

# Rushcliffe Borough Council Core Strategy Examination

## East Leake Parish Council, Written Representation

Question	Response	Core Strategy Ref	Soundness Criterion	Change Sought
M1Q1	East Leake is right on the edge of the Borough and has close links with Loughborough. There is no evidence in the IDP or elsewhere of in depth consultation with Charnwood Borough Council or Leicestershire County Council. See the response to M7Q1.	EX37 duty to cooperate	Not effective	Undertake to work closely, during “part 2”, with neighbouring authorities of Charnwood Borough Council (particularly on housing) and Leicestershire County Council (particularly on transport)
M1Q6	There is no evidence of planning the growth of East Leake as a sustainable community. There is no policy to enforce a mix of new market homes, there is no employment provision for the new residents, and no development of the village centre. If developer-led expansion is allowed to continue, the village will be surrounded by a series of large unconnected commuter estates dominated by 4 and 5 bedroom detached homes, rather than maintaining diversity of the population and community spirit. Strong feelings about deficiencies in infrastructure are evidenced in the Community Plan Survey report <sup>1</sup> .	2.2.13 and throughout	Inconsistent with NPPF para 7	Statement that “part 2” of the Local Plan will be completed before further major housing development is approved in East Leake.
M1Q8	Inconsistencies with the NPPF are described or implicit in many of the responses to other questions. Paragraph 7 of the NPPF is worth mentioning here as an overarching concern - East Leake has been identified as an existing “sustainable” settlement for additional housing, but there are no measures in the Core Strategy to develop its economy, community or environment as it expands.	Throughout	Inconsistent with NPPF – para 7 and others	Statement that “part 2” of the Local Plan will be completed before further major housing development is approved in East Leake.
M2Q1	See response to M1Q6 on the lack of planning for the economic, social and environmental sustainability of East Leake going forward. The Core Strategy	Ch 1 and 2	Inconsistent with NPPF –	Statement that “part 2” of the Local Plan will be completed before further

	deals only with local development plans for the strategic sites – local development plans (“part 2”) have not yet been produced for the other settlements, and these should be in place before development applications are approved.		para 7 and others	major housing development is approved in East Leake.
M2Q2	<p>The needs have been assessed only in relation to the Nottingham housing market. A high percentage of East Leake residents travel to work in other directions, and the village has strong links with Loughborough.</p> <p>For this reason, and because East Leake is not adjacent to the Nottingham urban area, development at East Leake does not necessarily contribute towards the requirements of the Nottingham HMA. There is no evidence of collaboration with the neighbouring HMA which is to an extent a relevant HMA for East Leake.</p>	Policy 2	Not effective	Undertake to work closely, during “part 2”, with neighbouring authorities of Charnwood Borough Council (particularly on housing) and Leicestershire County Council (particularly on transport)
M2Q3	It is not stated how the mix of market element of new housing will be enforced to match the assessed need arising from the households study. Evidence from East Leake to date is that when they are given free choice over housing mix on green field sites, developers favour large expensive detached executive homes.	Policy 7	Not effective	Include a statement that percentage targets for each type of housing, in both the market and affordable sectors, will be adhered to for each development site over a certain size.
M2Q5	<p>It is not clear to us how the decision to base a significant percentage of homes in the four large town/villages was arrived at. There is no evidence of consultation and evaluation of other options, e.g. developing one or more of the rural villages to a “sustainable” size and condition, or looking at a percentage increase across all settlements.</p> <p>Furthermore, we have not been able to discover any rationale for apportioning these homes between East Leake (min 400), Keyworth (min 450), Radcliffe on Trent (min 400), and Ruddington (min 250). It does not appear to be based on population size, nor on relative assessment of sustainability.</p> <p>Assessment of East Leake as high/medium suitability as a sustainable location for growth on p 42 of ED07 is no longer current. It scores infrastructure as green and states “access to services score is above average and there is some</p>	Policy 2 ED07 (Greater Nottingham Sustainable Locations for Growth)	Not justified	<p>Further justification of policy.</p> <p>Updating of assessment of East Leake as a “sustainable location for growth”.</p> <p>Rewording of policy 2 to deal with 1980 unallocated homes in section 2(b).</p> <p>Statement that “part 2” of the Local Plan will be completed before further major housing development is approved in East Leake.</p>

