We attached a letter setting out our objections to the emerging LP2.
We request an opportunity of addressing the inspector at the forthcoming EIP.
Kindly acknowledge receipt.
WE OBJECT to the Borough Councils Proposed Housing Allocations at Ruddington - for the following reasons:-

Two principal Issues:-

- Housing Numbers (objections 1-3)
- The Green Belt (objections 4-7)

Objection 1.

At the EIP to consider the Core Strategy the inspector recommended a modification to the plan to the effect:-

"Any increase in 13,150 is to be reviewed on a collaborative basis with partner local authorities across greater Nottingham"

The Borough Council is unilaterally increasing the number and has failed to disclose any evidence that such a review and consultation has been undertaken. Merely stating they have consulted is insufficient. This is particularly relevant as a substantial part of the overall Borough requirement is already committed and concentrated in the Green Belt swathe between Edwalton /Tollerton and Gamston and to further erode the Green Belt to the East of Loughborough Road at Ruddington without proper consideration of cross border opportunities constitutes a major failing.

Objection 2 (Policies 6.2 and 6.3)

We object to any further land being removed from the Green Belt to the East of Loughborough Road Ruddington. The housing requirement (250) has now been satisfied on windfall sites at Asher Lane Ruddington and at
Rempstone Road, East Leake. In total these two sites will deliver 410 units the details of which are as follows:-

- Since publication of LP2 planning permission for 175 homes has been allowed on appeal on land off Asher Lane Ruddington. (APP/P3040/W17/3185493). This constitutes a major windfall towards the 250 homes originally proposed for Ruddington.
- In November 2017 the Borough Council had a further windfall when on appeal planning permission was granted on Land North of Rempstone Road, East Leake. (APP/P3040/W/17/3178343. This development is for up to 235 dwellings. This location to the South of Ruddington is for land beyond the designated Green Belt.

The Borough’s overall housing numbers and current supply with planning permission has been boosted by these recently allowed appeal decisions. This has weakened the Councils argument to increase supply by 2,000 units (beyond the LP1 target of 13,150 units) and will allow the Council to review its plans and not to unnecessarily remove land from the Green Belt especially so far as this affects Ruddington.

Objection 3

The omission to recognise the eventual capacity of delivery from the strategic allocated sites is forcing an unreasonable burden on the key settlements and further unnecessary loss of Green Belt land.

- It should be recognised that Rushcliffe’s strategic allocations in LP1 all under-estimate total house building capacity. In the case of Clifton (recently approved by planning committee for up to 3000 homes) this is potentially by up to 500 units (source: Clifton Development Consortium). The major strategic allocations will eventually deliver more houses through increased build densities than currently anticipated and their delivery performance will be accelerated because each will have up to 4 main-stream house builders building in tandem as is now happening from the Edwalton site.
Objection 4

The Borough Council has ignored Government Policy to attach great importance to Green Belts and the five fundamental purposes of the Green Belt set out in the NPPF. (Para 80)

The NPPF states that development within the GB should only be permitted in `Exceptional Circumstances` and states that unmet housing need for new homes is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the very special circumstances justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt.

The Borough Council’s assessment for each of the `Green Belt sites ` under consideration as part of LP2 seeks to compare and score them against the five purposes of the Green Belt. In his decision the inspector for the Asher Lane appeal clearly did not agree with the Councils conclusions. Indeed he was highly critical of sites RD 13 and RD 05 (both to the East of Loughborough Road) and made the following points in his decision letter dated 23rd May 2018:-

1. “the evidence base and the Councils reasons for its preferred allocation of sites at Ruddington are issues that are relevant to this case and to which I attached considerable weight” (para 54)

2. “development on the Council`s preferred sites would clearly ,even by its own admission, create more harm in terms of the 5 purposes of the Green Belt in the NPPF para 80”(para 61)

3. “RUD05 and RUD13 lie on the east side of the A60 unlike the village which lies on its west. There is some development on Flawforth Lane and Flawforth Avenue and RUD 05 adjoins it. But at RUD 13, which would take its access off the Mere Road roundabout, there is no existing development on the east side of the A60. Both sites, and especially RUD 13, would be disconnected from the heart of the village, with relatively poor accessibility (when compared with the appeal site). In my opinion the A60 acts as a considerable physical and visual barrier to development on the eastern side of the village. Neither site (RD 05 and RD 13) would follow the historic morphology of the village and neither would have strong or defensible boundaries, merely field hedges” (para 58)
Objection 5 (Policies 6.2 and 6.3)

Sites RD 05 and RD 13 should be removed from the plan.

