constraints, including highways issues, have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria. Land for a new primary school, medical centre and potential crossing over the railway line is safeguarded within RAD03."

The word access in the summary of the main responses received as set out above, relates to the fact that access onto the A52 is required. therefore any reference to access in the council's response is assumed to be about this matter - it states that access can be achieved. However there is no agreement to give access to the A52 from this site and even the developers have said it can't be done. Also the response refers to the Highways Authority which does not have jurisdiction on matters concerning the A52. The response does not address the issues of safe access at all. Furthermore the response provides assurances that highways issues are recognised and mitigated in the site specific plan. However looking at the site specific plan of the Local Plan document (Policy 5.3) there is no reference whatsoever to highways issues.

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

Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2 to be sound?  
  . No

Do you consider this to be because it is NOT:  
  . Positively Prepared (please tick all that apply)
Please give reasons for your answer, where applicable. You may also use this box if you wish to make representations on one of the Local Plan Part 2’s supporting documents (e.g. Sustainability Appraisal, Habitat Regulations Assessment or Equalities Impact Assessment).

Infrastructure is not properly considered for Radcliffe. There is acknowledgement that existing infrastructure (schools) cannot meet the demands of additional housing in Radcliffe. It is acknowledged that upward of 1000 homes are needed to support a school, and yet 920 homes are proposed.

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.

Proper regard needs to be made to the fact that infrastructure cannot support 920 homes and that 1000 homes are needed before a new school could be viable.

An adequate response to the representations made concerning safe access to the development (policy 5.3) is needed and the local plan changed accordingly. Highways England particularly needs to respond to the fact that 920 homes are now proposed for Radcliffe and whether it wishes to change its response as a result.

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.
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><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mr</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Geoffrey</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Smith</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation (where relevant)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job title (where relevant)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postcode</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-mail Address</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone Number</strong></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.
Re: The proposed development to the south of Sutton Bonington on Park Lane

Dear Sirs

I wish to object to the above, proposed development on the following grounds:

- The village already has little in the way of facilities and amenities.
  - Only 2 shops (1 Post Office and 1 general store).
  - Doctors surgery is a modified 2 bedroom bungalow for which parking is on the street.
  - The local school will be inadequate (and see later re parking).

- There are poor transport links
  - Many journeys from the village are made via the A6006 and access to the A6006 can be extremely difficult at peak times.
  - The bus service through the village is quite limited, with a bus approximately one per hour in each direction.
  - Parked cars in the vicinity of the school especially at pick up and drop off times mean that there is danger to pupils and other road users. The lines of parked cars, particularly at pick up time, can stretch for 400 or 500 metres.
  - New additional residents in the village will mean that there will (presumably) be more children attending the school and probably more cars delivering those same children to the school.

- Increased flooding
  - The field, which it is proposed to develop, is on a slope and there are regularly floods when there is heavy rainfall.
  - Building on this land with the necessity for much hard landscaping will increase the risk of flooding in the area.

- Alternative sites
Adding 80 houses to the larger and better connected sites such as Cotgrave, Bingham, Clifton or in combination with other larger villages such as Ruddington or Keyworth would cause less impact on those villages.

I enclose the LP2 response form as required and look forward to hearing a positive response to my letter.

Yours faithfully

Geoffrey Smith
Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies Publication Version

Representation Form

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

This form has two parts:

**Part A** – Personal details

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Personal Details</th>
<th>2. Agent’s Details (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Mrs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Smith</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. 33 34
Paragraph no. 4
Policy ref. 4.4

Site ref. Policies Map

4. Do you consider the Local Plan Part 2:

4(1) Legally compliant Yes. 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.

   This is a sound Plan, which includes the best sites for housing in Keyworth, especially to the west (South of Bunny Lane - Hillside Farm).

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").
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.
Date form completed: 22/06/18

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/](http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/retention_schedule/)

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

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

---

Representations must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.
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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(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. 33 34
Paragraph no.
Policy ref. 4.4
Site ref.
Policies Map

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 your 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.

   This is an excellent Plan which has been informed by consultations with local residents. Evidence through the local consultations demonstrates that the majority of Keyworth residents agree with the four proposed housing sites, and especially with the inclusion of Hillside Farm, which is the nearest site to the centre of the village.