	<p>forecast future capacity in education infrastructure”. With a glut of recent housing approvals, primary schools that are already full, a Health Centre that needs replacing and sewage capacity issues, East Leake infrastructure can no longer be scored in this way.</p> <p>1980 of the 5500 homes proposed outside the PUA are unallocated. Ideally (see response to M2Q6) these would be allocated to the PUA. However, if they are to remain allocated outside the PUA, then Policy 2 should be amended to provide limits in each settlement related to infrastructure constraints. Note that the wording “around” for Policy 2/2/b/(i) to (iii) and “minimum” for (iv) to (vii) implies directing the 1980 homes towards (iv) to (vii).</p> <p>Delivery on sites should not start in advance of preparation of the Local Plan Part 2 (3.1.2.13).</p>			
M2Q6	<p>5500 homes of the target 13150 will be in rural villages and market towns some distance from the main built up areas of Nottingham. i.e. 42%. This is at odds with “a strategy that supports a policy of urban concentration” (first paragraph of policy 2).</p>	Policy 2	Not justified	Reallocate to the PUA a significant proportion of the 1980 homes currently at unspecified locations in towns and villages
M2Q7	<p>Sites identified in the SHLAA for East Leake are almost exclusively greenfield developments. See M2Q6 for the distribution of homes between the PUA and larger rural settlements.</p>	Policy 2	Inconsistent with NPPF para 17	Further research to bring forward brownfield sites
M2Q9	<p>No more sites in key settlements should be identified until part 2 of the development plans are in place dealing with holistic growth of these communities and their infrastructure. See also response to M2Q1, M2Q2, M2Q6</p> <p>A policy about self build would be welcomed, to contribute to a sense of community ownership, and improve the diversity (and possibly quality) of the housing stock, alongside the standard offerings by house building chains. Paragraph 50 of the NPPF covers self build. Delivery of serviced plots, perhaps</p>	<p>Policy 2</p> <p>Policy 7</p>	<p>Not effective</p> <p>Inconsistent with NPPF para 50</p>	<p>Statement that “part 2” of the Local Plan will be completed before further major housing development is approved in East Leake.</p> <p>Addition of a policy about self build covering delivery of serviced plots, perhaps as a required percentage of plots in large housing developments</p>

	as a required percentage of plots in large housing developments, would be a possible way to enable this.			
M2Q16	<p>Policy 7 does not go far enough to ensure the delivery of the correct mix of housing on each site. It contains aspirational statements (para1,2). It states the basis of calculating the mix (para3). Para 3.2.1.12 states how the mix achieved will be monitored. But the policy does not state how the correct mix will be made to happen. It should include a statement that percentage targets for each type of housing, in both the market and affordable sectors, will be adhered to for each development site over a certain size. These percentages should be published and reviewed regularly.</p> <p>Current practice at RBC is to ensure that each development provides a specific mix of house types for the affordable element by including details in the planning approval of the rental and shared ownership percentages, and the percentages within these categories of each type of home, from 1 bed starter flats to 5 bedroomed houses, and including bungalows. However the house type mix for the market element of each site is left largely to the developer to determine. On sites recently approved/developed in East Leake the determination of housing mix for the market homes has been developer led and 4-5 bedroom detached homes are favoured. The market mix should be treated like the affordable mix in order to fully provide for the housing need.</p>	Policy 7	Not effective	<p>Include a statement that percentage targets for each type of housing, in both the market and affordable sectors, will be adhered to for each development site over a certain size.</p> <p>Include monitoring statements to ensure that planning practice matches policy on a site by site basis.</p>
M2Q17	In the Community Plan survey East Leake residents commented on the difficulties that local people have staying in the village due to high house prices, housing mix, lack of rental homes, lack of homes for older people etc. I.e. they are locked out of the local housing market in their own community and have to move away. Policy 7 could assist this by assuring the correct house mix in the market element (see response to M2Q16). It could also help support communities by including a statement to prioritise allocation of affordable housing to people with a local connection. (There is an example of this being achieved in section 3.1.10 of the S106 agreement for planning application 07/00524/OUT for 154 homes on land north west of Gotham Road, East Leake.)	Policy 7	Not effective inconsistent with NPPF para 50	Include a policy prioritizing allocation of affordable housing in each settlement to people with a local connection.

