

Ruddington Neighbourhood Plan

Regulation 4(3)(b)(iii). Summary of Representations Received Submitted to the Independent Examiner.

Respondent	Summary of Representation
Boniface J	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan is a robust document that will support the sustainable development of the village. Policy 20 should require all new developments are zero carbon in terms of both construction operation.
Boniface T	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan is a robust document that will support the sustainable development of the village. Policy 20 should require all new developments are zero carbon in terms of both construction operation.
Coal Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific comments made on the policies or proposals within the Neighbourhood Plan.
Cunningham A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan provides little support for the improvements to parking provision in the village centre, highlighting negative problems. Little attention is given to the access needs of older residents. Parking and public transport require serious attention, if objectives are to be achieved. Map 5's retail frontages should include Church Street.
Davies S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be stricter requirements on amount of off-road parking per house. New housing development should provide two off-road parking spaces per house.
Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EA welcome the wording of design code M3 with regards to the requirement of major development to incorporate suitable biodiversity net gain. EA highlight the opportunity to support sustainable development that is resilient to future climate change within Policy 20. They recommend that to support the opportunity to minimise the use of water for all new residential development to meet the tighter water efficiency measures of 110 litres per person per day. Welcome Policy 21's highlighting benefits of development to net-gain and blue-green infrastructure. Welcome Policy 22's requirement for net-gain. Welcome Policy 24's requirement to enhance and create blue-green infrastructure.
Highways England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further comments provided.
Lanzoni L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fully supports the plan

OFFICIAL

Respondent	Summary of Representation
National Grid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Grid has identified that it has no record of National Grid electricity or gas assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area.
Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England does not have any specific comments on this submission version of the Ruddington Neighbourhood Plan.
NHS Nottingham and Nottinghamshire CCG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highlight that they will continue to require contributions from developments of more than 25 dwellings (£600 for 1 bed and £920 for 2 bed dwellings)
NHS Property Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy 25 should be amended as follows: <i>“Applications should avoid negatively impacting or lead to the loss of community assets identified in appendix 2, unless they can be replaced by equal or better provision elsewhere; <u>or in the case of health facilities, unless the loss is part of a wider public service transformation plan which requires investment in modern, fit for purpose infrastructure and facilities to meet future population needs or to sustain and improve services.</u>”</i> Paragraph 14.1 should include: <i>“<u>As such, Ruddington Parish Council will work with the clinical commissioning group and NHS bodies to understand the relationship growth has with their services and what this means for preparing a development strategy</u>”</i> Paragraph 14.2 should read: <i>“Existing facilities will be safeguarded from future development to prevent the loss of these services <u>unless as with the case of health facilities it can be demonstrated that the land or buildings are surplus to the operational healthcare requirements of the NHS</u>”</i>
Nottinghamshire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The County Council has no objections to the plan from a minerals or waste, or strategic highways perspective.
Potter J	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highlighted concerns regarding the Design Guide, which doesn't protect longstanding character, and erosion of the village edge. Plan should address insensitive, uncharacteristic and obtrusive lighting.
Ramsden S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcomes the Design Guide Connectivity of new developments to central facilities is important, building on number of interconnected routes that already exist. More open spaces (similar to The Green) are required. Tram should be extended along Wilford Road from the Clifton branch.

Respondent	Summary of Representation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic 3 storey properties exist within Ruddington, similar 3 up / 3 down properties should be considered within new developments
Robertson J	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disappointed with the relative absence of references to developments for people who have disabilities. • Policy 2 should specify how the centre of the village might accommodate useful disabled parking areas, ensure shops are as wheelchair accessible as possible, have good signage for people with sensory disabilities, have sufficient dropped pavements on all roads and that those that do exist do not lead into significant pools of collected rainwater. • Policy 6 leaves the plan will support those who have disabilities to find affordable, sufficiently adapted housing unspecified and only loosely linked to the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part One policy 8. This does not offer much confidence to this group of people that they will be able to expect decent housing meeting their needs in the Ruddington area in the future. More explicit wording should be included in this plan for people with disabilities.
Severn Trent Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWT advise that Policy 2 include surface water attenuation through the use of source control SuDS, such as tree pits, bio-retention areas and rain garden. • Within Policy 16, SWT recommend that the neighbourhood Plan requires the use of water efficient technology, Water Efficiency and Energy Efficiency measures. • The Design Guide should include accounting for topography, natural features, BGI and drainage as key principles. • SWT recommend that SuDS and the Drainage Hierarchy are detailed within Policy 19 to ensure that these key design features considered by developers from the outset of the development process. • Sustainable design should consider other resources such as water, utilities and environmental resources. • Protection of watercourses should be incorporated into Policy 21 alongside the protection of trees and hedges.
Taylor Wimpey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taylor Wimpey have promoted their site which is east of Pasture Lane as an appropriate location for residential development. The Neighbourhood Plan should identify growth targets and identify sites for development, including this site, that conform with the strategic policies in the Local Plan.

OFFICIAL

Respondent	Summary of Representation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 12 is too prescriptive and should allow for parking beyond individual house plots. • Policy 13 includes requirement to enhance the conservation area. This imposes tighter controls which are not appropriate for a neighbourhood plan. • The plan should identify the location of views and vistas protected within Policy 15. • There is no clarity as to how proposals can demonstrate that one room could be a home office. There is no criteria proposed by which to make an assessment of a proposal. • The Design Guide does not comprise design codes for major or strategic development (it is design guidance for the whole parish) and mention of design codes should be dropped. • Policy 20 should define what is meant by: "...minimum standards for energy efficiency and construction quality." • Taylor Wimpey request further consideration or monitoring of the outcomes of the policies within the RNP and evaluation of the effectiveness of policies in a review of the RNP within a defined period of time. • Taylor Wimpey requested a pause in the plan making process to address their concerns and that the examiner convene a hearing to examine the Neighbourhood Plan