



# **Rushcliffe Interim Planning Statement**

**December 2007**

## **Preface**

On 13 December 2007, Rushcliffe Borough Council resolved to approve the Rushcliffe Interim Planning Statement to assist determination of planning applications submitted ahead of progress being made on the Local Development Framework.

For further information please contact Richard Mapletoft, Development Framework Manager, on 0115 914 8457.

## **Rushcliffe Interim Planning Statement 2007**

### **1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1 As a consequence of the Borough being identified in the emerging Regional Plan as a location for substantial new growth, it is anticipated that planning applications could soon be submitted for high levels of new development, principally housing growth. The purpose of the Rushcliffe Interim Planning Statement (IPS) is to assist determination of these planning applications and provide, in addition to existing sources, additional guidance as to matters the Council feel need to be adequately addressed as part of any development proposals.
- 1.2 The IPS contains the following:
- A brief explanation of the current planning issues facing the Borough and why pressure exists for substantial new developments;
  - The aims in producing the IPS;
  - Issues that have been raised by Council Members at two recent workshops which developers need to be aware of and, where relevant, need to adequately address;
  - A brief summary of existing policy documents and guidance that should be taken into account by applicants and which will be used by the Council to determine planning applications; and
  - Some additional guidance that the Council wishes planning applicants to take into account when preparing development schemes, in order to achieve development that is of the highest standard, that takes place in the most sustainable location and which respects the existing quality of Rushcliffe's environment and the quality of life of its various communities.

### **2.0 Current planning context**

- 2.1 The planning system in Rushcliffe is in a transitional phase between the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan, which was adopted in 2006, and the production of Local Development Framework (LDF) documents, which are due for adoption between 2009 and 2010.
- 2.2 A handful of policies from the 1996 Rushcliffe Borough Local Plan have also been 'saved' until they are replaced by the LDF – these are listed in the Secretary of State's Direction which is published on the Council's Planning Policy web pages.
- 2.3 By contrast with the Council's LDF, the new Regional Spatial Strategy, the East Midlands Regional Plan, is approaching the latter stages of

- preparation by the Government Office for East Midlands and is due for adoption late in 2008. There was an Examination in Public of the draft Regional Plan during the summer 2007 and the Report of the Panel who convened the examination was published recently.
- 2.4 As the Regional Plan moves towards adoption it has significant implications for the Borough, in particular, in terms of:
- setting housing and employment requirements;
  - setting affordable housing targets;
  - setting a target for the number of Gypsy and Traveller pitches to be found; and
  - proposing likely revisions to the Green Belt as a result of the scale of development required within the Borough.
- 2.5 The Report of the Panel includes a number of recommendations that are relevant to Rushcliffe. It has recommended that a major review of the Nottingham Green Belt be conducted, with the suggestion that only land between Nottingham and Derby (not land within Rushcliffe) is worthy of retention within the Green Belt.
- 2.6 There is the recommendation that further consideration be given, jointly between all Greater Nottingham's local authorities that form the Nottingham Core Housing Market Area (HMA), to further review housing land availability and identify the need for and location of urban extensions. In terms of specific housing numbers, the Panel has recommended that the Regional Plan's housing requirements for Rushcliffe stay the same as those proposed in the draft Plan, with 445 per annum in and adjoining the Principal Urban Area and 110 per annum in the Non-Principal Urban Area of the Borough. However, for the entire HMA, it has recommended an increased requirement of 447 houses per annum which has not been tied to any particular local authority area, some of which could therefore be within Rushcliffe. This means the 445/110 per annum split that has been recommended is a fall back position only, which may be affected by the further work recommended on housing land availability and the identification of sites for urban extensions.
- 2.7 The Panel Report includes the recommendation that specific reference to land south of Clifton as a location for a sustainable urban extension be removed from the Regional Plan. However, the Panel has still concluded that a major urban extension is likely to be necessary in the later part of the Plan period, and in default of agreement otherwise (but only in default) that it should continue to be allocated in Rushcliffe.
- 2.8 Following on from the Panel Report, when Proposed Changes to the Regional Plan are published next year it will gain significant weight as a

