FOREWORD

It has been a privilege for me to be the Chairman of the Community-led Plan Steering Group, these last two years. We are a group of 18 ordinary members of the public with a strong feeling for community and a determination to seek out and represent the views and opinions of the whole community to the best of our ability. This report is the culmination of this effort.

There has always been a strong sense of community in Bingham. It showed in the clubs and charitable associations the people in Bingham formed in times gone by; in the schools they built and in their celebration of world and national events. Bingham loved a party, whether to celebrate a naval victory against the Dutch in the Demerara River in 1781 or a Ball at the Chesterfield Arms in 1842 to celebrate the christening of His Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales. We even have a church bell commemorating victory over the Spanish Armada in 1588. At big events the whole town celebrated together with parades, fireworks and feasts in the Market Place. Hundreds of children would be served with plum pudding, while adults were served food and beer at trestle tables. Whole sheep would have been roasted on spits set up in the Market Place and before the event barrels of beer would be processed around the Market Place in a cart pulled by white horses decked in laurel leaves. Everything was paid for by subscriptions made by the wealthier members of the public.

This spirit of community lives on. You can see it in the large number of clubs and social events that take place in Bingham now. It was present during the public meeting that set this project off in March 2014 and in the enormous amount of public support we received throughout this exercise. We are thankful for this and hope that this report justifies the trust you put in us.

Although the meeting that started us off was called by the Bingham Town Council, the members of the steering group are on it as individuals and we have taken strenuous efforts to maintain our independence from any political group or stakeholder. None were consulted in the process of putting this report together. The source data we used was entirely from the huge communal response to the two questionnaires we sent out last September. We had answers to 108 questions and thousands of individual comments to analyse and we were scrupulous about not letting ourselves be influenced by anything outside this. Thus, the views expressed here are those you gave to us. We are particularly pleased with the input to this process of Bingham’s schools. Their enthusiastic participation means that all ages of people who live in or use facilities in Bingham, from age seven upwards, are represented.

The 36 recommendations for high priority action that have been made in this report were selected because they gained the highest amount of support in the questionnaire answers. They are the changes you would like to see to make Bingham a better place to live in. Many of them can only be implemented by external authorities that have the power to make the changes required, but some of them can be taken up by you. It is now up to you to see that they happen. This is your manifesto.

Peter Allen
Chairman
Bingham Community-led Plan Steering Group.
May 2016
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In September 2015 4500 printed copies of a questionnaire prepared by the Bingham Community-led Plan (CLP) Steering Group were delivered to every household and business premises in Bingham. A shorter version was made for Toot Hill College and School, Carnarvon Primary School and Robert Miles Junior School. Both were also available online via the CLP website. The questionnaires were built around key issues that had been identified during public consultation events held in December 2014 and January 2015.

The response from the public was excellent. There were 1984 main questionnaires completed (a response rate of 44%), and 969 from the schools (a response rate of 46%). The final results, after detailed analysis, were well balanced in terms of adult and school-age participants. Furthermore, students from Toot Hill College participated in the analysis of the Toot Hill data and took part in discussion groups to look in depth at some of the students’ responses.

The end product is a list of priorities, given below, that people who live, work or use facilities in Bingham would like to see implemented. They are broadly based, but there is a common thread through some of them that reflects fears among the general public for the future viability of the town centre, both from the impact of recent planning decisions that have given consent for three new supermarkets and the lack of progress in solving the car parking problems. The first twelve are the ones that had the most support in the questionnaires, or which emerged as very strongly supported issues in discussions with the students.

THE 12 HIGHEST PRIORITY ACTIONS

- Bingham Town Council should use its powers to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan for Bingham.
- Improve the consultation process with Bingham residents for any future development proposals affecting the town.
- A Community Centre should be built, taking into account the preferred uses indicated in the questionnaire responses.
- Re-establish a local tip or recycling centre.
- Provide free limited hours car parking in the town centre to support shoppers, businesses and visitors and charge for longer stays.
- Provide a long-stay chargeable car park outside the town centre.
- Bingham Leisure Centre should be upgraded and maintenance improved, rather than build a new facility north of the railway line.
- Reduce traffic speeds to 20mph in the town centre and residential areas.
- Address safety concerns in the Market Place with pedestrian crossings at Eaton Place and Robert Miles Junior School. Improve accessibility for pedestrians and extend the one-way traffic system.
- Increase the use of the Market Place for outdoor dining and entertainment.
- Improve facilities for cyclists including parking, dedicated cycle lanes and links to surrounding villages.
- Provide safe pedestrian crossings on access routes to the schools and across main roads as given in the report.

HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE

- There was a preference for longer opening hours in the Belvoir Health Centre (rather than seven-day opening), particularly among working-age people.
- Start more local support groups to meet the individual needs identified.

EDUCATION

- Provide more adult education classes.
## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### SPORTS AND RECREATION
- Maintain and improve the range and standard of sporting facilities.
- Provide more outdoor play areas and better equipment for all ages.

### CRIME AND ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR
- Police presence in Bingham should be increased.
- Street lighting across the town should be improved.
- The threat of anti-social behaviour is more perceived than real, but could be addressed by providing more facilities for youngsters.
- Extend and improve awareness of the Neighbourhood Watch Scheme.

### PUBLIC CONVENIENCES
- Refurbish the present public toilets and introduce a small fee to help pay for it.
- Investigate adding extra public toilets to accommodate the expanding population and to cater for sports fields.

### ENVIRONMENT
- Improve the cleaning of streets and open spaces.
- Reduce the amount of dog mess on pavements, alleyways and open spaces.
- Introduce a ‘Bingham Bag’ scheme.
- Provide more allotments.
- Increase the provision of country park/gardens, wildlife areas and upgrade the Linear Park.

### BUSINESS
- Set up a website dedicated to Bingham that supports local businesses, promotes events and is a source of local information.
- Provide assistance for those wishing to start a business, including work space and information for new retailers.

### MARKET PLACE
- Encourage Rushcliffe Borough Council to support more outdoor events and activities in the Market Place.

### TRANSPORT
- Provide an accessible bridge or lift to give access to the Grantham bound platform at the railway station.
- Introduce traffic lights at the crossroads where Tithby Road meets the A52.
- Look into the provision of a Park and Ride service.

### PLANNING AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF BINGHAM
- The new development north of the railway line should include: adequate on-street, as well as private parking provision; a mix of traditional and modern housing designs; affordable housing to rent and buy; land for self-build homes; smaller 1 and 2 bed properties; warden-aided housing and bungalows.
- All current pedestrian crossings over the railway line should be retained.
The idea for Bingham to have a Community-led Plan was formally launched at a well-attended public meeting called by the Bingham Town Council under the leadership of the Town Mayor, Councillor Tracey Kerry, in the old Methodist Hall on 31st March 2014. The first meeting of those who had expressed an interest in joining the steering group took place in June 2014. Those who attended the second meeting, in July, became the steering group tasked to produce the plan. One of them was elected as chairman at that meeting. Appendix 1 gives the steering group membership. The timetable of events that followed is given in Appendix 2.

The stimulus that led to this action was a general unease about the way that Bingham has been developing in recent years. This public concern has many facets, but a common thread is related to the mismatch between the large increase in housing and the infrastructure facilities to support the increase in population. The lack of public consultation before major developments and the apparent lack of concern about the impact of major planning decisions cause widespread concern. With regard to the latest planning approval for 1050 houses north of the railway there are fears about the development of two separate communities with poor links across the railway line; the potential for congestion at the level crossing on Chapel Lane and poor public transport links out of the new development.

Other complaints have been made about the shortage of green space; difficulties in getting appointments at the Health Centre; too many estate agents; the over-supply of supermarkets and the possible impact these will have on existing shops in the town centre. Poor provision for car parking featured very strongly. This last one is critically important for the survival of the commercial heart of Bingham and is already thought to be responsible for a damaging reduction in the footfall in Market Place.

As most of these concerns are anecdotal, steps had to be taken to collect evidence from the population of Bingham in an organised manner and present the findings in a form that could be referred to by those authorities that are responsible for the way Bingham is developed. This report is the result of action taken to do this. There are two parts to it. The first part is a printed document that presents an analysis of the findings. The second part contains all the raw data and is available, together with the first part, on the Bingham Community-led Plan website, where it will stay until 2019.
THE HISTORY OF BINGHAM’S DEVELOPMENT

In the 1940s and 1950s Bingham was a small agricultural town of less than 1700 people, with a small proportion of inhabitants who commuted to Nottingham and elsewhere to work. For much of Bingham mains water and sewerage were not installed until the 1950s. Change came as a result of a decision by the County Council to concentrate on developing Bingham in order to protect the surrounding villages from expanding.