M2Q18/19	<p>A differentiated target for affordable housing seems unnecessary, given that the target is a ceiling figure, and can be adjusted according to viability of individual sites. The sub markets analysis could be used to inform the determination on a site by site basis.</p> <p>If a differentiated target is included, it should not reduce the target in any particular sub market below the evidenced figures in para 6.4 of the viability study (EX21). The modification is at odds with para 50 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The glut of planning applications for East Leake over the past 2 years has gone through with a 30% affordable element, clearly demonstrating viability at this level. Yet the CS modifications would reduce the target to 20%. This will exacerbate the difficulties that local people face finding homes in their own community (see response to M2Q17).</p>	Policy 7	Not justified, inconsistent with NPPF para 50	Set the affordable target to 40% throughout the Borough, including in para 5 of policy 7 reference to the sub market analysis, to help developers justify reduction from the 40% target for developments in the different areas on viability grounds.
M2Q20	Yes, the reduced % affordable threshold is justified and likely to boost delivery as smaller sites will be considered for delivery of an affordable element. Para 5 of policy 7 provides for the affordable element to be adjusted by RBC in individual cases if not viable.	Policy 7		No change required
M3	East Leake Parish Council response to the green belt consultation <sup>ii</sup> covers our view that green belt removed should be replaced further out and the need to protect East Leake from coalescence with Bunny, Gotham, Costock, West Leake, Stanford, Stanford Hall, Rempstone. Inset boundaries for Bunny and Gotham are of interest but relegated to “part 2” in the same way that consideration of the East Leake environment is relegated to part 2 of the local plan. Meanwhile developers are leapfrogging the green belt to develop green fields around East Leake.	Policy 3	Not effective	Undertaking in “part 2” (of local plan and green belt review) to address “green wedges” to prevent settlements coalescing.
M4Q1	Support for expansion of employment opportunities at the British Gypsum site in East Leake is welcomed, subject to rigorous protection of the interests of nearby residents (noise, dust etc).	Policy 4	Not effective	

	<p>It is necessary to take steps to protect the source of gypsum, as present national plans are to run down the production of desulphogypsum from the coal fired power stations over the life of the Core Strategy. Housing should not be built above mined areas. There is a need to preserve the ability to extract existing mineral deposits in the future, so development should not take place either in the areas where mineral deposits are present and/or allocated for future mining operations. Consultation and research into the Gypsum constraint is documented in section 5.4 of the East Leake Neighbourhood Plan Statement of Consultation<sup>iii</sup>. The NP project talked to geologist experts at British Gypsum and the relevant minerals policy experts at the County Council.</p> <p>The list at Policy 4, section 5 should include the Stanford Hall Defence and National Rehabilitation Centre.</p> <p>East Leake Parish Council welcomed creation of additional employment on the site South of Clifton in our response to the consultation on further housing sites<sup>iv</sup>.</p> <p>Apart from the above, development of employment across Rushcliffe does not help East Leake grow as a sustainable settlement, as public transport links to other centres are poor.</p>			<p>Include a statement in the policy to strengthen protection of the gypsum reserves.</p> <p>Add Stanford Hall Defence and National Rehabilitation Centre to list at Policy 4, section 5</p> <p>Include aspirational statements about development of public transport links between the district/local centres</p>
M4Q9	<p>The Core Strategy gives East Leake a housing allocation but there is no proactive provision for employment alongside the new homes. (See our responses in M1 and M2 on building sustainable communities.) This is at odds with Para 28 of the NPPF.</p>	Policy 4	Inconsistent with para 28 of the NPPF	Add a statement to encourage suitable employment opportunities within housing developments (of say over 100 homes), e.g. live/work units.
M4Q10	<p>Policy 5 para 3 omits development of East Leake as a centre, despite its projected housing growth (and current level of planning approvals far in excess of this figure). This is inconsistent with para 23 of the NPPF. Regeneration of the central shopping area is needed, along with measures to improve make it more pedestrian friendly and improve the car and cycle parking facilities. If the intention is to address this through “part 2”, then housing developments should not commence until this documentation is</p>	Policy 5	Inconsistent with para 23 of NPPF	Statement that requirements for improvement of East Leake as a retail and social centre will be undertaken before further major housing development is approved in East Leake.