- document the Council will have to have regard to in making planning decisions. As is evident, the most significant issues facing Rushcliffe are the likely requirement for substantial levels of new housing to be developed within the Borough and, potentially, substantial changes to the Nottingham Green Belt.
- 2.9 It is the role of the LDF, and its Core Strategy in particular, to apply the Regional Plan's requirements to the Borough; not least to decide where required development will be located. However, there invariably is going to be a time lag between the publication of the Regional Plan and when the Council can put substantial elements of its LDF in place, taking account of outstanding study and survey work that needs to be completed and the need to undertake meaningful public and stakeholder consultation.
- 2.10 Where the Council has particular concern is how in this interim period to best address any major planning proposals submitted, in order to meet the Regional Plan's requirements, without the benefit of a full suite of LDF documents. This would be less of a concern to the Council if it were first to be afforded time to put in place substantial elements of the LDF.
- 2.11 In accordance with the requirements of PPS3, the Council is now required to show that it has a five year supply of deliverable housing sites (for example, sites with planning permission or those allocated by a local development plan document) to meet strategic requirements. The five year land supply is calculated by aggregating the average annual strategic housing requirement for a five year period. PPS3 advises that where local planning authorities cannot demonstrate an up-to-date five year supply of deliverable sites they should consider favourably planning applications for housing, having regard to the policies in the PPS.
- 2.12 It is expected that once the housing requirements of the Regional Plan become clearer, the outcome will be that a substantial level of new housing will need to be developed in Rushcliffe; in excess of 10,000 houses. This requirement will be at a level where the Council will no longer be able to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land unless, that is, there is some scope to push delivery of the majority of housing to later on in the Regional Plan period, for example post 2016. There is suggestion in the Panel Report that this might be feasible. However, if the lack of a demonstrable five year housing land supply does arise this will put the Council in a position where it will be more difficult for it to resist planning applications for housing development.

### **3.0 Aim of the Rushcliffe Interim Planning Statement**

3.1 The Council remains committed to the Local Development Framework (LDF) process and is working energetically to ensure that this is delivered as soon as possible. However, the reality is that the world does not stand still while the LDF is being prepared and, in the meantime, there is, following in the wake of the new Regional Plan's emerging requirements, as well as strong Government emphasis on delivering housing development, considerable developer interest for new development in the Borough. Therefore, this document aims to:

- i) firstly, provide clarification as to what existing policies and guidance should be taken into account by potential applicants; and
- ii) secondly, add some further guidance on issues which the Council wishes to be taken into account when preparing development schemes and then submitting them as planning applications.

3.2 Underpinning this IPS is the desire to ensure that whatever development takes place in future is to the highest standard, that it takes place in the most sustainable location and that it respects the existing quality of Rushcliffe's environment and the quality of life of its various communities. The Council wishes to ensure that none of these aims are unduly or needlessly prejudiced by not being afforded the time to substantially put in place an LDF prior to receiving and then having to determine planning applications for major development proposals. What is best for Rushcliffe should always be the key consideration; whether major planning schemes are being progressed through the LDF process or, instead, through the planning application process.

### **4.0 Issues raised by Council Members**

4.1 This IPS follows on from the outcomes of two workshops convened for Council Members to consider emerging planning issues in Rushcliffe. As part of this exercise, Members identified a number of key issues that are associated with the pressure that exists for major development within the Borough, which developers should be aware of. The Council wishes developers to adequately address those matters of relevance when submitting planning applications.

4.2 The main issues raised through the workshops related to:

- a.) the ability of existing infrastructure to accommodate development;
- b.) the provision of necessary new infrastructure – including highways, education, health and community facilities;

- c.) the need to provide sustainable transport solutions;
  - d.) the need to provide for affordable housing;
  - e.) the need to integrate developments successfully with existing communities;
  - f.) the need to minimise loss of Green Belt;
  - g.) the need for high quality design;
  - h.) the need for development to have the highest possible energy efficiency standards at a reasonable cost;
  - i.) flooding risk and drainage concerns; and
  - j.) the need to protect areas of ecological and environmental interest and make provision for new areas.
- 4.3 At Appendix 1 of this IPS is a comprehensive list of the issues which Council Members have raised and which they wish to see adequately addressed by developers.