The Grand Clearance Scheme of 1956 led to many old houses and cottages being demolished and was followed by a major building programme. Demolition was phased to fit with a programme of building new council houses and flats, all done to Government-imposed standards set on local councils to ensure that people were decently housed.

In the early 1960s the first estate was built by private developers and since then new housing has been continually added in estates around the core of Bingham, so that now there is a population of nearly 10,000 people in the town. Planning consent has recently been given for another 1050 houses to be built north of the railway line, which will bring another 2500-3000 people to live here.
From the beginning, the steering group aimed to involve the people of Bingham in every stage of the process. The decision was taken to canvass public opinion using a questionnaire. The questions were developed through a process of debate within the steering group and external consultation at events in December 2014 and January 2015. These were designed to identify the key issues affecting people in Bingham and to find out what they most wanted to see changed. The 750 comments received from the public formed the backbone of the questionnaire. Some matters, such as bus and train travel were not raised in the consultation as a concern, although protests about the new bus service to Nottingham were raised after the event. Car parking was a live issue being dealt with by the Town Council and the questions asked were, as a consequence, limited. The future for Warner’s Paddock was taken up by the landowner, the Crown Estate, and Bingham Town Council after the questionnaire was distributed. Although the target area for the plan is the whole of the parish of Bingham, emphasis was put on activities in and adjacent to the town itself. There was no mention of rural activities in any of the consultation events and there are no questions about them in the questionnaire.

Two questionnaires were devised and made available online via the CLP website. In addition, 4500 paper copies of the main questionnaire were delivered to every household and commercial property in Bingham. A shorter schools’ version was completed by the upper classes in Robert Miles Junior School and Carnarvon Primary School and all years in Toot Hill Academy. This was available only online. Survey Monkey was used for processing the data collected online. While the two versions of the questionnaire were processed separately, the responses have been combined to make this report.

The questionnaires were directed at everyone who lived or worked in Bingham or who used the facilities here. Responses were received from all age groups from seven and eight year olds upwards. About half of the respondents to the schools’ questionnaire did not live in Bingham and this led to issues related to the connectivity between Bingham and the villages being raised in the debates with the sixth formers from Toot Hill College. For full details of the gender and age distribution in both questionnaires and where the respondents live see Appendix 3.

The people of Bingham responded excellently to the questionnaire. 1984 of the main questionnaires were completed, about 1350 of them directly online. All the paper returns were then manually entered online. The target school population was around 2100 students, of whom 969 completed the questionnaire entirely online. This amounted to a combined response rate of just short of 45%, which by any standards is good. What it means for the report is that the findings are a soundly based expression of public opinion.

In most cases there were equivalent questions in the schools’ questionnaire to the main version, sometimes with slightly different wording. However, an important question about the future of Bingham was included only in the schools’ questionnaire. A paragraph has been added to the section of the report on planning to cover the view of the future mostly as seen through the eyes of the school students.

Both of the questionnaires were divided into five themes and each theme contained questions related to the key issues that had been identified after the public consultation events (see Appendix 6 online only for the questionnaires). The questions were set by working groups, each of which had responsibility for a theme. The same working groups processed the results and wrote the section of the report that related to their themes, integrating the results from both of the questionnaires. In addition, a group of sixth formers
from Toot Hill College worked with members of the steering group to look in greater depth at some of the answers to their questions.

The themes were:

- Community Services and Facilities
- Transport
- Environment
- Business Development and Employment
- Planning

Appendix 4 (online only) gives the full responses to all the questions, including an analysis of the comments, quantified and ranked in order of the number of responses.

Appendix 5 (online only) gives the detailed analysis of the questionnaires by theme. It was this work that provided the evidence for the selection of actions given in the next section. The questionnaires themselves are given in Appendix 6 (online only).

The full report, which includes the six appendices, is available on the CLP website and will remain so until 2019. The target audience for the report is the general public, on behalf of whom it has been prepared, and the stakeholders who have the authority to implement the desired actions.
WHAT PEOPLE WANT

This section details the actions that people want to see happen and the supporting evidence. They are not given in any order of priority. While many more concerns were expressed in the questionnaires than are given here (see Appendices 4 and 5, online) only the main ones are mentioned. The proportion of the respondents who answered a particular question in support of any action is given throughout the text.

