

When telephoning, please ask for: Martin Elliott
Direct dial 0115 914 8511
Email constitutionalservices@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Our reference:
Your reference:
Date: Wednesday, 17 January 2018



To all Members of the Planning Committee

Dear Councillor

Planning Committee – Thursday, 25 January 2018

The following is a schedule of representations received after the agenda for the Planning Committee was finalised.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Glen O'Connell'.

Glen O'Connell
Monitoring Officer

**Rushcliffe Community
Contact Centre**
Rectory Road
West Bridgford
Nottingham
NG2 6BU

In person
Monday to Friday
8.30am - 5pm
First Saturday of
each month
9am - 1pm

By telephone
Monday to Friday
8.30am - 5pm

Telephone:
0115 981 9911

Email:
customerservices@rushcliffe.gov.uk

www.rushcliffe.gov.uk

Postal address
Rushcliffe Borough
Council
Rushcliffe Arena
Rugby Road
West Bridgford
Nottingham
NG2 7YG

Membership

Chairman: Councillor R Butler
Vice-Chairman: Councillor J Stockwood
Councillors: B Buschman, N Clarke, R Jones, J Greenwood, Mrs M Males,
S Mallender, M Edwards, Mrs J Smith and J Thurman



Meeting Room Guidance

Fire Alarm Evacuation: in the event of an alarm sounding please evacuate the building using the nearest fire exit, normally through the Council Chamber. You should assemble at the far side of the plaza outside the main entrance to the building.

Toilets: are located to the rear of the building near the lift and stairs to the first floor.

Mobile Phones: For the benefit of others please ensure that your mobile phone is switched off whilst you are in the meeting.

Microphones: When you are invited to speak please press the button on your microphone, a red light will appear on the stem. Please ensure that you switch this off after you have spoken.

14/01417/OUT

Applicant C/o Oxalis Planning

Location Land East And West Of Nottingham Road, South Of Clifton,

Proposal Outline application for the development of a sustainable urban extension comprising residential development up to a maximum of 3000 dwellings, employment development incorporating a maximum of 100,000sqm of B1, B2 & B8 floorspace, retail development (A1 to A5) up to a maximum of 2500sqm of floorspace, community buildings, leisure uses, schools, gypsy & traveller pitches, access to the site, new roads, footpaths & cycleways, green infrastructure including new community park, ancillary infrastructure & groundworks

Ward Gotham

LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Objections

RECEIVED FROM: Four residents

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- a. Rushcliffe should not have to absorb a failure to build Nottingham City's housing requirement within the city boundary – preferably on brownfield sites.
- b. We need to consider being more self-sufficient due to Brexit. This land is needed to produce crops.
- c. Queries whether one primary school and no secondary school on the site is right. East Leake will not be able to cope.
- d. The minimum affordable housing should be at least 30%.
- e. Putting the SuDs pond to the low point to the southeast is admitting that this land is subject to flooding and will need considerable drainage provision to make building possible.
- f. Uncontrolled over-population in this country is the real reason in continued government policy of increased housing, which in turn has a drastic, destructive effect on our countryside we have now, when is the planning system going to learn to have some respect for the countryside, before it's too late.
- g. This will seriously affect all of the surrounding areas.

- h. Ruddington in particular lies in the middle of the infamous rat run between the A453 and Lings Bar – planning permission already exists for the building of 600 houses (Sharphill) and the addition of another 3000 at the other end will increase highway safety issues on the High Street.
- i. Suggests that the increase in Council Tax and grant from the government is a great incentive.
- j. Considers it is useless to object as letters of intent have been given to the different companies who will provide the services to this development and the necessary preliminary work carried out.
- k. There is some need for housing for low income families in this area but this type of housing does not provide the maximum profit that developers can make by building houses for those in the higher income bracket of which there is already a surplus.
- l. Suggests that a newly built house is poorly built.
- m. Consider the future for people who provide your salary.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

The points raised are considered within the Committee report – no additional comments are necessary

2. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Comments on highway issues

RECEIVED FROM: Gotham Parish Council

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

Gotham Parish Council has submitted further comments on highway matters which they advise should have been submitted following the consultation exercise that was undertaken in August and apologise for this oversight. These are a detailed response to traffic assessment information submitted throughout the application process. The full submission is available to view on the website and it makes reference to their own traffic survey carried out in May 2017. They summarise their comments as follows:

- a. Reject the statement that the issue of Nottingham Road is fully addressed in the TA and correct modelling procedure has been followed.
- b. They consider that Oxalis are attempting to duck the requirement in the Core Strategy to mitigate the traffic effects in Gotham caused by the Clifton South development.