## **5.0 Existing policy documents and guidance**

### **National policy**

- 5.1 There is a host of national planning policy and related documents for which account will need to be made in putting together development proposals. It is not the purpose of this document to identify all those that may be relevant.

### **Regional policy**

- 5.2 At the regional level, the existing East Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS8) was adopted in 2005 and, following enactment of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, became part of the statutory development plan. The Act requires the Council, as the Local Planning Authority, to determine all planning applications in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. As has been identified, this Plan is near to being replaced by a Regional Plan which will then itself become part of the statutory development plan.
- 5.3 In addition to setting housing requirements for the Borough and providing the broad strategy for development, the Regional Plan contains a raft of policies aimed at securing development that is sustainable and, as far as is practicable, minimises environmental impact. There is, therefore, a number of detailed policies in the Regional Plan, covering matters such as design quality, protection of the natural and cultural heritage, biodiversity enhancement and landscape protection, which will be used by the Council when determining planning applications.

### **Structure Plan policy**

- 5.4 The Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Joint Structure Plan, adopted in 2006, remains part of the statutory development plan until such time as it is superseded by the new, emerging East Midlands Regional Plan. Until then, the Council will also continue to utilise its provisions, which cover issues such as Green Belt protection, developer contributions and biodiversity protection, in order to secure high quality development and refuse poor quality schemes.

### **Rushcliffe Borough Council policy and guidance**

- 5.5 Turning to the Council's own policies and developer guidance, as already identified, the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan was adopted in 2006. It now replaces the 1996 Rushcliffe Borough Local Plan which, save for six policies, expired in September 2007.

#### Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan

- 5.6 The Borough Council formally adopted the Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan on 14 December 2006. As set out in the document itself, the Non-Statutory Local Plan intends to:
- a) Provide a clear and local interpretation of central Government planning policies and the policies of the adopted Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Joint Structure Plan;
  - b) Review the existing Borough Local Plan which was adopted in June 1996;
  - c) Provide a clear basis for development control;
  - d) To give guidance to developers and the public as to the Borough Council's policies and approach to land use planning and the environment;
  - e) To provide a context for public and private development decisions; and
  - f) To promote the improvement of the environment of the Borough, through development, protection and enhancement of areas or particular sites and provide a context for considering wider environmental issues.
- 5.7 To reaffirm its position, the Non-Statutory Local Plan serves a full and important role as a basis for determining all planning applications. Full details in respect of the document can be found on the Council's Planning Policy web pages.
- 5.8 In addition to the Non-Statutory Local Plan, the Council previously adopted a 'Development Requirements Supplementary Planning

Guidance' (SPG) document in December 2003. This sets out in detail the mechanisms for securing developer contributions against a range of factors. This was adopted and will be treated as a material consideration in determining planning applications. The SPG makes provision for securing contributions for affordable housing, education, health, integrated transport measures, leisure and recreation facilities, and open space maintenance.

#### Emerging Local Development Framework evidence base

- 5.9 A number of studies and surveys have been completed or are currently being progressed as part of work to put in place an 'evidence base' to underpin the Local Development Framework (LDF). Key documents that have or are being produced include:
- Nottingham Core Strategic Housing Market Assessment, April 2007
  - Nottingham City Region Employment Land Study, February 2007
  - Nottingham Principal Urban Area Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, April 2007
  - Nottingham Core Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment – work ongoing
  - Greater Nottingham Strategic Flood Risk Assessment – work ongoing
  - Greater Nottingham Retail Study – work ongoing
  - Nottingham Core Affordable Housing Viability Assessment – work ongoing
  - Rushcliffe Borough Council Open Space Audit – work ongoing
- 5.10 Each one potentially forms a material consideration in the determination of planning applications, particularly for major development schemes. Developers should, therefore, have regard to their findings and conclusions, as too will the Council. This list of studies is likely to be added to over the coming months.

