

13/02329/OUT

Applicant William Davis Limited

Location Land Off Shelford Road,(Shelford Road Farm), Shelford Road

Proposal Outline application for development of up to 400 dwellings, a primary school, health centre and associated infrastructure including highway and pedestrian access, open space and structural landscaping

Ward Radcliffe On Trent

LATE REPRESENTATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

1. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Comments
RECEIVED FROM: Radcliffe on Trent Health Centre

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- a. They welcome the invite to comment on this development.
- b. They consider the land provides sufficient space to accommodate a Health Centre with adequate parking for patients and staff and would also accommodate future expansion should this be required
- c. Their understanding is that provision will be made to allow for the construction of a Health on the site to commence within five years of the start of the commencement and if a Health Centre is not developed within this time period then the Health Centre reserved site will be returned to the developer.
- d. They consider that this time limitation is too short and does not allow sufficient time for interested parties to develop a detailed financial and construction strategy and commence a scheme.
- e. They recommend the proposed five year period be extended. If this does not happen then there is a risk that if a suitable central site cannot be located within the village an alternative site would then be unavailable.
- f. The plans show a number of residential dwellings close to the Health Centre and consideration will be required to ensure that the privacy of patients and the care they receive is ensured.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

Discussions have been undertaken which has resulted in the applicant confirming that the offer for the site for a health centre will remain available for six years (previously 5 years) and that the financial contribution in relation to health provision will be provided prior to the occupation of 25% of the dwelling(previously 80%) The applicant has also confirmed that it is not necessary for work to commence on site within six years but that some certainty in that the site is needed (eg a contract of building works) will need to be provided. Details are proposed to be finalised by solicitors in the wording of the S106. This is considered to be an acceptable position and will allow sufficient time for the CCG to formulate a future plan for additional healthcare provision to serve the development and any future growth within Radcliffe on Trent.

2. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Comment

RECEIVED FROM: Head Teacher South Nottinghamshire Academy

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

As Headteacher of SNA in principle he neither objects or supports this application. Without the proposed investment as set out in the S106 Heads of Terms summary for the proposed investment for secondary education to enable extra capacity they would not be able to provide additional secondary places and therefore this is critical.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

The applicant has confirmed that he is in agreement with the approach to a financial contribution towards secondary school provision and this is set out in the draft S106 Heads of Terms.

3. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Objection

RECEIVED FROM: Local resident

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

a. Concern that insufficient time has been given to notify residents of the committee date – he is unable to use his right to public speaking and questions process

- b. Concerns revolve around changing the essential nature of the village with 1000 plus people
- c. Concern around the increase in traffic in an already overloaded system
- d. Do not consider that the traffic surveys bear any resemblance to reality
- e. Welcome that there are plans for increased infrastructure for education, health and public spaces but that doesn't address basic problem of traffic or the impact in increased numbers of residents
- f. He understands the why and the need for increased housing but not on the scale proposed
- g. He accepts change happens but this doesn't feel like evolution or progress but like a dawn raid on the semi rural village.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

- a. The resident has been made aware of the following:- In accordance with the Local Government Act 1972 Section 100B, paragraph 3, as amended by the Local Authorities (Access to Meetings and Documents) (Period of Notice) (England) Order 2002, we are required to publish agendas for public meetings five working days before the date of the meeting.
- b. In terms of the notification to residents of the date of the meeting, the timescales are not specified in legislation but we obviously cannot do this until such time that the agenda is finalised and published. We work to very tight timescales for finalising and publication of the agenda and the notification is normally sent to coincide with the publication of the committee papers. Similarly, the specific procedures for the operation of public speaking are not set out in legislation and these are determined locally. We have published on our website a protocol for public speaking.
- c. In relation to the remaining comments the consideration of scale and traffic impacts are set out in the report

4. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Additional comments

RECEIVED FROM: Campaign for Better Transport

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- a. The NBT planning expert is a bit surprised at the limited number of speakers allowed by Rushcliffe.