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

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

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

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

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

(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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

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

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

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

- [ ] The Local Plan Part 2 has been adopted

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

localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk; or

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

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

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 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 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,

[Signature]

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

RUSHCFIGE BOROUGH COUNCIL
BUSINESS SUPPORT UNIT
RECEIVED
27 JUN 2018
Copies sent to
Referred to

18/06/2018
Comment

Consultee: Mr Robert Smith (977195)

Event Name: Local Plan Part 2 (Publication Draft)

Comment by: Mr Robert Smith (977195)

Comment ID: 20

Response Date: 18/06/18 15:14

Status: Submitted

Submission Type: Web

Version: 0.1

Files: RUSHCLIFFE LOCAL PLAN COMMENTS

To which document does your response relate?

Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version

Policy reference: Policy 4.2: Housing Allocation – Land between Platt Lane and Station Road, Keyworth

Site reference: Policy 4.2: Housing Allocation – Land between Platt Lane and Station Road, Keyworth

Policies Map

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
- Effective

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

The draft Plan contains a number of policies that are not based on evidence, in particular the need to remove land from the Green Belt and the planning justification for the sites that are proposed for development, which appear to be based on site availability rather than any strategic planning.

Please add any supporting files (if applicable)  
RUSHCLIFFE LOCAL PLAN COMMENTS

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
RUSHCLIFFE LOCAL PLAN COMMENTS

(Comments in Italics)

General

This Plan is full of fine words like 'sustainability' but simply mentioning those words does not make it a sustainable plan. The reality is that the development proposed in the plan is deeply unsustainable, will cause huge damage to the landscape environment of Rushcliffe, add to traffic and pollution, and is little more than a housebuilders' charter.

Housing Allocations at Keyworth

3.30 The Core Strategy sets a target of a minimum of 450 new homes that need to be built on greenfield sites at Keyworth up to 2028. It is considered that Keyworth has scope to sustain around 600 dwellings in total on greenfield sites adjacent to the village.

'Considered' by whom and on what basis? These are not greenfield but Green Belt sites. Using the word sustainable is no more than PR talk. 600 new houses in the Green Belt will fundamentally change the character of Keyworth and its relationship with Nottingham. It means an increase in population of up to 1200-1800 residents, hugely adding to traffic and pressure on local facilities. There seems to have been no strategic plan for Keyworth, simply the selection of particular sites on the basis of availability.

Finally, the development sites proposed partly arise from the Council’s assertion that additional land needs to be identified for housing development due to the slow rate of development of land already allocated. This hardly seems a sound justification; the reasons for the slow development of existing sites are not analysed, may include wider market conditions, availability of funding for affordable housing etc, and do not automatically lead to yet more land being allocated for housing.

3.31 For instance, the new health centre has scope to accommodate this level of development subject potentially to developer contributions to support improvements. It is also judged that, given the existing size of the town which has around 3,000 dwellings, around 600 new homes should be able to be assimilated as part of Keyworth without unduly affecting the town’s character or local amenity.

This again is untrue. When did Keyworth become a 'town'? The character of Keyworth is largely defined by its Green Belt location, which will be changed by the removal of large areas of Green Belt land for housing development. The health centre is already overstretched, with long waiting times for appointments, and could not remotely accommodate such a large increase in patient numbers.

3.32 In balancing housing requirements across Rushcliffe to 2028, sustainability, Green Belt, settlement capacity and other relevant planning considerations, the following sites (see Figure 3) have been identified as housing allocations and have been removed from the Green Belt:

Land off Nicker Hill;
Land between Platt Lane and Station Road;
Land south of Debdale Lane; and
Hillside Farm.
The Green Belt is an integral part of the character of Keyworth. The development already under way at Wheatcroft, plus linking Keyworth to Tollerton via the Station Road development will result in an almost unbroken line of development between Keyworth and the built up area of Nottingham. In addition, the road connections to Keyworth, and in particular the narrow and low railway bridges, are unsuitable for additional traffic. The already limited parking in Keyworth village would be made worse by large scale development on the periphery which will generate internal village traffic. Finally, it is highly questionable whether sites on the village periphery are the most suitable location for the 20% low-cost housing.

3.33 With the exception of Hillside Farm, the sites are identified as recommended housing allocations within the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan.

The Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan is deeply flawed. The plan was significantly altered at the last minute by a small group of councillors who refused to allow any public comment. The referendum on the plan became a party political campaign in which the original community-led purpose of Neighbourhood Planning was lost. Finally, people were asked to vote on 'up to 480' new houses rather than the 600 now proposed.