	complete.			
M4Q11	The “hierarchy” is not appropriate for East Leake in that residents do not usually turn to West Bridgford or Bingham for needs that are not met in East Leake. The “district centres” of West Bridgford and Bingham are not convenient, sustainable centres for East Leake residents, public transport links being poor.	Policy 5, diagram p58	Not justified	Include aspirational statements about development of public transport links between the district/local centres And/or Redesignate East Leake as a “district centre” with appropriate investment in its development
M4Q12	ED20 does not consider East Leake as a retail centre, therefore there is no existing analysis to underpin policy 5 as far as East Leake is concerned (a matter, no doubt, for “part 2”). Housing development should not take place until this analysis is done.	Policy 5	Not justified	Statement that requirements for improvement of East Leake as a retail and social centre will be undertaken before further major housing development is approved in East Leake.
M5Q9	<p>In the diagram of Green Infrastructure that accompanies policy 15 there are no green corridors shown around East Leake. If the intention is to identify green infrastructure at this local level in “Part 2”, then this analysis should be in place before further development is allowed.</p> <p>Discussions with Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust for the East Leake Neighbourhood Plan<sup>v</sup> identified the following green corridors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The railway line, designated a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) runs roughly SW to NE through the parish.</li> <li>• Kingston Brook which runs E to W through the parish.</li> <li>• Fairham Brook, which rises in Keyworth and runs west via Bunny before turning N towards Clifton. Whilst not actually in the parish, it comes very close to the northern boundary.</li> <li>• A partial E to W corridor starting at Bunny Woods, passing through woods on Ash Lane, linking to Hotchley Hill and Rushcliffe Golf Course (the latter two in the parish).</li> </ul>	Policy 15 and diagram	Not justified	Add green corridors local to East Leake to the map Or Statement that requirements for East Leake environment will be undertaken before further major housing development is approved in East Leake

M5Q14	<p>Yes, a policy should be included to address concerns about aircraft noise. Planning conditions for new homes in East Leake Parish should include enhanced sound insulation and mechanical ventilation systems to mitigate the effects of aircraft noise. (The area covered should not exclusively be East Leake, but this is the extent of our investigation into the matter.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• East Leake is close to the approach to Runway 27 at East Midlands Airport and there can be a high level of aircraft activity in the area. For approximately 70% of the year, arriving aircraft approach the airport from the east, and East Midlands Airport operates on a 24 hour basis with a substantial level of night activity. A policy should state that new residential developments should ensure that appropriate sound insulation measures are included. This does not address the concerns of existing householders, but will start to improve the situation for future residents.</li> <li>• Properties adjoining the railway are also adversely affected by noise, and use of the line could increase over the lifetime of any new homes. However the measures required to alleviate the impact of aircraft noise should cover the entire parish of East Leake and thus it is unnecessary from the point of view of East Leake to include an additional policy statement about railway noise.</li> <li>• In the free text question in the Community Plan Questionnaire asking for the things residents did not like about living in East Leake, aircraft noise topped the list with 17% of all comments.</li> <li>• At a meeting between the Neighbourhood Plan Project and the Principal Planner of East Midlands airport in April 2014, it was suggested that the East Leake Neighbourhood Plan should include a policy to include noise mitigation measures in new housing.<sup>vi</sup> A policy in the Core Strategy would be preferable.</li> <li>• Details of the airport's measures to manage the impact of aircraft noise can be found in the East Midlands Airport Noise Action Plan<sup>vii</sup> and</li> </ul>	Policy 9, 1b 3.2.3.1	Not justified	Add statement specifying enhanced levels of sound insulation and mechanical ventilation systems for new housing developments within East Leake Parish (and other relevant areas on the flight path)
-------	--	-------------------------	---------------	---