The tables in each section list the actions in the left hand column. The right hand column identifies the potential lead and support bodies that would be responsible for taking these actions. The middle column gives an indicative timescale for action. This is a judgement made by the members of the working groups who analysed the questionnaire data. It is recognised that while it may be important to initiate some actions in the short term, their execution may take several years. ‘Short term’, as used here, is up to 3 years (that is the time left in the current town council electoral cycle), whilst ‘medium term’ is up to 5 yrs and ‘long term’ is more than 5 yrs.
There were two linked issues here:

1. Provision of a Community Centre, or similar facility, for the use of the community as a whole.
2. Interest in arts and cultural activities, some of which would be carried out within the community centre.

Support for a purpose-built community centre in Bingham was high among both adults (94%) and students (79%). Opinion on the preferred site for a new building was equally divided between the Manor House and its adjacent land and the old police station site.

There was a high demand expressed in both questionnaires for the centre to provide a meeting place for interest groups and space for private functions. Use for film was slightly stronger among the students (56%) than adults (50%). For theatre it was 69% and for gallery space it was 40% in the main questionnaire. Seventy one percent (71%) of the adult respondents regarded involvement in arts and cultural activities as of some importance to them; but only 60% of the students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>INDICATIVE TIMESCALE (Short/Medium/Long term)</th>
<th>POTENTIAL LEAD/SUPPORT BODY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Community Centre should be built taking into account the preferred uses in the questionnaire responses.</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Bingham Town Council, Rushcliffe Borough Council, Police and Crime Commissioner, Chief Constable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUPPORT FOR A COMMUNITY CENTRE

94% of Adults
79% of Students

The Manor House

The old Police Station
Three key issues were identified:

1. Hours that the Health Centre is open.
2. The quality of care provided for the elderly, children and young people.
3. What improvements could be made to the services?

There was a preference for longer opening hours in the Belvoir Health Centre rather than seven-day opening, the result being strongly influenced by replies from working-age respondents. With regard to the quality of care for the elderly and all age groups with ongoing health problems more than 76% expressed satisfaction. The provision for carers and for those with mental health problems the satisfaction level was rather less (72% and 66% respectively).

When asked for ways to improve services, however, a variety of needs was expressed by between 39% and 56% of the adult respondents. These were for supported housing; help with access to or support in work; befriending schemes; improved transport to and access to facilities in Bingham and, more generally, local support groups, though these were not individually identified (see Appendix 4 for details). On the schools’ questionnaire 46% responded to this question and made a wide range of suggestions for new clubs with a particularly strong plea for support for young carers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>INDICATIVE TIMESCALE (Short/Medium/Long term)</th>
<th>POTENTIAL LEAD/SUPPORT BODY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extend the opening hours of the Surgery.</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Belvoir Health Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start more local support groups to meet the individual needs identified.</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Notts County Council – Social Service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bingham Medical Centre
The single key issue relevant to education was:

How education facilities are rated from childcare to adult.

This was a relevant question for a quarter of the respondents. Matters raised ranged from childcare for the under 5s, to childminders, breakfast clubs and formal education, but the only cause for dissatisfaction was in adult education where 36% of the respondents felt a need for more classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>INDICATIVE TIMESCALE (Short/Medium/Long term)</th>
<th>POTENTIAL LEAD/SUPPORT BODY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide more adult education classes.</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Notts County Council Education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The key issues were:

1. Overall provision of facilities for sport.
2. Leisure Centre.
3. Outdoor parks and play areas.

Participation in sport was high (44% of adults and 52% of school children). Football and swimming were dominant among the students, swimming among the adults, but both the adults and children took part to a significant level in a wide range of other sporting activities. There was an overriding view that all facilities needed to be better maintained and improved, particularly with regard to lighting and the outdoor playing surfaces. The two sports regarded as having the poorest facilities are tennis and cycling.

There was an even split among the adult respondents between those who were satisfied with the Bingham Leisure Centre (49.5%) and those who were not (50.5%). Highest levels of dissatisfaction on both questionnaires were with regard to parking, general maintenance and the quality and cleanliness of the changing rooms for swimming. When asked about future leisure Centre provision there was a very strong preference for upgrading the current Leisure Centre (84% among adults, 81% on the schools’ questionnaire) rather than building something new in the development north of the railway line. Should the land allocated for leisure activities north of the railway line be developed, of three options offered the respondents preferred a small building with sports fields (53%).