- c. There is a disparity between the roads modelled in the TA and the Masterplan which shows Nottingham road as a major road in the development.
- d. Generally Gotham Parish Council finds the outcome of the GNTM (Greater Nottingham Transport Model) Modelling with respect to the local roads south of the site as unbelievable. They recommend that further studies are carried out to ensure the accuracy of the modelling and an examination is made of the assumptions input to the model that have produced this dubious outcome.
- e. In particular they recommend that further modelling is carried out to more accurately assess the Nottingham Road traffic and that recent survey data from NCC and GPC is used to calibrate the reference case.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

The information has been sent through to Nottinghamshire County Council as Highway Authority and the applicant for comments. Their comments are set out below and it is not considered that the position in relation to highway matters as set out in the report requires further update.

3. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Response to Gotham Parish Council's late response to highways matters

RECEIVED FROM: Planning Agent for the application

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- a. They have reviewed the matters raised and consider that all of these points have been adequately addressed in the extensive transport assessment work undertaken through the application process, including the Transport Assessment itself and then subsequent Transport Technical Notes. The culmination of this work has resulted in no objection to the proposal from either Highways England or the County Highway Authority.
- b. The issue of through traffic along Nottingham Road/Gotham Road has been a main issue in the work undertaken and detailed analysis of this matter has been undertaken to satisfy concerns previously raised by the community and indeed by NCC. The work undertaken demonstrates that the impacts of the proposal are acceptable.
- c. A condition has been proposed and agreed which seeks to monitor the effects of the scheme in terms of changes to through traffic (including to Gotham) and further mitigation would be required if the monitoring indicates that unexpected impacts have occurred.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

Points are noted – no change to report required.

4. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Response to Gotham Parish Council late highways submission

RECEIVED FROM: Nottingham County Council as Highway Authority

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

The Highway Authority (HA) comments that it is unfortunate that the information was received so late in the process. They have reviewed the content and whilst it is not considered appropriate to respond to every point raised in detail the following points are raised in relation to the summary (the points raised by the Parish Council are reproduced in italics with the summary of the HA comments below):

2.1 We reject the statement in 2.11 that ‘The issue of Nottingham Road is fully addressed in the TA and the correct modelling procedure has been followed.’ We believe Oxalis are attempting to duck the requirement in the Core Strategy to mitigate the traffic effects in Gotham caused by the Clifton South development.

As stated in the formal comments from the HA, there is no way to absolutely model how Nottingham Road will function as a result of the development. Nottingham Road will be realigned to provide a more tortuous alignment and discourage traffic. Unfortunately there is no provision within the model to cater for this. The model only has the ability to consider the effect of the road being fully opened or fully closed. What has been modelled is the two extremes. With Nottingham Road closed to traffic there is limited impact as traffic does not route through the estate, whereas with Nottingham Road open the route becomes more attractive to rat running potentially impacting on Gotham, Clifton and Ruddington. The extent of the rat running will depend on how easy and convenient it is to cut through the estate and whether motorists can save time by doing so. In reality the absolute scenario will sit somewhere between the two extremes and will be very much dependant on the internal road layout and how successful this is in discouraging traffic from using the route as a cut through.

The only way to fully determine the impact of the scheme and the success of the Nottingham Road diversion measures is to measure traffic on the ground. To this end we have secured a condition which requires the developer to establish baseline traffic conditions prior to commencement of works and monitor traffic impacts as the development is built out. Should the monitoring indicate that traffic is not routing as desired and this is having a severe impact on adjacent villages and junctions then there will be recourse via this condition to force developer to install further measures to encourage traffic back to within acceptable levels.

2.2 There is a disparity between the roads as modelled in the TA and the Master Plan which shows Nottingham Road as a major road in the development.