The area to the East of Loughborough Road is in our view `prime` Green Belt and its loss would be the opening moves in a longer term eastward expansion of the village. New homes here would place overly reliance on the use of the motor car to access the village services. Our views were supported by the Inspector handling the Asher Lane appeal in his critical analysis of the Borough Council`s preferred options (RD 05 and RUD 13)

Site RDS (South of Flawforth Lane) has variously been stated to be a `brownfield site` yet it does not appear on the Council`s register of brownfield sites. This site is established for agricultural/horticultural use within the defined Green Belt. Its loss to housing would signal a medium term risk of new housing mushrooming along Flawforth lane where developers are already sufficiently encouraged to approach landowners for development options. We can confirm this by first-hand experience by the unsolicited approaches we have received for Nursery House from mainstream house builders.

Objection 7

The words of the EIP planning inspector when he stated in his recommendations and modifications:-

“All planning decisions have to be based on the planning merits of a case rather than on the numbers of people for and against”

What he was implying is that most people given a choice prefer not to have development in their own back-yard. This is why the majority view resulting from the Parish Council`s questionnaire opted to see new housing to the East of Loughborough Road.......with two non-sustainable sites (RD 05 and RD13) in our judgement a major incursion into the GB with no defensible boundaries potentially leading to longer term undesirable development pressure.

The Parish Council has opted to support the draft allocations at RD 5 and RD13 largely on grounds that “fewer people would be affected”. This is not what good planning is about.

The Borough Councils published report `Landscape and Visual Analysis of Potential development sites` has been used to score each of the Borough wide
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LOCAL PLAN 2- Rushcliffe Borough Council

From Michael and Diane TEBBUTT
WE OBJECT to the Borough Councils Proposed Housing Allocations at Ruddington - for the following reasons:-

Two principal Issues:-

1 Housing Numbers (objections 1-3)
2 The Green Belt (objections 4-7)

Objection 1.

At the EIP to consider the Core Strategy the inspector recommended a modification to the plan to the effect:-

"Any increase in 13,150 is to be reviewed on a collaborative basis with partner local authorities across greater Nottingham"

The Borough Council is unilaterally increasing the number and has failed to disclose any evidence that such a review and consultation has been undertaken. Merely stating they have consulted is insufficient. This is particularly relevant as a substantial part of the overall Borough requirement is already committed and concentrated in the Green Belt swathe between Edwalton/Tollerton and Gamston and to further erode the Green Belt to the East of Loughborough Road at Ruddington without proper consideration of cross border opportunities constitutes a major failing.

Objection 2

We object to any further land being removed from the Green Belt to the East of Loughborough Road Ruddington. The housing requirement (250) has now been satisfied on windfall sites at Asher Lane Ruddington and at Rempstone Road, East Leake. In total these two sites will deliver 410 units the details of which are as follows:-

1 Since publication of LP2 planning permission for 175 homes has been allowed on appeal on land off Asher Lane Ruddington. (APP/P3040/W17/3185493). This constitutes a major windfall towards the 250 homes originally proposed for Ruddington.
2 In November 2017 the Borough Council had a further windfall when on appeal planning permission was granted on Land North of Rempstone Road, East Leake. (APP/P3040/W/17/3178343. This development is for up to 235 dwellings. This location to the South of Ruddington is for land beyond the designated Green Belt. The Borough’s overall housing numbers and current supply with planning permission has been boosted by these recently allowed appeal decisions. This has weakened the Councils argument to increase supply by 2,000 units (beyond the LP1 target of 13,150 units) and will allow the Council to review its plans and not to unnecessarily remove land from the Green Belt especially so far as this affects Ruddington.

Objection 3

The omission to recognise the eventual capacity of delivery from the strategic allocated sites is forcing an unreasonable burden on the key settlements and further unnecessary loss of Green Belt land.

1 It should be recognised that Rushcliffe’s strategic allocations in LP1 all under-estimate total house building capacity. In the case of Clifton (recently approved by planning committee for up to 3000 homes) this is potentially by up to 500 units (source: Clifton Development Consortium). The major strategic allocations will eventually deliver more houses through increased build densities than currently anticipated and their delivery performance will be accelerated because each will have up to 4 main-stream house builders building in tandem as is now happening from the Edwalton site.
Objection 4

The Borough Council has ignored Government Policy to attach great importance to Green Belts and the five fundamental purposes of the Green Belt set out in the NPPF. (Para 80)

The NPPF states that development within the GB should only be permitted in ‘Exceptional Circumstances’ and states that unmet housing need for new homes is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the very special circumstances justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt.