POLICY 4.1 HOUSING ALLOCATION – LAND OFF NICKER HILL, KEYWORTH

POLICY 4.2 HOUSING ALLOCATION – LAND BETWEEN PLATT LANE AND STATION ROAD, KEYWORTH

The following comments apply to both Nicker Hill and Platt Lane/Station Road. Both sites are significant in the Green Belt around Keyworth and its separation from the built up area of Nottingham. Both sites will create additional traffic on Platt Lane or Station Road which are the two routes into Nottingham. Neither of these routes is suitable for additional traffic. While the roads themselves can be improved, the railway bridges en route to the A606 are narrow and low, and the junctions with the A606 are already overloaded at times and in the case of the Platt Lane/ A606 junction at Normanton, dangerous to users. Station Road already suffers from poor sight lines and hazardous accesses along its route, and it is difficult to see how access to a large housing estate could be safely incorporated.
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

[Redacted]

Mrs. M. Snowden
### Draft Rushcliffe Statement of Community Involvement for Planning Policy and Planning Applications

#### Response Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Details</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MR E J SPENCER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1. Consulting on Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs)

Do you agree or disagree with the consultation methods identified in the Draft Statement of Community Involvement? If you disagree, please explain why and how the Draft Statement of Community Involvement should be changed.

I agree with the method, but not some of its content

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

#### 2. Consulting on Planning Applications

Do you agree or disagree with the consultation methods identified in the Draft Statement of Community Involvement? If you disagree, please explain why and how the Draft Statement of Community Involvement should be changed.

Again I agree with the method. However, the conclusions you have come to, I do not agree with
3. Please provide any other comments you wish to make

I have some degree of sympathy with you. You are being forced by higher authority to provide for some of the folly of Government of this country. With regard to Cotgrave, the road junction at the Post office has been and is subject to gridlock. Can you re-build the centre of Cotgrave to cope??

Date: 18/06/18

Please return by 5pm on Thursday 28 June 2018 to: Planning Policy Rushcliffe Borough Council Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road West Bridgford Nottingham. NG2 7YG
Or to: localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Please note that your comments can be directly entered through the Borough Council’s online consultation system: http://rushcliffe-consult.objective.co.uk/portal

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.
With the additional traffic that what you propose to do will generate? It is not just that, Cotgrave is a rat run for everyone else that see it as a short cut into town i.e. Nottingham or wherever west of the village. The increase in traffic over the years is noticeable and I know it is a view shared with a number of others in the village.

I also think that your views with regard to impact on the village and sustainable delivery, benefit etc. are flawed. Whilst I agree that the face lift of the shopping centre and the new multipurpose building are an improvement, they actually do not increase the number of facilities other than offices. What extra is there to benefit the village over what there was? I do not see how you can improve the junction of Hollygate Lane and Colston Gate.

Whilst I see the logic of development as planned, I fail to see any extra resource to facilitate this. Where are the extra staff for the Health Centre (the doctors have failed so far to recruit any new G.P.'s and the schools have limited extra capacity).

I would suggest you are being forced P.T.O.
into a situation that Housing i.e. extra
housing in Rushcliffe is only going to
put added strain on the facilities that
exist in the Borough. I fail to see
where any extra houses would be
of benefit to us, you can not squeeze
a quart into a pint pot and that is
effectively what they are forcing you
to do, where weight of numbers will
overcome the capacity to provide in
the future.

Yours Sincerely,
Planning Policy

Rushcliffe Borough Council

Dear Sir/Madam

I note the housing development in Keyworth.

My wife and I were pleased that the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan was well supported by its residents. In particular, regard to where housing development should take place in the coming years, we agree that the three sites, Key 10, Key 4a and Key 8 are the most suitable. However, we do not consider that site, Key 13, is at all suitable.

Our main concern regarding the use of this site relate to the dangers that would arise from vehicular traffic emerging on both sides, north and south, on the Bury Lane. This road is already a busy road and visibility to traffic both entering and leaving Keyworth is, at times, poor due to vehicles that park each and every day.

Our other objection relate to the development of housing on site Key 13, which
would be located near it. The sewage works and also the adjacent farm which has quite recently ceased sizable agricultural building for housing livestock. These environmental concerns are of significance and need to be taken into account.