- b. Although the 'eastern bypass' Cllr Upton and others suggest may have merit, as it has to cross the railway plus new A52 junction, it will be VERY expensive. We could have a gold plated train service for that spend and it will of course encourage more to use their car. It would also impact on tranquility on the countryside beyond the development.
- c. We note not all S106 is agreed and remains under discussion. Improved bus services need to be sooner and the applicant needs to fund the buses at the start of the development. Otherwise, at the rate houses are built, it could be a couple of years into the development before the S106 buses kick in. There isn't clarity on what 'improved' offers and given the precarious status of the Villager bus route, it might only fund what we have now, rather than anything better.
- d. Improvements to rail infrastructure are mentioned, but this remains pointless without a meaningful level of service, which gets no mention. Rail ought to be a solution to the A52 corridor.
- e. Following on from 4), even if Rushcliffe is minded to grant permission, Rushcliffe needs to add a narrative pointing out that it considers the County Council's transport policy for the A52 unsound and enhanced rail services must be part of policy along the corridor.
- f. No matter what, there will be increased traffic through RoT to the RSPCA Junction. In the Chestnut pub area, the 90 degree bends, with bus stops, elderly citizens and cars travelling at unsafe speeds, all point to a disaster soon to happen. There needs to be safe crossing provision in the area of the Chestnut.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

- a. The specific procedures for the operation of public speaking are not set out in legislation and these are determined locally. We have published on our website a protocol for public speaking.
- b. The site is not proposed to deliver a eastern bypass
- c. The S106 table whilst in draft clearly sets on the proposed contributions for bus services and the triggers for payment. This has been agreed with the NCC Transport and Travel Services. They have confirmed that the S106 contribution will support a bus service for the Shelford Road development. Where possible the existing service will be enhanced to provide an improved level of service. If this is not possible a new service will be commissioned using the funding.
- d. Rail Services improvements in relation to frequency of services is unable to be directly secured by an application of this nature. Work is being undertaken by other areas of the Borough Council to encourage the provision of improved services and

the Council supports the Strategic Outline Business Case for improving the Poacher Line to serve its communities and enable the wider economic growth of the area as part of the East Midlands refranchise.

- e. The S106 secures the provision of funding (£ 260,000) for traffic management calming measures on Shelford Road. The County Council as the highways authority wish to have the flexibility to design the scheme which will reduce speeds and facilitate non vehicular movements. This is set out in the Heads of Terms table.

5. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Additional Comments

RECEIVED FROM: Cllr Clarke

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- a. He re-iterates that he has no objection to the principle of the development, as it is recognised that considerable additional housing provision needs to be found in the Radcliffe on Trent area. However, he does have some concerns, many of which are contained within his ward members comments in the report but, in addition:
- b. He would have thought that it would be much more practical to consider this application in tandem with the application for land at the northwest tip of this application site. This smaller development will require a separate access on to Shelford Road. It should be considered at the same time, so that a proper integration of traffic issues are developed with an overall plan - not piecemeal.
- c. The current application should have two access points anyway, not one. Therefore, a second access should be proposed that incorporates access to both this current application and the smaller application. What if an emergency occurs that blocks the one access? Some collective foresight planning needs to be brought into play. Future residents will think it very odd, and will not be interested in an explanation that the two developments were a few months apart. This needs more thinking through.
- d. On the current application, the roundabout must be positioned further north, away from the hazard that will be created, affecting some of the existing dwellings on the northwest side of Shelford Road (See comments in report's ward member comments).
- e. Parking standards guidelines are wholly inadequate for today's needs. An allocation of 2 spaces per household should be included, not 1.5. Otherwise, this will be just the same as other estates that become overcrowded with cars parked on footways and verges.
- f. He underlines his previous comments regarding a Health Centre. A contribution should be included for a new Health Centre in the centre of the

village.

- g. There are comments locally that insufficient education provision is being made to meet demand.
- h. Finally, he would like to place a reminder for the need for a management company to be established to cater for all maintenance of amenity and open spaces.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

