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To which document does your response relate? Other supporting document

If you answered 'other supporting document' please state which document you refer to
Policy 10 Housing –Land North of Park Lane Sutton Bonington

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

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).  
NA  

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 Plan is not sound or effective for the following reasons:

**Inadequate School Capacity**

The 80 houses proposed would very likely mean at least a further 20+ pupils attending SB Primary School (0.25 / house). With families looking for houses this would in reality be higher. The school currently operates out of 2 porta-cabins in addition to the main building and has done for 20 years. There is no space to extend the school even if the money were available. The additional intake would mean more, poorly heated / temporary learning accommodation. The space at secondary schools would also be impacted, with East Leake Academy currently at capacity.

**Excessive Proportional Increase & Urbanisation**

The very significant increase of the current 600 houses in the village to 680 would comprise 13%. The current house / garden area of the village is approx. 85 acres so the 10 acre increase would mean a 12% increase by land area. This is too great a proportional increase for a village of this size and impacts transport, school and services.

SB and Normanton are currently 200m apart to the first single house / farm and 400m between groups / rows of houses i.e the site represents an important strategic gap as the only remaining countryside between these 2 distinct settlements. The proposed development of the 16 acre field would effectively merge these separate villages and urbanise the strong rural character of this part of the Soar Valley. It would create a strip / wall of houses which would enclose the valley corridor and comprise urban sprawl over a largely pastoral agricultural land use.

140 houses were proposed in the Core Strategy. Whilst 80 houses are now proposed, this is over approx 60% of the field so there is no reduction in density. There is a very great concern that the remainder of the field will be put forward for a 2nd phase of development and the plan shows no sound
measures for preventing that. Furthermore it would seem to be a strategy to develop the full field in a piecemeal fashion and try to reduce local opposition.

**Increased Flooding**

- Recent development within SB at Rectory Close, has led to unprecedented flooding on Main Street by the Kings Head and disruption to residents despite the development being in Flood Zone 1 (as for the proposal at Park Lane). Water balancing was not therefore properly risk assessed by Rushcliffe BC or the developer.

- The contour of the proposed field slopes towards the existing houses on Charnwood Fields / Charnwood Av. Surface water drainage for those houses is to soakaways and as such is already inadequate. A show of hands at the 23rd May Sutton Bonington (SB) Local Residents meeting indicated over 10 residents had experienced flooding of their gardens at the southern end of SB. Most of the 10 are next to the proposed development field. Some gardens are sodden throughout winter. The roadside boundary of the field holds floods during winter and this is the only available position for new access.

- Easter 2018 saw several flooding events: Main Street by the Kings Head, under railway bridge at Hungary Lane, Park Lane near the proposed site and at Charnwood Avenue. All of which disrupted traffic and threatened property.

- Severn Trent Water (STW) have no maps of the culverts, ditches and drains in SB. The parish council are taking the initiative and prompting STW to assist in mapping, to confirm who is responsible and to instigate a maintenance regime.

- As a green field the site provides a good deal of water balancing but in itself still floods. Its low lying position in the valley and location immediately adjacent to flood risk zone 2 mean that if this field became a 50% sealed surface, it would cause more frequent floods of the road and new and existing houses. It would extend the flood risk 2 area into the site.

**Poor Transport & Access**

- 80 houses proposed which at 1.2-2 cars per house means 100-160 more cars with the majority at peak times.

- It is currently very difficult to emerge from Park Lane onto A6006 at commuting peaks / school run. Worst when M1 / A453 / A6 are blocked and the village becomes a ‘rat run’, when traffic can back up to Willow Poole Lane.

- Increased population = more children at the school and many parents driving children to school, adding to existing congestion problems. Parked cars form a line stretching 1000m from Orchard Close and Gables Lea at drop off / pick up, narrowing the road to 1 lane. Parents returning to A6006 often perform the dangerous manoeuvre turning 180 degrees. Accidents which are already likely become even more likely.

- Current traffic load on A6006 very high. Proposed East Mids Airport freight terminal and current DNRC (Stanford Hall) development will significantly increase load and detract from the accessibility of Park Lane.

- New residents almost entirely car dependent and likely to drive to village centre / shop. Currently only 2-3 parking spaces outside so parking is likely to extend onto verges / road sides, worsening visibility on the adjacent blind bend.

**The plan is not justified for the following reasons:**

**Alternative Sites**

- 80 houses would comprise only 0.6 % of the Rushcliffe BC target for 2028 of 13,150 i.e. it will have virtually no contribution to the target (nor to the future availability of jobs in the village).
on the house number within the village is far higher (80 houses added to 600 existing = 13% increase) and will negatively impact accessibility, services for current / future residents.

- Adding 80 houses to the larger / better connected sites such as Cotgrave, Bingham, Clifton, Gamston or in combination with the other larger villages such as Ruddington / Keyworth would comprise less of an impact on those settlements, given their wider range of facilities and services.

Please note that as a representative of the Local Residents Committee meeting held on 23rd May 2018 I have attached below a copy of an attendance register for that meeting.

Please add any supporting files (if applicable)

Sutton Bonington Local Residents Committee - Meeting Attendance - 23rd May 2018
Sutton Bonington Local Residents Committee - Meeting Attendance - 23rd May 2018

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

Yes

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).

NA

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.

Removal of Sutton Bonington from the Local Plan Part 2 in its entirety and replacement of the 80 house allocation on the larger sites in the Borough.

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

Yes, I wish to appear at the examination

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

I was present at the Sutton Bonington Local Residents Group meeting on 23rd May 2018 to discuss the Local Plan Part 2. The details above are a summary of the issues raised at the meeting and represent the views of the group. Attendees were asked to record their names on a register circulated at the meeting and a copy of that original list is attached for reference by the Planning Inspector. As a representative of the Local Residents Committee I feel that it would be fair, open and transparent to allow us to be represented at the hearing.

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.
FLEURAKIES

CRAIG ALLISON
Edd BERRIDGE
BEN JACOBY
MARK CUSINS
AMANDA DRAKE
NIKKI JAMES
CHOIS HUGHES
RAY PEACOCK
STEVEN DAY
Kim COLLINS
KATHERINE HEBBLETHWAITE
John & Brenda FORSITT
LANCE SIMON
PETER AINSWORTH
DAVID & SHIRLEY WHITE
andy & JANE STEWART
MIKE HACI
Thomas & Sharron LLOYD

Alasdair Donaldson
M'r Barney