The Borough Council’s assessment for each of the ‘Green Belt sites’ under consideration as part of LP2 seeks to compare and score them against the five purposes of the Green Belt. In his decision the inspector for the Asher Lane appeal clearly did not agree with the Councils conclusions. Indeed he was highly critical of sites RD 13 and RD 05 (both to the East of Loughborough Road) and made the following points in his decision letter dated 23rd May 2018:-

1. “the evidence base and the Councils reasons for its preferred allocation of sites at Ruddington are issues that are relevant to this case and to which I attached considerable weight” (para 54)
2. “development on the Council’s preferred sites would clearly, even by its own admission, create more harm in terms of the 5 purposes of the Green Belt in the NPPF para 80” (para 61)
3. “RUD05 and RUD13 lie on the east side of the A60 unlike the village which lies on its west. There is some development on Flawforth Lane and Flawforth Avenue and RUD 05 adjoins it. But at RUD 13 which would take its access off the Mere Road roundabout, there is no existing development on the east side of the A60. Both sites, and especially RUD 13, would be disconnected from the heart of the village, with relatively poor accessibility (when compared with the appeal site). In my opinion the A60 acts as a considerable physical and visual barrier to development on the eastern side of the village. Neither site (RD 05 and RUD 13) would follow the historic morphology of the village and neither would have strong or defensible boundaries, merely field hedges” (para 58)

Objection 5

Sites RD 05 and RD 13 should be removed from the plan.

The area to the East of Loughborough Road is in our view ‘prime’ Green Belt and its loss would be the opening moves in a longer term eastward expansion of the village. New homes here would place overly reliance on the use of the motor car to access the village services. Our views were supported by the Inspector handling the Asher Lane appeal in his critical analysis of the Borough Council’s preferred options (RD 05 and RUD 13)

Site RD5 (South of Flawforth Lane) has variously been stated to be a ‘brownfield site’ yet it does not appear on the Conncll’s register of brownfield sites. This site is established for agricultural/horticultural use within the defined Green Belt. Its loss to housing would signal a medium term risk of new housing mushrooming along Flawforth lane where developers are already sufficiently encouraged to approach landowners for development options. We can confirm this by first-hand experience by the unsolicited approaches we have received for Nursery House from mainstream house builders.

Objection 7

The words of the EIP planning inspector when he stated in his recommendations and modifications:-

“All planning decisions have to be based on the planning merits of a case rather than on the numbers of people for and against”

What he was implying is that most people given a choice prefer not to have development in their own back-yard. This is why the majority view resulting from the Parish Council’s questionnaire opted to see new housing to the East of Loughborough Road……with two non-sustainable sites (RD 05
and RD13) in our judgement a major incursion into the GB with no defensible boundaries potentially leading to longer term undesirable development pressure.

The Parish Council has opted to support the draft allocations at RD 5 and RD13 largely on grounds that "fewer people would be affected". This is not what good planning is about.

The Borough Councils published report `Landscape and Visual Analysis of Potential development sites` has been used to score each of the Borough wide allocated sites in terms of their `relative landscape and visual affects`. The Inspector in The North Road East Leake appeal concluded that the report was of limited value. (see APP/P3040/W/17/3178343 at para’s 18-20)

The Council has failed to consider on a site specific basis the impact of sites RD5 and RD 13 on the openness and visual impact their loss would have to the landscape value of the Green Belt and.....

1. Failed to adequately consult and identify sites out with the Green Belt in the areas of neighbouring authorities.
2. Erroneously under-estimated delivery from the LP1 strategic sites
3. Over-estimated the requirement for Ruddinton through a cavalier approach as a panic defence to show a 5 year land supply
4. Shown complete contempt for the importance of the Green Belt and the Councils own policy statements to protect it.
5. Pampering to Ruddinton Parish Council by opting for sites `of least public resistance`.
6. Failed to take into account recent planning appeal decisions which contain critical comments from appeal inquiry inspectors.

---------------------------------------------------------------
Michael and Diane Tebbutt
June 2018

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) Justified
. Consistent with national policy

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

LOCAL PLAN 2- Rushcliffe Borough Council
From Michael and Diane TEBBUTT

WE OBJECT to the Borough Councils Proposed Housing Allocations at Ruddington - for the following reasons:

Two principal Issues:

1. Housing Numbers (objections 1-3)
2. The Green Belt (objections 4-7)

Objection 1.