- a. It is not necessary for both this site and Grooms cottage to be considered at the same time. They are separate sites in separate ownerships and one site will not prejudice the delivery of the other site. The site subject to this application is at a position to move forward and help improve the Borough Councils housing land supply situation. Grooms Cottage can be accessed independently and can be delivered separately. There is no justification to delay the determination of this application. Consideration in terms of layout and linkages between the developments can be achieved at Reserved Matters stage.
- b. Nottinghamshire County Council have confirmed that the provision of a roundabout as the site access to serve the proposed scale of development has already been deemed to be acceptable in the original highway observations which were made on the proposal. Nothing has changed in the intervening period to alter the opinion of the Highway Authority as to the adequacy of the proposed means of access. A second access is therefore not required on highway safety grounds.
- c. The location of the roundabout and its interrelationship with existing properties has been considered by the County Council as the Highways Authority and is considered acceptable in highway safety terms.
- d. Parking provision will be considered at the REM stage and detailed design considerations in relation to level and location of parking provision will be given at that stage.
- e. A financial contribution is sought for health care provision which could go towards a new health centre in the village. The application allows flexibility in how health care provision is provided in the future to serve the new residents
- f. The S106 heads of Terms table allows for provision of a new school if necessary or improvements to existing provision. Contributions are also sought for secondary school improvements. These are in line with what is requested from the education authority.
- g. The S106 heads of Terms table reflects the need for a management company to be established

6. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION**

Updated Framework Plan
reference number and
change to conditions

RECEIVED FROM:

Planning agent for the application

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- a. An updated Framework Plan reference DE_085-003 Rev F has been submitted which includes the general outline of the proposed roundabout details including the provision of a replacement hedge for what is required to be removed for visibility requirements.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

This plans avoids removes any confusion with the detailed roundabout design subject to this application which will require the removal of hedgerow to provide the necessary visibility splay and the previously submitted framework plan. Condition 3 and 35 needs amending to refer to this plan

7. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:**

update to S106 Heads of Terms Table

RECEIVED FROM:

Planning Agent

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

The agent has confirmed that the offer for the site for a health centre will remain available for six years (previously 5 years) and that the financial contribution in relation to health provision will be provided prior to the occupation of 25% of the dwelling(previously 80%) The applicant has also confirmed that it is not necessary to work to commence on site within six years but that some certainty in that the site is needed (eg a contract of building works) will need to be provided. Details are proposed to be finalised by solicitors in the wording of the S106.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

These changes are welcomed and will assist with the forward planning of health care provision within Radcliffe. The draft Heads of Terms table is proposed therefore to be amended to reflect this change. The Radcliffe on Trent Health Centre and the CCG have been consulted on these changes

but have not yet responded.

8. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** Update from Planning Officer

RECEIVED FROM:

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

Condition 9 is proposed to be amended to tie the details to the technical approval from the County Council as highways authority under S38 not S278 (S38 deals with internal road layout not changes to existing roads)

The committee report refers at para 207 to a planning application being expected to be received shortly at Grooms Cottage. An outline planning application for 55 dwellings has been received and is now valid. Consultation will be commencing shortly on the application. The application reference is 18/02269/OUT.

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

- a. Condition 9 needs amending to include the words technical approval and S38 not S278 and to ensure the implementation of such works. The condition will therefore read:-

No development shall take place within each phase of the development (other than for the access to Shelford Road approved under condition 6) until the technical approval under S38 has been agreed with Nottinghamshire County Council for the construction of the roads and associated works within that phase of the site. The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details and no dwelling in that phase shall be occupied until the roads necessary to serve that property have been constructed to base level.

- b. This application and the recently submitted application at Groom Cottage can be considered independently with consideration of the interrelationship of the two sites being considered at Para 207 of the Report.

5. **NATURE OF REPRESENTATION:** objection
RECEIVED FROM: local resident

SUMMARY OF MAIN POINTS:

- a. Consider that the consideration of this application should be deferred as any decision will be premature and will undermine the process of approving Part 2

- b. Many residents object to the proposals in Local Plan Part 2 on the grounds that they do not take into account the Neighbourhood Plan. They have the opportunity to present their objections to the Independent Inspector later this year and any decision will undermine the Local Plan process and effectively deny residents the opportunity to have their objections heard.
- c. They question whether the regulations actually allow RBC to make a decision on this application before the Local Plan Part 2 has been approved.
- d. Consider the local plan process has highlighted some significant issues that will directly impact on this application – specifically impact on the A52

PLANNING OFFICERS COMMENTS:

- a. The report sets out why the application is being considered at this time.
- b. The report considers the implications of the Neighbourhood Plan
- c. Should members be minded to support the application the matter will be referred to the Planning Casework Unit to see whether the SoS for Environment wishes to call in the application for a decision or whether the Borough Council can make the decision on the application.
- d. There are no highway objections to the application from Highways England on the Strategic Road Network or the County Council as Local Highways Authority on either the proposal subject to this application or the proposals put forward in Part 2 of the Local Plan.