Finally, there is also an aesthetic aspect which also needs to be acknowledged in terms of Keynsham’s development. As an approach to Keynsham along Bourn Lane the outline of the village is pleasingly visible, a feature that would be marred if housing was allowed on both sides of Bourn Lane.

We would hope that Bath and North Somerset Council will respect the residents of Keynsham as expressed in the referendum, and reject any attempt to build now, or in the future on Site Key B.

Yours faithfully,

( P. STAFFOR )

( B. STAFFORD )
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)

1) The Parish Council also should not unilaterally
represent the interests and views of the villagers
have agreed a plan totally unpublicized — not
even a mention in the village magazine.
Surely challengeable in law.

2. We owe it to future generations to preserve the green
but — once lost, it’s lost forever.

3. There are numerous brownfield sites near the city
centre being cut up by developers — they make
more profit by building upon greenbelt.

4. There is already far too much traffic in the
village which, despite constant representations from
villagers, is a problem gone unheeded by the
Parish Council and L.A.

5. Green belt can only be used in exceptional
circumstances which include the provision of low
cost housing — developers will not provide much
of this.

Signed:
Name:
Address:

East Bridgford Residents Group Drop-In, 16th May 2018, East Bridgford Village Hall
Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find enclosed my response to the draft Local Plan Part 2. The letter is chiefly concerned with my fear over the flood risk to my own home of building on the field adjoining Wilford Lane. I fail to understand why the Council would choose to build on flood level 2/3 land when it is virtually the only piece of land surrounding the whole village that is at any risk of flooding (according to the environment agency website). This seems myopic in the extreme!

That said, I think that many of us who live in Ruddington are extremely disappointed with the Council’s intent to build 100’s of new homes in Ruddington at all. I appreciate my hypocrisy as my family have lived in the village for only 3 years and we live on a new estate but since living here we have realised that; the roads are in a dire state of repair, side streets are jammed with parked cars, the centre of the village is jammed at peak times and has totally inadequate parking, the schools are at capacity and the medical facilities also. In short, nothing is being done to improve the infrastructure of the village to cope with the increased number of homes. Sadly, I envisage that within a few years the character of Ruddington will be lost and the village will have become just another suburb of Nottingham.

I look forward to hearing your response.

Kind Regards,

Dave Stephen

On 16 May 2018, at 17:03, Localdevelopment <Localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Sir/Madam

Rushcliffe Borough Council has published its draft Local Plan Part 2, which is available to comment on until 5pm on Thursday 28 June 2018.

Further details are set out in the attached letter and at www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy, including where the draft Local Plan Part 2 and associated documents can be viewed and how comments can be made.

The Borough Council is also consulting on a draft Statement of Community Involvement at the same time.

You have been sent this email as you are currently registered on our consultation mailing list. If you no longer wish to be contacted in relation to Local Plan matters please let us know by replying to this email.

Kind regards
Follow us on Twitter [https://twitter.com/Rushcliffe](https://twitter.com/Rushcliffe)

Like us on Facebook - [https://www.facebook.com/rushcliffeborough](https://www.facebook.com/rushcliffeborough)


Connect with us on LinkedIn - [www.linkedin.com/company/rushcliffe-borough-council/](http://www.linkedin.com/company/rushcliffe-borough-council/)

Sign up to receive our business newsletter - [http://eepurl.com/dbczkn](http://eepurl.com/dbczkn)

Call us on 0115 981 9911 (8.30am to 5pm, Monday to Friday), email customerservices@rushcliffe.gov.uk or visit [www.rushcliffe.gov.uk](http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk)

<Local Plan Part 2 letter_consultees_email.pdf>
From Mr David Stephen

Planning Policy
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rectory Road
West Bridgford
NG2 6BU
17 Jun 2018-06-05

Dear Sir, Madam,

RUSHCLIFFE LOCAL PLAN PART 2 - RUDDINGTON, WILFORD ROAD SITE

Reference A: Photographs of the proposed site taken during Winter 2017/18.

I am writing to once again express my concern about the proposed development of the land adjoining Wilford Road, Ruddington as detailed in the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2 dated May 2018. I attended the information session that was held in Ruddington Village Hall in Autumn 2017 and was disappointed to learn that this land was being considered despite the fact that it lies within flood zones 2 and 3. The representative that I spoke to explained that a sequential test had been carried out and this area still represented one of the best options. I am staggered that this is the case when it is probably the only piece of greenbelt land surrounding the village that has any risk of flooding at all.