With regard to outdoor play areas and parks both questionnaires yielded a similar, strong response, with more than 36% of the respondents to both questionnaires supporting each suggestion. These included improvements in the range of equipment for young people and adults, better equipment for children and new play areas for small children. The provision of additional recreational areas for teenagers was well supported on the adult questionnaire (54%), where it was seen as a means of mitigating anti-social behaviour. Support for this was higher among the school-age respondents (67%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>INDICATIVE TIMESCALE (Short/Medium/Long term)</th>
<th>POTENTIAL LEAD/SUPPORT BODY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and improve the range and standard of sporting facilities.</td>
<td>Short/medium term</td>
<td>All sports groups, Bingham Town Council, Rushcliffe Borough Council, Toot Hill Academy and Parkwood Leisure Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham Leisure Centre should be upgraded and maintenance improved, rather than build a new facility north of the railway line.</td>
<td>Short/medium term</td>
<td>Rushcliffe Borough Council, Toot Hill Academy and the Parkwood Leisure Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more outdoor play areas and better equipment for all ages.</td>
<td>Medium to long term</td>
<td>Bingham Town Council, Rushcliffe Borough Council, Crown Estate, Developers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRIME AND ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR

The following key issues were identified:

1. Crime levels.

Fewer adults (23%) than school children (35%) expressed concern about crime and anti-social behaviour in Bingham, with respondents to the schools’ questionnaire identifying a number of specific places in Bingham where they did not feel safe. More detailed analysis of the two questionnaires reveals concerns about the lack of a Police presence and a need for better street lighting across the whole of Bingham. Anti-social behaviour comes across more as a perceived than an actual threat, which could be dealt with by providing improved facilities for teenagers.

63% of the respondents said that they lived in a Neighbourhood Watch area and of those who did not over half said that they would like to take part in the scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>INDICATIVE TIMESCALE (Short/Medium/Long term)</th>
<th>POTENTIAL LEAD/SUPPORT BODY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the Police presence in Bingham.</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Police and Crime Commissioner, Chief Constable, Bingham Town Council, Notts County Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve street lighting across the town.</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Notts County Council, Bingham Town Council / Rushcliffe Borough Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend and improve awareness of the Neighbourhood Watch Scheme.</td>
<td>Medium to long term</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Watch Scheme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rushcliffe Leisure Centre

Bingham Rugby Union Club
WHAT PEOPLE WANT

PUBLIC CONVENIENCES.

The key issue was:

The adequacy of the public conveniences in the town.

This issue has a particular resonance, as currently there is only one public lavatory in operation, which is clearly unsatisfactory. The closed one is in private ownership. There was no feeling that the two available sites should be changed, but the students suggested that more accessible toilet facilities should be available in the playing fields at Toot Hill and there were comments that additional public toilets would be needed to accommodate the expanding population when the new houses north of the railway line were built.

70% of the adult respondents would be willing to pay a small charge to use the public conveniences. The students did not favour any charge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>INDICATIVE TIMESCALE (Short/Medium/Long term)</th>
<th>POTENTIAL LEAD/SUPPORT BODY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refurbish the present public toilet facilities.</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Rushcliffe Borough Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate adding extra public toilets in sports fields and to accommodate expanding population.</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Rushcliffe Borough Council &amp; Bingham Town Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider introducing small payment scheme.</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Rushcliffe Borough Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

70% of adults would pay to spend a penny

Current public toilet near the Library

Disused public toilet on Station Street
The following key issues were identified:

1. Litter and dog fouling.
2. Recycling and waste disposal.
3. The maintenance and improvement of green spaces.

The questionnaires also sought to measure the level of interest in a consultation exercise on reducing energy usage in Bingham and the use of green energy. Responses among adults indicated a 64% level of support for this. Among the students 90% thought that these were important issues.

There is concern about litter amongst all age groups. The main problem area identified was overwhelmingly the town centre, followed by Butt Field and Toot Hill playing fields and footpaths including the Linear Park. Over 360 individual comments were made on this issue and among them nearly every part of Bingham was singled out as in need of protection against litter. Interestingly, there was more concern about litter amongst the 8 – 10 year-olds than older students.

Dog fouling is also a major concern, but in different areas. The town centre is relatively clean. The problem areas are the Linear Park (90%), access routes to the primary schools, parks, footpaths and recreation areas (80%). It is perceived that the problem has worsened since the Town Council stopped supplying bags for the disposal of dog waste.

The loss of the recycling facility at Langar is a major concern and 89% of the respondents would like the return of a local recycling centre. A clear majority would favour on-street glass collection (64%) and local collection points for small items such as small electrical items, pens and ink cartridges (55%).