#### Developer's Checklist

- 5.11 Finally, in terms of ensuring that appropriate matters are addressed when a planning application is submitted, the Council has a published 'Developer's Checklist' which is periodically updated. The checklist includes a summary of the various information and assessments that may be required to accompany a planning application and also lists the different types of developer contributions that may be sought by the Council. A copy of the checklist is available on the Council's Planning web pages.

5.12 In summary, it covers:

- Submission of Supporting Planning Statement;
- Housing Developers and Building For Life;
- Design and Access Statements;
- Design Statements;
- Proposed Development within The Green Belt
- Street Montages and Section Drawings
- Development Schedules
- Transport Assessments
- Highways Layout
- Green Travel Plans
- Flood Risk and Drainage Strategies
- Contamination Surveys
- Archaeological Surveys
- Environmental Impact Assessments
- Structural Surveys
- Noise Assessments
- Ecological Surveys
- Tree Surveys/Arboricultural Statements
- Affordable Housing Provision
- Education Contributions
- Health Contributions
- Integrated Transport Measures
- Leisure and Recreation Contributions
- Open Space and Future Maintenance
- Legal Agreements
- Designing Out Crime
- Access Statements
- Waste and Recycling
- Rights of Way
- Cycle Parking
- Listed Building Appraisal And Conservation Area Appraisal
- Retail Assessment
- Sustainability Appraisal
- Air Quality Matters

5.13 In terms of tackling the issues arising out of the Member Workshops for instance, the Developer's Checklist already addresses a number of these. It, therefore, remains appropriate to refer to the checklist in respect of a host of necessary requirements when submitting development proposals.

- 5.14 However, it is considered necessary in respect of certain issues for some further amplification or additional guidance to be provided, which follows below at Section 7. It should be noted that matters identified both in the Checklist and in Section 7 are not necessarily an exhaustive list of all matters that will reasonably need to be addressed by applicants; this will depend on the nature of the proposed development and its particular location.

## **6.0 Sustainable Developer Guide for Nottinghamshire**

- 6.1 The Council also strongly recommends that developers refer to and take account of guidance in the 'Sustainable Developer Guide for Nottinghamshire'. The Guide has been prepared by a partnership of Nottinghamshire local authorities, the Environment Agency and Newark and Sherwood Energy Agency.
- 6.2 The Guide is intended as a useful resource for anyone involved in the development process. Its main focus is on planning and design, but it also offers advice about the construction and maintenance of buildings and considers how the wider impacts of development can be managed (for example, waste and transport issues).
- 6.3 The Guide offers:
- A reliable set of recommendations on a range of key topics;
  - Directions to the most relevant sources of practical information – publications and web sites; and
  - A range of case studies that have successfully incorporated several sustainable elements.
- 6.4 The Guide demonstrates that it is relatively easy, and not necessarily more expensive, for designers and builders to improve on their current performance in delivering beneficial environmental and social outcomes. The individual topics covered by the Guide include:
- Land use, layout and landscape
  - Travel and transport
  - Building design and specification
  - Energy use
  - Renewable energy
  - Health and pollution
  - Waste minimisation
  - Water use and drainage
  - Biodiversity
  - Community

- Historic environment
- Maintenance and management

6.5 The Guide can be viewed on the internet at:  
[www.sdg-nottinghamshire.org.uk](http://www.sdg-nottinghamshire.org.uk)