As the application is in an outline form and no specific details have been provided for how Nottingham Road will be diverted, it is difficult to comment at this stage as to what form the revised alignment will take. Success of the scheme will be very dependent on the detailed design of the internal layout. We would want it designing such that it would push the distribution of traffic as close as possible to the modelled scenario where Nottingham Road is closed and will endeavour to secure this via reserved matters applications.

2.3 Generally GPC finds the outcome of the GNTM modelling with respect to the local roads south of site as unbelievable. We recommend that further studies are carried out to ensure the accuracy of the modelling and an examination is made of the assumptions input to the model that have produced this dubious outcome.

As stated in the HA formal comments, there is no absolute way to model all scenarios and extensive modelling has been undertaken to date. Requiring further modelling at this stage would be considered unreasonable. The condition referred to above places a requirement to monitor traffic as the development progresses and offers the opportunity to react to any impacts should traffic not behave as predicted.

2.4 In particular we recommend that further modelling is carried out to more accurately assess the Nottingham Road traffic, and that recent survey data from NCC and GPC is used to calibrate the Reference case.

As above.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

The response of the County Council is clear and reflects the position as set out in the report. Conditions are already suggested in relation to the monitoring and have been agreed with the County. No further update needed.

5. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Updated comments

RECEIVED FROM: NET (Nottingham Express Transit)

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

Initial concern was raised that the design of the proposed junction on the access road between Mill Hill roundabout and the NET park and ride would prevent vehicles leaving the new development turning right directly into the NET park and ride site which could affect custom. Queries were raised in relation to this and it was requested that this design was reconsidered. Information was received from the applicant stating that

“The junction will not operate within capacity with the right-turn in place as it would require a third phase at the traffic lights. That is not the reason it was removed however as this was done so as to encourage Clifton SUE residents to walk or cycle to the P&R and not drive and tests using the GNTM showed no difference in take-up either with or without the right-turn in place.”

Following receipt of additional information in relation to the forecast changes in traffic flow on the access link to the Park and Ride they comment that it is helpful to understand the operation of this access road junction and confirm that this arrangement is acceptable subject to appropriate vehicle access being provided from the development with suitable signing arrangements. Any works should ensure access to the Park and Ride facility remain unimpeded.

They confirm that there is a general willingness to work together with the applicant moving forward.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

An additional informative is proposed to state:

The access road to the Park and Ride site from Mill Hill is a private road within the ownership of NET/City Council. Continued dialogue with the NET/City Council regarding the use of their access is recommended and proposed developers should be aware of the need to ensure access to the Park and Ride facility remain unimpeded at all times and appropriate signage may be required to be displayed to show how access can be achieved by vehicle if necessary.

Bearing in mind the comments of the County Council it is not considered that signage should be requested by condition as it is not necessary to make the development acceptable.

6. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** In response to NET comments

RECEIVED FROM: Nottingham County Council
Highways

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

From the County Councils perspective they would not wish to encourage residents to drive to the park and ride. Considerable effort has been put into securing footway and cycle links to and from the development in order to encourage sustainable (non-motorised) travel.

Providing a right turn facility to encourage residents who live within easy walking/ cycling distance to drive to the park and ride would be contrary to what they are trying to achieve in terms of sustainable transport and national planning policy. It would also appear to be contrary to the core purpose of what the City Council are trying to achieve by offering the Tram as an alternative to car based travel.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

The points are noted.

7. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Condition update and potential update to S106 Draft Heads of Terms Table

RECEIVED FROM: Planning Officer

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

1. To make condition 10 more precise in relation to the Biodiversity management plan the word 'ongoing' is proposed in the condition following the words '....mitigation measures, *ongoing* management.'
2. Condition 19 which controls the maximum size of the retail units should read 499sq m not 500sqm.
3. Condition 28 should be amended to include for the provision of appropriate signage on the pedestrian/cycle routes. The condition should therefore include the words 'including a signage scheme' in the following location in the condition '...proposed Pedestrian/Cycle Infrastructure improvement works *including a signage scheme* and an associated delivery plan...'
4. To ensure the delivery of the retail element within the Neighbourhood Centre the Draft Heads of Terms and/or conditions should require the submission of a strategy for its delivery to be submitted to and approved by the Borough Council.

This page is intentionally left blank