At the EIP to consider the Core Strategy the inspector recommended a modification to the plan to the effect:

"Any increase in 13,150 is to be reviewed on a collaborative basis with partner local authorities across greater Nottingham"

The Borough Council is unilaterally increasing the number and has failed to disclose any evidence that such a review and consultation has been undertaken. Merely stating they have consulted is insufficient. This is particularly relevant as a substantial part of the overall Borough requirement is already committed and concentrated in the Green Belt swathe between Edwalton /Tollerton and Gamston and to further erode the Green Belt to the East of Loughborough Road at Ruddington without proper consideration of cross border opportunities constitutes a major failing.

Objection 2

We object to any further land being removed from the Green Belt to the East of Loughborough Road Ruddington. The housing requirement (250) has now been satisfied on windfall sites at Asher Lane Ruddington and at Rempstone Road, East Leake. In total these two sites will deliver 410 units the details of which are as follows:

1. Since publication of LP2 planning permission for 175 homes has been allowed on appeal on land off Asher Lane Ruddington. (APP/P3040/W17/3185493). This constitutes a major windfall towards the 250 homes originally proposed for Ruddington.
2. In November 2017 the Borough Council had a further windfall when on appeal planning permission was granted on Land North of Rempstone Road, East Leake. (APP/P3040/W/17/3178343. This development is for up to 235 dwellings. This location to the South of Ruddington is for land beyond the designated Green Belt.

The Borough’s overall housing numbers and current supply with planning permission has been boosted by these recently allowed appeal decisions. This has weakened the Councils argument to increase supply by 2,000 units (beyond the LP1 target of 13,150 units) and will allow the Council to review its plans and not to unnecessarily remove land from the Green Belt especially so far as this affects Ruddington.

Objection 3

The omission to recognise the eventual capacity of delivery from the strategic allocated sites is forcing an unreasonable burden on the key settlements and further unnecessary loss of Green Belt land.

1. It should be recognised that Rushcliffe’s strategic allocations in LP1 all under-estimate total house building capacity. In the case of Clifton (recently approved by planning committee for up to 3000 homes) this is potentially by up to 500 units (source: Clifton Development Consortium). The major strategic allocations will eventually deliver more houses through increased build densities than currently anticipated and their delivery
performance will be accelerated because each will have up to 4 main-stream house builders building in tandem as is now happening from the Edwalton site.

Objection 4

The Borough Council has ignored Government Policy to attach great importance to Green Belts and the five fundamental purposes of the Green Belt set out in the NPPF. (Para 80)

The NPPF states that development within the GB should only be permitted in `Exceptional Circumstances` and states that unmet housing need for new homes is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the very special circumstances justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt.

The Borough Council`s assessment for each of the `Green Belt sites ` under consideration as part of LP2 seeks to compare and score them against the five purposes of the Green Belt. In his decision the inspector for the Asher Lane appeal clearly did not agree with the Councils conclusions. Indeed he was highly critical of sites RD 13 and RD 05 (both to the East of Loughborough Road) and made the following points in his decision letter dated 23rd May 2018:-

1 “the evidence base and the Councils reasons for its preferred allocation of sites at Ruddington are issues that are relevant to this case and to which I attached considerable weight” (para 54)
1 “development on the Council`s preferred sites would clearly ,even by its own admission, create more harm in terms of the 5 purposes of the Green Belt in the NPPF para 80”(para 61)
1 “RUD05 and RUD13 lie on the east side of the A60 unlike the village which lies on its west. There is some development on Flawforth Lane and Flawforth Avenue and RUD 05 adjoins it. But at RUD 13, which would take its access off the Mere Road roundabout, there is no existing development on the east side of the A60. Both sites, and especially RUD 13, would be disconnected from the heart of the village, with relatively poor accessibility (when compared with the appeal site). In my opinion the A60 acts as a considerable physical and visual barrier to development on the eastern side of the village. Neither site (RD 05 and RD 13) would follow the historic morphology of the village and neither would have strong or defensible boundaries, merely field hedges” (para 58)

Objection 5

Sites RD 05 and RD 13 should be removed from the plan.

The area to the East of Loughborough Road is in our view `prime` Green Belt and its loss would be the opening moves in a longer term eastward expansion of the village. New homes here would place overly reliance on the use of the motor car to access the village services. Our views were supported by the Inspector handling the Asher Lane appeal in his critical analysis of the Borough Council`s preferred options (RD 05 and RUD 13)

Site RD5 (South of Flawforth Lane) has variously been stated to be a `brownfield site` yet it does not appear on the Conncil`s register of brownfield sites. This site is established for agricultural/horticultural use within the defined Green Belt. Its loss to housing would signal a medium term risk of new housing mushrooming along Flawforth where developers are already sufficiently encouraged to approach landowners for development options. We can confirm this by first-hand experience by the unsolicited approaches we have received for Nursery House from mainstream house builders.