	<p>Sustainable Development Plan<sup>viii</sup>, including 2012 noise contours<sup>ix</sup>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Using the methodology of Planning Policy Guidance 24<sup>x</sup>, the night-time noise contour for the majority of East Leake Parish shows as Noise Exposure Category B (“Noise should be taken into account when determining planning applications and, where appropriate, conditions imposed to ensure an adequate level of protection against noise”.)</li> <li>In Aug-Sept 2011 noise monitoring<sup>xi</sup> was undertaken at Stanford on Soar by EMA. This location lies further outside the noise contour than East Leake, yet the report concludes that “the monitoring location is assessed to fit into NEC A during the day and NEC B at night”.</li> <li>A planning application<sup>xii</sup> for 154 houses on Gotham Road went to appeal and conditions 9 and 10 of the appeal report specified noise assessment and ventilation required to protect the homes against aircraft (and railway) noise. See the appeal report and ELPC response to the 2012 initial publication Core Strategy consultation<sup>xiii</sup> for further details.</li> </ul>			
M6Q1	<p>Policies 13 and 14 are not sufficient to promote sustainable transport at the local level. (See paras 37, 38 of NPPF). There are aspirational statements but these have a hollow ring in a village where each green field site that comes up is being developed as a commuter estate island, with little thought given to walking or cycling connections from the developments to the village centre, or between different areas of housing, no employment being developed alongside the housing, and no public transport improvements planned. It is difficult to see how the issues will be resolved by the Core Strategy, particularly if housing development happens before “part 2”.</p> <p>Parking in East Leake village centre needs to be considered to cater for housing growth at the periphery of the village (para 40 of NPPF).</p> <p>See our response to M5Q14 which indicates that RBC could do more to support the future growth of East Midlands airport (para 33 of NPPF).</p> <p>Para 3.2.8.2 should include improvements in public transport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>between the various Rushcliffe district and local centres</li> </ul>	Pols 13, 14	Inconsistent with paras 37,38, 40 of NPPF	<p>Complete the work required to define walking and cycling linkages before sites are approved.</p> <p>Include monitoring statements to ensure that planning practice matches policy.</p> <p>See changes suggested elsewhere re development of East Leake as a centre and need to complete “part 2” before further housing development.</p> <p>Additions to 3.2.8.2 as stated</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• between South Rushcliffe villages and East Midlands Airport/East Midlands Parkway</li> <li>• between the airport and East Midlands Parkway station</li> </ul>			
M6Q3/4	Over reliance on the Greater Nottingham Transportation Model means that cross authority linkages with Leicestershire have not been fully addressed, particularly important for East Leake as we are at the edge of the county. Para 31 of the NPPF is not fully addressed. See also our response to M7Q1.	3.2.7.5	Inconsistent with para 31 of NPPF	Undertake to work closely, during “part 2”, with neighbouring transport authorities, i.e. outside the Nottinghamshire area
M6Q7	Policy 13 should be more locally distinctive. See our responses to M6Q1, M7Q1.			
M6Q11	Our response to M7Q1 is relevant to “rat running” through Clifton and Gotham.			
M7Q1	<p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan does not provide a sound base for provision of necessary infrastructure, nor demonstrate that RBC understands infrastructure costs for East Leake. The IDP is thus inconsistent with Paragraph 177 of the NPPF. Deficiencies are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table 4.3 shows that the infrastructure analysis is for 400 additional houses in East Leake. This is the “minimum” figure proposed in the Core Strategy, and there is no maximum set. In the worst case scenario all of the 1980 unallocated homes for the towns and villages could fall to East Leake, giving a total of anything up to 2380 additional homes in East Leake, almost doubling it in size. The infrastructure requirements for development over and above 400 homes have not been considered and cannot therefore be understood by RBC.</li> <li>• The transport analysis concentrates on travel to work to Nottingham. East Leake residents travel to work also in Loughborough, Leicestershire, and the airport. Road improvements are needed on routes other than those considered. There has been consultation only with Derbyshire County Council, Nottingham City Council, and Nottinghamshire County Council (see p14 of IDP), not Leicestershire County Council.</li> <li>• The existing congestion at rush hour on the A60 has not been addressed, nor the accident record on the A6006 between Hathern and Rempstone.</li> </ul>	Policy 17 Appendix C IDP	Not justified Not effective Inconsistent with para 177 of NPPF	Undertake to complete additional work on infrastructure etc before further housing development is approved in East Leake