## **7.0 Additional guidance**

### **Justifying the principle of development**

- 7.1 Prior to the progression of Rushcliffe's Local Development Framework (LDF) there will be an absence of Borough-wide strategies for distributing development and, where necessary, removing land from the Green Belt. Such strategies will be formulated, in part, through comparative assessment of the various alternative options for development in order to choose the most sustainable available.
- 7.2 The Council is keen to ensure that the importance of such comparative analysis is not ignored when planning applications are submitted for major development schemes, prior to the LDF being substantially put in place. Therefore, as a means of justifying the development, the Council expects applicants to fully demonstrate the suitability of their site and the scale of development proposed above that of reasonable alternatives, by undertaking comparative analysis of alternative locations. This should take full account of how each site performs against national, regional and local policies and other criteria. The results of such analysis should be clearly presented to the Council with any planning applications in order that it can expediently determine those submitted.
- 7.3 The Council is required by the national Planning Policy Statement (PPS12) on Local Development Frameworks to adopt a spatial planning approach, in order to ensure the most efficient use of land by balancing competing demands within the context of sustainable development principles. Spatial planning goes beyond traditional land use planning to bring together and integrate policies for the development and use of land with other policies and programmes which influence the nature of places and how they function.
- 7.4 Consequently, there is a requirement to take full account of the principles and characteristics of other relevant strategies and programmes. This includes Rushcliffe's Community Strategy, along with, for example, strategies for education, housing, health, waste and recycling, biodiversity, economic development and transport. A list of relevant regional and local strategies and programmes is at Appendix 2, although this is not necessarily an exhaustive list and will change over time.

- 7.5 The Council believes that consideration of such matters should not in anyway be overlooked when major planning applications are submitted in advance of LDF progression. To do so would be to ignore spatial planning requirements. The Council, therefore, expects applicants to systematically demonstrate that appropriate account has been taken of all relevant strategies that apply to Rushcliffe and to illustrate how development proposals have adequately addressed their essential requirements. Relevant strategies will include those identified above, but there may well be others that are also important.

### **Transport Assessments**

- 7.6 A Transport Assessment will be required for developments that are likely to have significant transport implications. New guidance – ‘Guidance on Transport Assessment’ – was published in March 2007, and should be referred to in full by those submitting relevant planning applications. Compared to the previously published guidance, it expands the scope of the assessment to cover potential implications of development proposals on the entire transport system, including the public transport system (buses, rail and trams), the Strategic Road Network, local highways and footways. Such issues are considered by the Council to be critical matters that any planning application will need to fully address.
- 7.7 In association with Transport Assessments, it is expected that there will be the submission of a Travel Plan, which the Council sees as an increasingly important tool in the delivery of sustainable transport movements – achieving trip reductions and greater use of public transport, for instance. A Travel Plan is a package of site-specific initiatives aimed at improving the availability and choice of travel modes to and from a development. It may also promote practices or policies that reduce the need for travel. The Council wishes such measures to be incorporated in major development schemes in order to minimise any further pressure on the Borough’s road network, which in certain locations, such as along the A52, is very stretched. This is in addition to highway infrastructure improvements that may be identified as necessary through the Transport Assessment process itself.
- 7.8 In respect of Transport Assessments, if a number of major planning applications are to be submitted around the same time there would be a requirement to undertake assessments in a standard way to ensure consistency and allow comparative analysis. Applicants will need to discuss with the methodology of assessment and the likely impact of proposals and the measures required to mitigate adverse impacts and provide suitable site access.

### **Quality design**

- 7.9 The Rushcliffe Borough Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan's Policy GP2 includes criteria that are aimed at securing well designed development that makes a positive contribution to an area. Additionally, emerging East Midlands Regional Plan Policy 3 includes a number of requirements aimed at ensuring that the layout, design and construction of new development is improved.
- 7.10 The production of a 'Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document' (SPD) is timetabled as part of the Local Development Framework. A draft of this document is near to completion, at which time it will be made available to developers. Once available, the Council wishes to ensure that developers give its provisions full consideration when putting together development schemes.
- 7.11 In addition, the Council fully endorses the use of the 'Building for Life' standard, devised by the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment and the Home Builders Federation. As set out in the Council's Developer's Checklist, housing developments should be designed in accordance with the 20 'Building For Life' questions. The 20 questions are set out at Appendix 3. Further details on the standard can be viewed at [www.buildingforlife.org](http://www.buildingforlife.org)