I have no experience or qualifications in the fields of geography or geology but I have lived in the village for 3 years in a house that backs onto the proposed development site and I have observed that the field in question floods every winter for approximately 4 months. I enclose photos that I took this winter in December and April which demonstrate how waterlogged the area is. I don't believe the rainfall we had this year was in any way exceptional. Once again, it staggers me that this area would be considered when there seems to be more and more news coverage every year of communities devastated by flooding and warnings about how global warming will lead to more and more extreme weather in the future.

I doubt that there is very much I can do against the power of Rushcliffe Borough Council and Bloor Homes to force this seemingly myopic development through. That said, my understanding from Paragraph 3.73 on page 44 of the Local Plan part 2 is that the onus is firmly on the Borough Council and whoever carries out the flood risk assessment to ensure that my home is protected from flooding in the future as a result of the proposed development. To that end, please can you acknowledge receipt of this letter and acknowledge your responsibilities as the organisation that has proposed development of flood zone 2 and 3 land? Additionally, and assuming the Local Plan part 2 is approved in December, can I please request that I receive a copy of any completed flood risk assessment for the area in question and details of which agencies financed and produced it?

Yours faithfully,
Reference A:

Photo taken 29 December 2017

Photo taken 02 April 2018
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

[Handwritten signature]

ADAM STEVENS
Dear Sir/Madam

I have read the proposal for the new houses to be built in East Bridgford (specifically as I live there) and I can not believe anyone would build further houses in East Bridgford on a mass scale.

Firstly there is only one main road in and out of the village, which currently struggles with the school run and latterly the traffic from the new ‘Home and Garden’ shop with has recently opened. The road could not take more traffic, it has taken me over 15mins to travel the length of it to get home.

There is also just not the infrastructure in place for children (school will not have the capacity to cater for families) and traffic in and out of the village.

I also doubt gunthorpe Bridge will be able to cope with the influx of cars of the houses currently bring built in two places in Bingham and newton plus any extra from this new planning proposal.

I do hope you will take this into consideration and leave East Bridgford as the village has been for hundreds of years.

Kind regards,

Penny storr

Sent from my iPhone
Dear Sir,

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely

your signature

your name

MAKRY STRAW
Dear Sir,

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Harold Sumner
Anita Sumner
Sizes must be received by 5pm Thursday 28 June 2018. Representations received after this time will not be considered duly made.

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>Miss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Teresa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Sweeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (where relevant)</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title (where relevant)</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</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: Miss T Sweeving

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. 51 and 52

Paragraph no. 8.1 and 8.2

Policy ref. Policy 8.1: Housing Allocation – Land between Butt Lane and Closes Side Lane, East Bridgford

Site ref. Policy 8.2: Housing Allocation – Land south of Butt Lane, East Bridgford

Policies Map East Bridgford

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

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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positively Prepared</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>Justified</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Consistent with national policy</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Please give reasons for you answer to Questions 4(1), 4(2), 4(3) and 5, where applicable.

The local plan is not legally compliant as this new 125 home plan which will significantly change the village with devastating effects has never previously been put to the public and most certainly not to the most important people, every resident of the village in the long two years of public consultation, leaving us with only six weeks to respond. This to me is an unfair and not legally compliant way of consultation and is a method used to rush something through with the minimum of fuss. Especially as this new plan has not even been mentioned in the parish council news in the brilliant and informative Village Magazine read regularly by most households, at least 88% of the village, as it is a source of information on what is happening and may potentially happen on our doorstep. Therefore sadly some residents and members of the general public, as residents in nearby villages also take an interest in what is happening in their area of Rushcliffe, still do not know what the parish council and Rushcliffe are proposing for the village.

The local plan is not sound and to me has not been positively prepared as being positively prepared to me is taking on board data that has been published on opinions of the village, these are the very people that huge change to our village structure effects the most so why wouldn’t you take on board our opinions? The community plan group carried out a very in depth survey and I think the results speak for themselves. The green belt is one of the most important aspects and should be preserved. I find it strange that boundaries can be moved and altered at will to accommodate such as these huge developments when there is no support for large or even medium sized developments on the edge of the village. I feel that in order to meet the requirements that the Government has imposed on Rushcliffe of a rolling supply of land for development that green belt land around our village has become easy pickings afterall developers like land which does not have to be cleared like brownfield. No thought to IMPACT on the village has been observed like the increase in traffic, each household would have at least one if not two cars bringing more traffic down main street. As the development would stretch as far as Closes Side Lane, a country lane, where there is hardly any traffic, if there is an exit road here goodbye another quiet village road. We value the green belt land around our village and being surrounded by fields and open space adds wellbeing and its preservance is of the utmost importance.