Objection 7

The words of the EIP planning inspector when he stated in his recommendations and modifications:-

“All planning decisions have to be based on the planning merits of a case rather than on the numbers of people for and against”

What he was implying is that most people given a choice prefer not to have development in their own back-yard. This is why the majority view resulting from the Parish Council`s questionnaire opted to
see new housing to the East of Loughborough Road…….with two non-sustainable sites (RD 05 and RD13) in our judgement a major incursion into the GB with no defensible boundaries potentially leading to longer term undesirable development pressure.

The Parish Council has opted to support the draft allocations at RD 5 and RD13 largely on grounds that “fewer people would be affected”. This is not what good planning is about.

The Borough Councils published report “Landscape and Visual Analysis of Potential development sites” has been used to score each of the Borough wide allocated sites in terms of their “relative landscape and visual affects”. The Inspector in The North Road East Leake appeal concluded that the report was of limited value. (see APP/P3040/W/17/3178343 at para’s 18-20)

The Council has failed to consider on a site specific basis the impact of sites RD5 and RD 13 on the openness and visual impact their loss would have to the landscape value of the Green Belt and…..

1 Failed to adequately consult and identify sites out with the Green Belt in the areas of neighbouring authorities.
2 Erroneously under-estimated delivery from the LP1 strategic sites
3 Over-estimated the requirement for Ruddinton through a cavalier approach as a panic defence to show a 5 year land supply
4 Shown complete contempt for the importance of the Green Belt and the Councils own policy statements to protect it.
5 Pampering to Ruddinton Parish Council by opting for sites `of least public resistance`.
6 Failed to take into account recent planning appeal decisions which contain critical comments from appeal inquiry inspectors.

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).

LOCAL PLAN 2- Rushcliffe Borough Council
From Michael and Diane TEBBUTT

WE OBJECT to the Borough Councils Proposed Housing Allocations at Ruddington - for the following reasons:-
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1 Housing Numbers (objections 1-3)
2 The Green Belt (objections 4-7)
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At the EIP to consider the Core Strategy the inspector recommended a modification to the plan to the effect:-
"Any increase in 13,150 is to be reviewed on a collaborative basis with partner local authorities across greater Nottingham"

The Borough Council is unilaterally increasing the number and has failed to disclose any evidence that such a review and consultation has been undertaken. Merely stating they have consulted is insufficient. This is particularly relevant as a substantial part of the overall Borough requirement is already committed and concentrated in the Green Belt swathe between Edwalton /Tollerton and Gamston and to further erode the Green Belt to the East of Loughborough Road at Ruddington without proper consideration of cross border opportunities constitutes a major failing.
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We object to any further land being removed from the Green Belt to the East of Loughborough Road Ruddington. The housing requirement (250) has now been satisfied on windfall sites at Asher Lane Ruddington and at Rempstone Road, East Leake. In total these two sites will deliver 410 units the details of which are as follows:

1. Since publication of LP2 planning permission for 175 homes has been allowed on appeal on land off Asher Lane Ruddington. (APP/P3040/W17/3185493). This constitutes a major windfall towards the 250 homes originally proposed for Ruddington.

2. In November 2017 the Borough Council had a further windfall when on appeal planning permission was granted on Land North of Rempstone Road, East Leake. (APP/P3040/W/17/3178343. This development is for up to 235 dwellings. This location to the South of Ruddington is for land beyond the designated Green Belt.

The Borough’s overall housing numbers and current supply with planning permission has been boosted by these recently allowed appeal decisions. This has weakened the Councils argument to increase supply by 2,000 units (beyond the LP1 target of 13,150 units) and will allow the Council to review its plans and not to unnecessarily remove land from the Green Belt especially so far as this affects Ruddington.

Objection 3

The omission to recognise the eventual capacity of delivery from the strategic allocated sites is forcing an unreasonable burden on the key settlements and further unnecessary loss of Green Belt land.

1. It should be recognised that Rushcliffe’s strategic allocations in LP1 all under-estimate total house building capacity. In the case of Clifton (recently approved by planning committee for up to 3000 homes) this is potentially by up to 500 units (source: Clifton Development Consortium). The major strategic allocations will eventually deliver more houses through increased build densities than currently anticipated and their delivery performance will be accelerated because each will have up to 4 main-stream house builders building in tandem as is now happening from the Edwalton site.
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The Borough Council has ignored Government Policy to attach great importance to Green Belts and the five fundamental purposes of the Green Belt set out in the NPPF. (Para 80)

The NPPF states that development within the GB should only be permitted in “Exceptional Circumstances” and states that unmet housing need for new homes is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the very special circumstances justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt.