### **Energy efficiency standards**

- 7.12 The introduction of the Code for Sustainable Homes and the Government's intention that all development should be zero carbon by 2016 is welcomed, but the Council considers that more immediate action is required.
- 7.13 The Council wishes to see that all new development exceeds the requirements of the existing building regulations and would like to see low energy development, as set out within the Code for Sustainable Homes, brought forward as soon as possible. It wishes to see housing development that is at least one level ahead of the Government's timescale for the implementation of zero carbon development by 2016, starting with the aim that, at the very least, all dwellings meet or exceed level 3 of the code with immediate effect, rather than in 2010.
- 7.14 In respect of all development, not just housing, the Council wishes to ensure that opportunities are maximised for renewable energy generation. A number of other local authorities are looking to ensure that larger developments incorporate a certain level of on site energy production (such as ground source heat pumps or biomass energy use) to provide for

a certain percentage of energy requirements. This has tended to equate to 10% of total energy requirements, and the Council wishes to see, as far as practicable, such an approach followed in Rushcliffe in order that development schemes best assist with the Government's targets for fossil-fuel use reduction and to accord with its Planning Policy Statement (PPS22) on Renewable Energy, which sets out that local authorities and developers should consider the opportunity for incorporating renewable energy in all new developments.

### **Flooding related issues**

- 7.15 There are significant concerns about avoiding development in areas at risk from flooding or where the development may give rise to increased risk of flooding elsewhere. Clearly the views of the Environment Agency and the requirements of the Government's Planning Policy Statement (PPS25) in respect of Development and Flood Risk are critically important in relation to this issue. In accordance with PPS25, developers will be required to produce a sequential flood risk analysis for their sites.
- 7.16 In addition, the Council is participating in a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) for the Greater Nottingham area and will, once finalised, take account of the findings of the study in considering future development proposals; so too should developers. The Borough Council may need to produce further guidance once the SFRA has been concluded in order to interpret how its outcomes potentially affect new development across the Borough.

## **Appendix 1: Summary of issues raised at Member Workshops**

1. Two Member workshops were held to consider emerging planning issues in Rushcliffe Borough. The first workshop, held on the afternoon of 17 October, was attended by 19 Members, and the second, held on the evening of 1 November, was attended by 14 Members. Issues identified within the workshop included:
  - a.) concern over the ability of the A52 corridor and the A453 to accommodate development. Significant improvements are required before large scale development could go ahead (suggestion that the A52 multi-modal study be implemented);
  - b.) the need for new infrastructure to be provided to accommodate large scale development: including highways, schools, health, education and community facilities, recreation and open space, and new drainage capacity;
  - c.) the need to provide sustainable transport solutions and maximise use of existing public transport;
  - d.) that large scale developments can, given their scale, be better able to generate new infrastructure;
  - e.) the need to provide high levels of affordable housing, with general support for affordable housing in rural areas;
  - f.) the need to integrate developments successfully with existing communities – some concern was expressed that this is more difficult with larger developments;
  - g.) concern that loss of high quality farm land is minimised;
  - h.) concern that adverse impact on landscape and townscape quality is minimised;
  - i.) that there is a need to prioritise brownfield development;
  - j.) there is a need to achieve a mix of uses on large developments;
  - k.) the need to minimise loss of Green Belt;
  - l.) the need to best protect the Green Belt where no defensible boundary exists;
  - m.) there is a need for the highest quality of design;

- n.) need for development to have highest possible energy efficiency standards at reasonable cost;
- o.) avoid development at risk of flooding or which exacerbates the risk of flooding elsewhere – specific reference made to land adjacent to Gamston;
- p.) need to minimise impact upon wildlife – specific reference was made in respect of Sharphill Wood;
- q.) the need to protect areas of ecological and environmental interest and create new areas;
- r.) if Cotgrave Colliery is redeveloped, there is a need to establish physical links with the village;
- s.) there is no potential for RAF Newton to accommodate substantial development without significant highways improvements to the A52 corridor and the A46;
- t.) substantial development at Cotgrave and Bingham should be linked to regeneration of existing centres;
- u.) substantial development at Clifton, Gamston and Sharphill/Edwalton would require comprehensive new infrastructure and services;
- v.) there is general concern about concentrating too much development around the edge of the main urban area; and
- w.) there is general support for a ‘reasonable’ amount of rural housing to support Borough’s rural communities;