There was no willingness to prohibit the use of plastic bags in shops in either survey, but the suggestion of a ‘Bingham Bag’ scheme in order to encourage people to re-use shopping bags received support from 81% of adults. The responses on the schools’ questionnaire showed rather less awareness of this being an environmental problem than among the adults.

The results from both surveys showed a desire to maintain and improve green spaces within the town.
A clear priority among adults was for a Country Park (80%) followed by improvements to the Linear Park (65%) and the development of wildlife areas (61%). Among the children 62% wanted more space for outdoor play. The preservation of Warner’s Paddock (under discussion with the Crown Estate to be leased to the Bingham Town Council) featured strongly in the individual comments with a strong preference for it to be left as it is.

There is a need expressed by 63% of the adult respondents for more allotments in the town although there was little interest (21%) in a community allotment or garden scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>INDICATIVE TIMESCALE (Short/Medium/Long term)</th>
<th>POTENTIAL LEAD/SUPPORT BODY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve cleaning in streets and open spaces.</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Rushcliffe Borough Council, Toot Hill School, Bingham Town Council, Friends of Linear Park, Notts County Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the amount of dog mess on pavements, alleyways and open spaces.</td>
<td>Short to long term</td>
<td>Rushcliffe Borough Council, Bingham Town Council, Sports associations, Schools, Residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-establish a local tip or recycling centre.</td>
<td>Medium to long term</td>
<td>Notts County Council, Rushcliffe Borough Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce a ‘Bingham Bag’ scheme.</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Bingham Town Council, Bingham Business Club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more allotments.</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Bingham Town Council, Crown Estates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure long-term future of Warner’s Paddock. Establish country park/gardens, open play areas, wildlife areas and upgrade the Linear Park.</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Bingham Town Council, Crown Estates, Developers, Friends of the Linear Park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The aim of this section was to see if the business and commercial environment in Bingham met the needs of the residents and to this end the following key issues were identified:

1. A Bingham website.
2. Broadband services.
3. Which businesses are missing from Bingham?
4. Start-up space opportunities for small businesses.

Other matters considered as being important to the commercial development of Bingham, such as car parking, safety in the Market Place and the commercial uses to which the Market Place could be put are dealt with elsewhere.

There is a significant demand among the adult population for a website providing local community information (83%) as well as information on local businesses and their services (76%), though the business community was not keen on paying to advertise on it. The student population was less enthusiastic (52%) preferring other methods (mainly using a smart phone) for mass communication. The broadband service was generally considered to be adequate.

In both questionnaires there was a good response to the questions about new commercial services, but they were different. The adults wanted retail outlets, notably clothes and shoe shops that would enable them to do more shopping in Bingham. The students wanted a wider range of services, including fast food outlets that would better meet their requirements for Bingham as a social ‘hub’; particularly for those living in the villages.

The strong demand for start-up business facilities (145 statements of interest) is an indication of the underlying health and confidence in the town’s commercial and business economy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>INDICATIVE TIMESCALE (Short/Medium/Long term)</th>
<th>POTENTIAL LEAD/SUPPORT BODY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set up a website dedicated to Bingham that supports local businesses, promotes events and is a source of local information.</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Bingham Town Council-sponsored with assisted funding from Rushcliffe Borough Council / The Growth Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give assistance for those wishing to start a business, including work space and information for new retailers.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Landowners, estate agents, Bingham Town Council &amp; Rushcliffe Borough Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

83% of adults want a community website

145 statements of interest in start-up business facilities
The Market Place and the Butter Cross provide a focal point for Bingham and questions were asked about how this can be enhanced. These questions have increased in relevance since two new supermarkets have opened in Bingham. The key issues centre on the following:

