

East Leake Neighbourhood Plan. Summary of representations Received to the pre-examination consultation.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Summary of Representations</b>
Cllr Andrew Brown (Nottinghamshire County Council)	<p>A great deal of time and effort has gone into this plan and only 123 people in East Leake</p> <p>Traffic I know causes many problems in the Village, most of the issues with parking , speeding etc., most are caused by local people. By changing road layouts or providing extra car parking spaces will not solve this problem. More visible policing and enforcement would help. As would more encouragement for children to walk to school.</p> <p>The only people who complain about aircraft noise are people who have recently moved to the Village. Complaints to EMA from East Leake are single figures.</p> <p>One comment was made that the County Council did not understand people's problems in the Village. Well myself as a resident for nearly 30 years does and as County Councillor relays those problems.</p> <p>More public support is needed before any more funding for a referendum or literature is produced.</p>
Environment Agency	<p>Welcome that flood risk is a key consideration within policy H7 for new Housing.</p> <p>We agree that there should be adequate sewerage capacity on the sewage system to accommodate new homes as detailed in policy H1</p> <p>The Environment Agency has no environmental concerns and is satisfied that the draft neighbourhood development plan meets the "basic conditions" as set out in paragraph 8(2) of schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as applied to neighbourhood plans by section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.</p>
IPlan solutions	<p>H1. Inflexible approach to additional infrastructure. Developments should only be required to make an appropriate and justified contribution towards the rectification of infrastructure shortfalls caused by the development itself.</p>
IPlan Solutions	<p>H3 Types of market housing. The policy is too simplistic in suggesting a prescriptive mix. Each site should be considered on its individual merits.</p>
IPlan solutions	<p>Policy H7, is unduly inflexible. Furthermore, it is the case that a detailed or full planning permission has already been granted for the largest sites within East Leake and therefore the practical ability of the policy to influence the broader impact of the overall new housing provided within the village is significantly restricted.</p> <p>Each site should be considered on its individual merits, particularly those that are smaller where it becomes numerically more difficult to provide the very prescriptive dictatorial requirements sought.</p> <p>Fundamentally, the provision of housing should be considered across all tenures within policy H3 and not solely restricted to the element of a scheme that is to provide market housing.</p>

	In accordance with the same policy approach to the provisions of policy H2, it is requested that policy H3 be amended such that the prescription in the composition of housing mix only applies to sites for 50 or more homes. Accordingly it is requested that the policy wording preamble be amended to include a threshold of 50 or more dwellings
IPlan solutions	East Leake was identified as a sustainable settlement by Rushcliffe Borough through a comparison with other settlements within Rushcliffe Borough itself. The use of an arbitrary figure of 1.25 km as a prescriptive acceptable walking distance is unreasonably restrictive, and a greater degree of flexibility should be introduced into the policy through the introduction of the word “approximately” prefacing “within 1.25 km walking distance of East Leake village centre” at criteria (a).
IPlan solutions	<p>E1. Objection is made to the eastern boundary identified on the southern side of West Leake Road for the proposed area important for separation. The appropriate planning practice, when defining policy areas, is to utilise physical features on the ground as a basis for clear unambiguous policy delineation. The proposed eastern boundary for policy E1(b) within Fig 5.1/2 runs through the middle of an agricultural field with no logic or sound basis for doing so. It does not relate to a physical feature on the ground.</p> <p>Consequently, it is requested that if the area Important for Separation is to persist, notwithstanding the fundamental objection raised above, that this boundary is re-drawn further to the west such that it is contiguous with the readily identified physical feature of the western boundary of the agricultural field, such that it is therefore also contiguous with the eastern and southern most boundary of the existing allotments.</p> <p>Objection is raised to the statement made at paragraph 5.1.7 and also to criteria (c) of draft policy E1. It is a matter of fact that the railway line is not a boundary to the built-up area of East Leake. Furthermore, there is no underlying rationale to support criteria (c), nor why such an alleged exception should be necessary as to require “strong justification” for any future development in this locality. It is requested that the criteria be deleted in its entirety.</p>
Micropropagation services	<p>The draft Neighbourhood Plan for East Leake appears to broadly be a good representation of the community, and is well-written.</p> <p>It is possibly no longer appropriate to be referring to East Leake as a village. With the significant residential developments along Gotham Road and Lantern Lane during the last 15 years this increased community has given more of a small town feel, with a significant proportion of commuters.</p>
Micropropagation services	In speaking in the last few weeks with many residents of East Leake, they are most concerned about the lack of primary school provision and pressures on the health centre facilities.
Micropropagation services	We have a concern with paragraph 2.6.2 – with respect to walking distance of 1.25 km from Tjunction in the community centre. There are currently several long-established areas of the village that are significantly further away than this – eg. Maple Close, Orchard Close, Rempstone Road, Rushcliffe Grove, Angrave Rd – all up to 1.5km from the T-junction. So the plan should perhaps be amended so that permitted developments should be considered within 1.5km of the T-junction.
Micropropagation services	We feel that paragraph 2.6.8 – regarding the green ridgelines surrounding the community, is good as an ideal. But it must be