## **Appendix 2: Relevant regional and local strategies and programmes**

### **Regional**

- East Midlands Integrated Regional Strategy – Our Sustainable Development Framework EMRA (2005)
- Regional Economic Strategy for the East Midlands 2006-2020, EMDA (2006)
- East Midlands Regional Housing Strategy 2004-2010, RHB (2004)
- Investment for Health: A Public Health Strategy for the East Midlands, EMRA (2003)
- Time for Culture: A Cultural Strategy for the East Midlands (2001)
- Regional Environment Strategy (EMRA):
- Part One: Policies and Objectives for the East Midlands Environment (2002)
- Part Two: Actions for the East Midlands Environment (2003)
- East Midlands Regional Energy Strategy - The East Midlands Energy Challenge, EMRA (March 2004)
- Water Resources for the Future: A Strategy for the East Midlands, Environment Agency (2002)
- East Midlands Regional Waste Strategy - EMRA (2005)
- Putting Wildlife Back on the Map – The East Midlands Biodiversity Strategy, EMRA (2006)
- Change 4 Sport in England's East Midlands – A Regional Plan for Sport 2004 to 2008, Sport England (2004)
- East Midlands Regional Freight Strategy, EMRA, (2005)
- Space4Trees – East Midlands (August 2005)
- Local Transport Plan (LTP) for Greater Nottingham 2006/7 – 20010/11, October 2005

### **County and Borough-Wide**

- Nottinghamshire County Council Bus Strategy 2003, July 2003
- South Nottinghamshire Rail Network Review, August 2003
- Climate Change – Framework for Action in Nottinghamshire – Agenda 21, September 2005
- Nottinghamshire County Council Cycling Strategy
- Action for Wildlife in Nottinghamshire – Local Biodiversity Action Plan, May 1998
- Trent River Park Initiative, October 2005
- Rushcliffe Borough Council Corporate Strategy
- A Better Future for Rushcliffe – Nature Conservation Strategy
- Rushcliffe Borough Housing Strategy
- Rushcliffe Community Strategy 2005-2020

## **Appendix 3: 'Building for Life' 20 Questions**

### **Character**

1. Does the scheme feel like a place with a distinctive character?
2. Do buildings exhibit architectural quality?
3. Are streets defined by a well-structured building layout?
4. Do the buildings and layout make it easy to find your way around?
5. Does the scheme exploit existing buildings, landscape or topography?

### **Roads, parking and pedestrianisation**

6. Does the building layout take priority over the roads and car parking, so that the highways do not dominate?
7. Are the streets pedestrian, cycle and vehicle friendly?
8. Is the car parking well integrated and situated so it supports the street scene?
9. Does the scheme integrate with existing roads, paths and surrounding development?
10. Are public spaces and pedestrian routes overlooked and do they feel safe?

### **Design and Construction**

11. Is the design specific to the scheme?
12. Is public space well designed and does it have suitable management arrangements in place?
13. Do buildings or spaces outperform statutory minima, such as Building Regulations?
14. Has the scheme made use of advances in construction or technology that enhance its performance, quality and attractiveness?
15. Do internal spaces and layout allow for adaptation, conversion or extension?

### **Environment and community**

16. Does the development have easy access to public transport?
17. Does the development have any features that reduce its environmental impact?
18. Is there a tenure mix that reflects the needs of the local community?
19. Is there an accommodation mix that reflects the needs and aspirations of the local community?
20. Does the development provide (or is it close to) community facilities, such as a school, parks, play areas, shops, pubs or cafés?