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The traffic impact of the Stanford Hall development (Defence and National Rehabilitation Centre) and the possible large housing development in Cotes have not been considered.</li> <li>• The impact of the Clifton expansion on the travel to work journey into Nottingham from East Leake has not been modelled.</li> <li>• The impact of East Leake housing on the routes from East Leake to the M1, A453 and the Nottingham ring road, via Bunny, Gotham, West Leake etc need to be considered.</li> <li>• No consideration has been given to the possibility of a mainstream network rail link and station for East Leake.</li> <li>• There is no provision for rail and NET2 interchange at Ruddington.</li> <li>• East Leake has urgent and critical issues with sewage capacity that have not been taken into account.</li> <li>• Electricity capacity for East Leake is dependent on new circuits in South Clifton, so the relative phasing of these developments needs to be considered.</li> <li>• There is pressing need for a new Health Centre building in East Leake, not shown in the IDR.</li> <li>• Further development of East Leake as a retail etc centre is noted as “tbc” – this work should be undertaken before significant development is approved.</li> <li>• East Leake primary schools are full. Some increased capacity of the existing primary schools is under discussion but will not come on stream until after new homes are built. To meet the remaining projected need a third primary school will be needed; planning is at a very initial discussion stage. This constraint should be informing the phasing of delivery of new homes. Planning of school places is additionally hampered by the open ended housing allocation for East Leake. Placing East Leake children in school outside the village would work against building a strong community.</li> <li>• Requirements for green infrastructure for East Leake are not defined.</li> </ul>			
M7Q2	Appendix C, note 1 states “There is continuing work in relation to the broad locations at East Leake, Keyworth, Radcliffe on Trent and Ruddington”	Appendix C note 1	Not effective	Undertake to complete additional work on infrastructure before further housing development is approved in

	The work required to identify the infrastructure requirements of these villages should be completed and published before development is authorized.			East Leake
M7Q3	Policy 17 is heavily reliant on the IDP – see M7Q1 for our views on this. At the risk of repeating ourselves, housing development should not be approved until “part 2” is completed. With no maximum housing number set, the IDP does not address the infrastructure need.	Policy 17, IDP	Not effective	Undertake to complete additional work on infrastructure before further housing development is approved in East Leake
M7Q4	<p>With respect to 3.4.2.4, see our comments in M7Q1 and elsewhere about the need to cooperate wider than the greater Nottingham area.</p> <p>See our comments in about the difficulty of travelling to the “district centres”. Contributions from developments in East Leake should be used for facilities in East Leake; it is not clear in some categories within 3.4.2.2 that this will happen and the wording in the policy could be strengthened in respect of the second bullet in para 204 of the NPPF. For example, using East Leake developer contributions to fund a cultural resource in East Leake might be acceptable whereas funding a “collective” (as in para 3 of policy 18) cultural resource in West Bridgford or Bingham would be of little use to the residents of East Leake if they can’t get there.</p> <p>The problem with amassing developer contributions to fund large schemes (such as the East Leake Health Centre replacement) is that the funds come in in dribs and drabs, but the outlay is needed at a point in time. There are no particular measures in Policy 17 to help with this.</p> <p>However, we welcome the intention to introduce the CIL at last.</p>	Policy 18	Not effective	<p>Undertake to work with neighbouring authorities during “part 2”</p> <p>Strengthen wording in policy to ensure CIL is used in direct relevance to the local settlement</p>
M7Q6	The targets etc at the end of each policy do not always seem to have been given much thought. There should be an indication of how they relate to national benchmarks. There should be sufficient granularity in the reporting to ensure that figures are available to compare performance between the different settlements, rather than only providing Borough-wide figures.	Each policy, section 4	Not effective	Specify granularity of reporting