The Borough Council’s assessment for each of the Green Belt sites under consideration as part of LP2 seeks to compare and score them against the five purposes of the Green Belt. In his decision the inspector for the Asher Lane appeal clearly did not agree with the Councils conclusions. Indeed he
was highly critical of sites RD 13 and RD 05 (both to the East of Loughborough Road) and made the following points in his decision letter dated 23rd May 2018:-

1 “the evidence base and the Councils reasons for its preferred allocation of sites at Ruddington are issues that are relevant to this case and to which I attached considerable weight” (para 54)
1 “development on the Council’s preferred sites would clearly ,even by its own admission, create more harm in terms of the 5 purposes of the Green Belt in the NPPF para 80”(para 61)
1 “RUD05 and RUD13 lie on the east side of the A60 unlike the village which lies on its west. There is some development on Flawforth Lane and Flawforth Avenue and RUD 05 adjoins it. But at RUD 13, which would take its access off the Mere Road roundabout, there is no existing development on the east side of the A60. Both sites, and especially RUD 13, would be disconnected from the heart of the village, with relatively poor accessibility (when compared with the appeal site). In my opinion the A60 acts as a considerable physical and visual barrier to development on the eastern side of the village. Neither site (RD 05 and RD 13) would follow the historic morphology of the village and neither would have strong or defensible boundaries, merely field hedges” (para 58)

Objection 5
Sites RD 05 and RD 13 should be removed from the plan.

The area to the East of Loughborough Road is in our view ‘prime’ Green Belt and its loss would be the opening moves in a longer term eastward expansion of the village. New homes here would place overly reliance on the use of the motor car to access the village services. Our views were supported by the Inspector handling the Asher Lane appeal in his critical analysis of the Borough Council’s preferred options (RD 05 and RUD 13)

Site RD5 (South of Flawforth Lane) has variously been stated to be a ‘brownfield site’ yet it does not appear on the Connec of brownfield sites. This site is established for agricultural/horticultural use within the defined Green Belt. Its loss to housing would signal a medium term risk of new housing mushrooming along Flawforth lane where developers are already sufficient encouraged to approach landowners for development options. We can confirm this by first-hand experience by the unsolicited approaches we have received for Nursery House from mainstream house builders.

Objection 7

The words of the EIP planning inspector when he stated in his recommendations and modifications:-

“All planning decisions have to be based on the planning merits of a case rather than on the numbers of people for and against”

What he was implying is that most people given a choice prefer not to have development in their own back-yard. This is why the majority view resulting from the Parish Council’s questionnaire opted to see new housing to the East of Loughborough Road……with two non-sustainable sites (RD 05 and RD13) in our judgement a major incursion into the GB with no defensible boundaries potentially leading to longer term undesirable development pressure.

The Parish Council has opted to support the draft allocations at RD 5 and RD13 largely on grounds that “fewer people would be affected”. This is not what good planning is about.

The Borough Councils published report ‘Landscape and Visual Analysis of Potential development sites” has been used to score each of the Borough wide allocated sites in terms of their ‘relative landscape and visual affects’. The Inspector in The North Road East Leake appeal concluded that the report was of limited value. (see APP/P3040/W/17/3178343 at para’s 18-20)

The Council has failed to consider on a site specific basis the impact of sites RD5 and RD 13 on the openeness and visual impact their loss would have to the landscape value of the Green Belt and…..

1 Failed to adequately consult and identify sites out with the Green Belt in the areas of neighbouring authorities.
2 Erroneously under-estimated delivery from the LP1 strategic sites
Over-estimated the requirement for Ruddinton through a cavalier approach as a panic defence to show a 5 year land supply.

Shown complete contempt for the importance of the Green Belt and the Councils own policy statements to protect it.

Pampering to Ruddinton Parish Council by opting for sites `of least public resistance`.

Failed to take into account recent planning appeal decisions which contain critical comments from appeal inquiry inspectors.

Michael and Diane Tebbutt

June 2018

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.

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.

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.
allocated sites in terms of their `relative landscape and visual affects`. The Inspector in The North Road East Leake appeal concluded that the report was of limited value. (see APP/P3040/W/17/3178343 at para`s 18-20)

The Council has failed to consider on a site specific basis the impact of sites RD5 and RD 13 on the openness and visual impact their loss would have to the landscape value of the Green Belt and.....