The plan should be based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development, this to me is...
researching for need of development, East Bridgford does not need large or even medium scale
development, who are these houses for? Fosters close was built as it was felt there was a need for affordable
and rented family homes and bungalows and I was lucky enough to fall in that category especially as I was
already living in East Bridgford, BUT if this development would not have been built I would still have
remained as I was already living here which was one of the main categories for applying for a house here.
So shouldn’t development I mean very very very very small scale, Fosters close is a small bespoke cul de
sac of originally 10 houses this was increased to 12 when 2 more bungalows were built, be based on local
need? Not the need for Rushcliffe to meet the needs of the Government imposed requirement. I cannot
understand why Rushcliffe wants to destroy the very essence of what a lot of the area covered by
Rushcliffe is made up of namely villages. When it should be doing its upmost to defend this very area but I
feel there has been on going consultation for the last 19 years, housing in Newton, where I lived about 15
years ago there is now a huge housing estate behind my old house where there used to be fields, but
previous to this the proposed asylum centre, the new A46, the potential fracking in Shelford, so many
changes in a relatively small area. Not to mention the mass housing in Bingham! Also the strain on an
already busy medical centre, our local school which has already been developed to accommodate more
children, our roads especially main street which has now become a run through for people finding a quick
way to their destination, and the disappearance of country roads such as Butt lane which my children and I
used to call the long lane but now has a huge bridge being cut across by the new A46, the lack of an evening
bus service the last bus being 6.30pm from Nottingham, not such good infrastructure to accommodate a
huge development is it?
Is the plan justified? The plan should be the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable
alternatives. I am sure that this has not been the case as reasonable alternatives to me would be areas to be
considered which are closer to where most people would work namely Nottingham City which would have
a less devastating impact on the area, once green field has gone it is gone forever and will never be replaced
by a builders green space. I cannot believe that the evidence gathered by Rushcliffe when considering the
best area for new build brings out East Bridgford as the most suitable, when considering all the facts proves
it is not a sustainable area for large development.
Is the plan effective? No I do not believe it is as even if there was a cross boundary need for housing
suitable areas should be intensively researched not an easy fix of just enlarging our village and destroying
our green fields which can never ever be replaced. There was once a reason why green belt was called this
to preserve it and make sure it is there for future generations.
Consistent with national policy, this calls for the delivery of sustainable development, but I cannot see how
this development can be sustainable by our village as it will put even more strain on infrastructure, it will
change the village beyond all recognition, it will see the reduction of more green belt land and take away
the sense of open spaces from the houses already along the site of the proposed development.

So no I do not think the plan is sound.

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.
The only way I see this plan as being sound is to not go ahead with it. To listen to the views of local people to understand how important the very structure of the village is to us and how important it is to preserve what we have without increasing its size considerably and giving us all the problems this will make. I believe green belt should be left alone where there was a time when this would never be looked on as a building prospect and makes a mockery of the term green belt. Why would we want a development that would destroy this and allow developers to create new landscaped open space when we have the real thing already that has been around for years. I think it is important to look at our needs first don’t you after all we are the ones who live here and would have to put up with the detrimental impact of a huge development. With all the proposed building in all the villages I feel that although I do not live in the city that the city is moving towards us so much so that soon there will be no spaces between villages that the very fabric of village life will be eroded away and we all become small towns what a sad thing for future generations with the older generation saying I remember when East Bridgford was a village. Therefore it is up to residents to try and preserve what we have and for Rushcliffe to find a better way of bridging their gap in government funding after all new houses means more council tax doesn’t it? If this is not possible then you need to go back to the drawing board and seek better areas for development and not choose what it considers to be easy areas. Remember green belt land does prevent communities and developed areas being joined up, the areas retain a sense of identity, and acts as a buffer to preserve open land and countryside not just for us but for future generations. It is important to retain what we have there has already been so many changes hasn’t there?

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

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

Yes, I wish to appear at the examination

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

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

Click here to enter text.

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

10. Please indicate if you wish to be notified that: (please tick all that apply)
The Local Plan Part 2 has been submitted for independent examination.

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

The Local Plan Part 2 has been adopted

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

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.