	noted that this has already been broken by the development currently under construction at the top of Woodgate Road, East Leake This paragraph can therefore only be aspirational in terms of sustainable development.
Micropropagation services	We would like to support paragraph 5.1.2, to keep East Leake separate from neighbouring settlements. The latter are small rural villages in nature which should be kept as such and not become part of a larger community/small town. This would ensure that these neighbouring settlements remain sustainable in their own right and would maintain East Leake as a separate sustainable identity.
Micropropagation services	We would like to support paragraph 2.5.17 with reference to the Building for Life programme. Full consideration of comparatively small design issues and attention to detail can lead to a sustainable development which is functions well for residents and can be a pleasure to live in.
Micropropagation services	We very much support Section 3.2, supporting small businesses and start-ups. Having started our business in East Leake we appreciate the support from the community as a whole over the years. Most of our staff are from East Leake, or the directly adjacent villages. Business activity, aside from retail, are a vital part of any sustainable development. Entrepreneurial enterprise should be encouraged, often this might initially start by working from home but maintaining/providing facilities as businesses may grow is very valued within a community.
JC Cranston	The green colouring on the plan covers part of my garden to suggest it is used otherwise as a private garden.
Mr J Potter	<p>Policy B3:(b)  The Gypsum Works between Hotchley Hill (Ridge D) and Ridge B (page 41) are visible from e.g. parts of Ruddington parish, and Clifton South , with the Charnwood Hills beyond; when in the future it becomes possible, it would be beneficial to allow a more naturalistic longer landscape view through there; policy aimed at reducing lighting or light pollution there, is /would be beneficial to the wider area also.</p> <p>Page 37 4.3.1. Not in agreement re its mentions of Clifton and Ruddington. Fig 5.1/2 page 42 In agreement with area important for separation- when including Green Belt - at the north area of East Leake parish.</p> <p>Policy E2(b) Essentially agree.</p>
Natural England	We have reviewed the Plan (submission publication) and we are pleased to note that our comments on the draft document have been taken on board. Natural England consider that our interest in the natural environment is well covered within the Plan and we particularly support the policies encouraging; the protection and enhancement of landscape character, the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and green infrastructure and improvements to PROW and access.
Planning Policy. Nottinghamshire County Council	<p>The County Council has no objections to the proposed draft plan from a Minerals or Waste perspective.</p> <p>In terms of Ecology, the County Council is generally supportive of the plan and welcomes the inclusion of a section on wildlife, subject to suggested additional texts.</p> <p>The County Council would like to ensure that the Parish Council are aware of the issues surrounding the provision of primary school places in relation to new developments.</p>

Severn Trent Water	Provided that development is not sited in an area of flood risk, surface water is managed responsibly and individual developments are designed so that any flood water from extreme rainfall will not damage properties, then the risk of sewer flooding will be small. In areas where the risk of flooding is significant then Surface Water Management Plans should be considered.