- Failed to adequately consult and identify sites out with the Green Belt in the areas of neighbouring authorities.
- Erroneously under-estimated delivery from the LP1 strategic sites
- Over-estimated the requirement for Ruddington through a cavalier approach as a panic defence to show a 5 year land supply
- Shown complete contempt for the importance of the Green Belt and the Councils own policy statements to protect it.
- *Pampering* to Ruddington Parish Council by opting for sites `of least public resistance`.
- Failed to take into account recent planning appeal decisions which contain critical comments from appeal inquiry inspectors.

……………………………………..  …………………………………………….

Michael and Diane Tebbutt

June 2018
Dear Mr Mapletoft

Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2
Community Involvement Consultation

I wish to object to the proposal to allocate up to 125 houses on land behind East Bridgford Surgery Medical Centre. This proposal did not form part of the original public consultation and has crept in at a much later date. The proposal is completely out of line with the village envelope and conservation area.

In addition, East Bridgford has several infrastructure issues which will only be made worse by any proposed development.

1. East Bridgford Primary School is bursting at the seams and could not accommodate any more children
2. The drains and sewers in the village constructed at a time when the village was much smaller are now inadequate for its current size.
3. The village has serious parking and through traffic issues

I oppose the proposal.

Yours sincerely

Mrs Patricia Temple
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

Helena Tesauro

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

Dear Sir,

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

MRS. K. L. THORLEY
The attached emails have come to me via our MP, Robert Jenrick.

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Sue Tomlinson
> Sent: 10 May 2018 10:40
> To:
> Subject: N
> >
> > Dear Robert
> >
> > I hope this email finds you well. I am writing as I am very concerned about the impact of the proposed 125 homes will have in the fabric of East Bridgford. I live next door to St Peters school a fabulous village school which is already bursting at the seams and drawing in large numbers of cars in the morning and afternoon. The congestion causes a real problem for local residents already. Main Street is completely clogged at rush hour as commuters use it as a cut through to avoid the hold up nearer to Bingham. Rushcliffe council has not done a traffic survey to identify what issues there currently are and what the impact of over 150 new cars will have on the village. Would it be possible to put some pressure on the council to do a traffic survey?
> >
> > Thank you for your time
> >
> > Best wishes
> >
> > Sent from my iPhone
> From:
> Sent: 11 May 2018 10:03
> To:
> Subject: Fwd: Greenbelt Development East Bridgford
Subject:  
Date: 11 May 2018, 07:50  
To: Cllr N Lawrence <

I wish for it to be noted by yourself and the council that myself and the majority of the residents of East Bridgford oppose this newly planned development.

EB is indeed a small, vibrant community, but is already struggling in terms of roads, pavements, doctors surgery, schools, parking and traffic.

On another note, when myself and my husband made enquiries to the planning office at RBC regards the building of one eco home in EB on greenbelt (as EB residents) we were refused. So why the change of heart on such a massive scale?? It would seem to me that there is something not right here.

I will be attending the meeting in EB village hall to voice my opinion.
Dear Sir,

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Brian Topham
Muriel Topham
Dear Sir,

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Josie A. Towle
Dear Sir,

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,
Dear Sir/Madam,

With regard to the LAPP published by Rushcliffe Borough Council, I find that it is not compliant in its duty to cooperate with the emerging Gotham Neighbourhood Plan, nor with the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government guidelines (see attached letter).

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

It is unsound in that it has not looked at alternative sites proposed by Gotham Parish Council. From the GPC document published on your website: "Why 'green field' only? There are brown field sites to be considered too. Indeed one of the Core Planning principles in the NPPF states: 'encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brown field land), provided that it is not of high environmental value'. There is no attempt shown by RBC in this document to use brown field sites first before taking out green belt land. Across the borough RBC may argue that they handle brown field site as a different resource but looking from the local community it is important to use our brown field sites first before losing our green belt."

It is unsound in that it unnecessarily removes land from the Green Belt.

It is non-compliant in that there is no mention in the Plan of access to the GOTSa site. From the GPC document published on your website: Access. Some sites show that the background paper has been edited from an original that analysed sites differently: in particular comments on GOTSa and 5b come from an analysis of the sites together as GOTS. This shows a lack of attention to important detail and casts doubt on the analyses made and the decisions based on them.

Further evidence for this lack of attention to detail is shown in the fact that Rushcliffe’s Representation Form re LAPP 2 is headed Harrogate District Local Plan Publication Draft... In other words, Rushcliffe Planning Department is understaffed and overwhelmed!