<sup>i</sup> <http://www.east-leake.co.uk/questionnaire.html>

<sup>ii</sup> <http://www.east-leake.gov.uk/docs/Green%20Belt%20Review%20Consultation%20Form.pdf>

- 
- <sup>iii</sup> Work is under way on East Leake Neighbourhood Plan documentation, including the statement of consultation. Latest versions are at <http://www.east-leake.gov.uk/east-leake-neighbourhood-plan>
- <sup>iv</sup> [http://www.east-leake.gov.uk/docs/Further%20Housing%20Proposals%20consultation%20form\\_June%202013v2.pdf](http://www.east-leake.gov.uk/docs/Further%20Housing%20Proposals%20consultation%20form_June%202013v2.pdf)
- <sup>v</sup> Notes of the meeting are at section 5.1 of East Leake Neighbourhood Plan Statement of Consultation, <http://www.east-leake.gov.uk/east-leake-neighbourhood-plan>
- <sup>vi</sup> See section 5.9 of the East Leake Neighbourhood Plan Statement of Consultation  
<http://www.east-leake.gov.uk/east-leake-neighbourhood-plan>
- <sup>vii</sup> East Midlands Airport Noise Action Plan, <http://www.eastmidlandsairport.com/emaweb.nsf/Content/Noise>
- <sup>viii</sup> East Midlands Airport Sustainable Development Plan, <http://www.eastmidlandsairport.com/developmentplan>
- <sup>ix</sup> EMA Night-time airborne aircraft noise contours 2012, [http://www.eastmidlandsairport.com/emaweb.nsf/alldocs/77329F830247396A80257A8C00527A67/\\$File/Night-time+Noise+Contours+Summer+2012.pdf](http://www.eastmidlandsairport.com/emaweb.nsf/alldocs/77329F830247396A80257A8C00527A67/$File/Night-time+Noise+Contours+Summer+2012.pdf)
- <sup>x</sup> Planning Policy Guidance 24. This is now replaced by the NPPF, which contains no methodology for assessing noise exposure or recommendations for mitigation. However the national and European legislative framework, standards, and guidance that underpinned PPG24 remain relevant.  
<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20120919132719/http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/156558.pdf>
- <sup>xi</sup> Community Noise Monitoring, Stanford on Soar, 2 August – 12 September 2011  
[http://www.eastmidlandsairport.com/emaweb.nsf/alldocs/855E8FCC922A814880257A8C0051EA85/\\$File/Community+Noise+Report+Stanford+on+Soar+2+Aug+-+12+Sep+2011.pdf](http://www.eastmidlandsairport.com/emaweb.nsf/alldocs/855E8FCC922A814880257A8C0051EA85/$File/Community+Noise+Report+Stanford+on+Soar+2+Aug+-+12+Sep+2011.pdf)
- <sup>xii</sup> Rushcliffe Borough Council planning application reference 07/00524/OUT
- <sup>xiii</sup> <http://corestrategy.rushcliffe.gov.uk/media/CoreStrategy/Documents/Index/Responses/59-63.pdf>