Rushcliffe is working on outdated housing targets that 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 housing targets for Rushcliffe at 600 per year. Rushcliffe's own Core Strategy states that housing allocations in villages like Gotham should be for local needs only.

The LAPP Policies Plan for Gotham should be redrawn to include GOT1 and GOT3 within the inset boundary.

The LAPP Policies Plan for Gotham should be redrawn to remove GOTSa and GOT4 from the inset boundary.

Incidentally, Gotham does not mean "goat home" as reported in Focus on Gotham in the latest Rushcliffe Reports. Do not trust Wikipedia!

Shape up Rushcliffe Planning Department!

Yours faithfully,

Mrs Hazel M Trobridge
Dear Mrs Trobridge

Thank you for your letter of 21 February about neighbourhood plans.

Due to the ministerial quasi-judicial role in the planning system, I cannot comment on specific planning cases. However, I can respond in general terms to the concerns raised about neighbourhood planning.

Neighbourhood planning gives communities direct power to develop a shared vision for the future of their area. Communities can decide the location of new homes, employment, shops and services, protect local green spaces and heritage, and set policies on the design of new buildings. Once a neighbourhood plan comes into force, it becomes part of the statutory development plan and must be a starting point for planning application decisions.

The recently updated draft National Planning Policy Framework is clear about the important role that neighbourhood plans play in our plan-led system. The draft:

- confirms the protection for neighbourhood plans from speculative development.
- encourages neighbourhood planning groups to consider allocating small sites suitable for housing in their area.
- highlights the important roles neighbourhood plans can play on design.

We have placed a lot of information online at https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-communities-and-local-government and trust this is helpful. In many cases, your local authority may be better placed to answer questions. You can find your local council by entering your postcode at https://www.gov.uk/find-local-council

Carmella Hollett
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>Mrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Name</strong></td>
<td>Nicola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Name</strong></td>
<td>Truslove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation</strong></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job title</strong></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 1</strong></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 2</strong></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 3</strong></td>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 4</strong></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address – line 5</strong></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postcode</strong></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-mail Address</strong></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone Number</strong></td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part B (please use a separate Part B form for each representation)

Name/Organisation: Nicola Truslove

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 10 Housing –Land North of Park Lane Sutton Bonington

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

- Page no.: 55-57
- Paragraph no.: 3.103-3.107
- Policy ref.: Choose an item.
- 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.
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.

As a resident of Charnwood Fields I would like to raise concerns about the Park Lane proposal (its soundness, effectiveness and justification) which threatens to detract from my ability to maintain my property and our (my families) enjoyment of my home and garden.

Size Increase of the Village
I understand from the Local Residents Committee that the development would increase the size of the village by 13%. I see this as too great an increase for a settlement of this size. It would destroy the rural character of the village by bringing what will be quite a high density of houses into a green field and basically connecting it (sprawling) into Normanton. There must be better sites which could accommodate this number of houses without that scale of impact on one village.

I can also see that the size of the proposal has been reduced from the whole field in the Core Strategy to about 60% of it in the Local Plan Part 2. If the remaining 40% is not to be developed (as a graduate in Countryside Management myself) I cant see a farming tenant wanting to manage that remaining piece in the long term. Are RBC seriously telling the people of Rushcliffe that the remaining 40% wont then come forward for future development proposals? I do feel that reduction is entirely procedural and as such have lost a great deal of faith in the process being presented this time. If a slice is being left then surely it would make sense to use it to mitigate the impacts in the existing residents by increasing the landscaping / green buffer on the village rather than the road edge.

Privacy
I am concerned that a new development across the back of Charnwood Fields and Charnwood Avenue would see houses built too close to those existing residents. We enjoy our gardens / countryside view / privacy and with new build being squeezed in so tightly these days, it would be a very great shame if suddenly new houses were built within 20m of our garden which badly overlooked our property.

Flooding
Our garden has always been water-logged in the wetter months in the piece nearest the field and we have even seen leaches on the tree at that end. I understand the roof water goes to a soakaway and it is clear just from looking over the hedge that the field drains down towards the existing houses. I am concerned that a developer wouldn’t be able to provide adequate flood water management in this low lying field and wouldn’t properly link their system to the existing out of date one on the village boundary.
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”).

Taking Sutton Bonington out of the Local Plan Part 2 and placing the 80 houses on to the larger sites in the borough.

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:

I am a resident of Charnwood Avenue and my enjoyment of the rural landscape, the quiet, the privacy and the 'sense of place' will be severely impacted by a development in that location.

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 20/06/2018

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,

Bethany Rippon
Nathan Turner.