1. Road safety and access.
2. The use of the space.

Specific questions about road safety around the Market Place drew strong support from the respondents in both questionnaires for pedestrian crossings in the Market Place, specifically at the entrance to Eaton Place and near the entrance to Robert Miles Junior School. There was also strong support (56% of respondents) for pedestrianisation around the Market Place, while 78% of the respondents wanted to extend the one-way traffic system. These results accord well with the strongly stated desire expressed in both questionnaires for more use to be made of the Market Place for outdoor dining and live entertainment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>INDICATIVE TIMESCALE (Short/Medium/Long term)</th>
<th>POTENTIAL LEAD/SUPPORT BODY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address safety concerns in the Market Place with pedestrian crossings at Eaton Place and Robert Miles Junior School; improve accessibility for pedestrians and extend the one-way system around the Market Place/ Cherry St/ Church St.</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Notts County Council, Bingham Town Council &amp; Rushcliffe Borough Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invite local food and drink providers for expressions of interest in providing outdoor catering and al fresco dining in the Market Place.</td>
<td>Short/Long term</td>
<td>Bingham Town Council &amp; Rushcliffe Borough Council to authorize usage of Market Place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask Rushcliffe Borough Council to sanction more outdoor events there.</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Rushcliffe Borough Council and the Growth Board (to assist with relevant insurance costs for the events.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

78% OF ADULTS WANT ONE-WAY TRAFFIC IN THE MARKET PLACE
The following key themes were identified:

1. Road safety and traffic management including traffic speeds and pedestrian crossings.
2. Parking in the centre of the town.
3. Cycling facilities.

Other transport matters, such as bus and train travel, were not considered by residents as being significant key issues during the public consultation. Since the questionnaire was issued, however, Trent Barton has amended their service frequency and routes and a new operator has commenced an express bus service to Nottingham.

Over half the respondents (51%) considered improved access, particularly for wheelchairs, to the Grantham-bound side of the railway station was important. It was also pointed out that wheelchairs cannot access the trains from the Grantham-bound platform.

Pedestrian and cycle access across the railway line (to give as many links between Bingham and the new development north of the railway line) was raised as a key issue. This is considered later.

In both questionnaires road safety was given as a significant problem by about a quarter of the respondents. Specifically, speed restrictions to a limit of 20 mph were thought by the adults to be necessary in the town centre (79%) and residential areas (63%). Since the questionnaire was published advisory 20 mph signs have appeared on the access roads to the primary schools. Other measures (road humps and better signs) were thought by the adults to be appropriate close to schools, though this was a much stronger issue among the school children. While only 31% of the respondents to the main questionnaire wanted further provision of pedestrian crossings, safety at road crossings was a major issue in the response to the schools’ questionnaire (71%). All access routes to the schools were thought to need improvement with special mention being given to Tithby Road crossings including the White Lion traffic lights and further north across Fairfield Street. Younger children wanted to see an upgrade to a pelican crossing with improved lighting across Long Acre at the Yeung Sing Restaurant.

Nearly half of the respondents would like to see traffic lights at the junction of Tithby Road and the A52.
Car parking is a live issue in the town and is actively on the agenda for the Bingham Town Council, but some questions were asked. There was strong support (89%) for charging for town centre car parks after an initial free period of two or three hours. Almost as strong (81%) was the support for a long-stay chargeable car park outside the town centre, ideally with public transport links in and out of town or as a Park and Ride service. There were also suggestions for permit parking on all town centre roads.

There was a strong response to questions on cycling in both questionnaires and cycling on pavements was expressed as a concern. More than half wanted to improve the cycling environment and facilities. Among these are improved parking and locker facilities, the provision of more cycle lanes especially on the main roads and for safe cycle routes to the villages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>INDICATIVE TIMESCALE (Short/Medium/Long term)</th>
<th>POTENTIAL LEAD/SUPPORT BODY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement charges for long-stay town centre parking after an initial free period of 2 or 3 hours.</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Notts County Council, Bingham Town Council &amp; Rushcliffe Borough Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a long-stay chargeable car park away from the town centre.</td>
<td>Medium/long term</td>
<td>Notts County Council, Bingham Town Council &amp; Rushcliffe Borough Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve safety at road crossings including all school access roads, Nottingham Road near bus stops at Mallow Way and Meadowsweet Hill and the Zebra crossing on Long Acre.</td>
<td>Short/medium term</td>
<td>Notts County Council, Bingham Town Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce 20 mph speed restrictions in the town centre and residential areas and other measures to slow traffic near schools.</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Notts County Council, Bingham Town Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve facilities for cyclists including better parking facilities, dedicated cycle lanes throughout Bingham and improved cycle links to surrounding villages.</td>
<td>Cycle Parking – short term</td>
<td>Notts County Council, Bingham Town Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycle lanes/links – Medium to long term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A new accessible bridge or lift should be provided to improve access to the Grantham bound platform.</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
<td>Network Rail, Bingham Town Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce traffic lights at the crossroads where Tithby Road meets the A52.</td>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>Highways England, Notts County Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whilst no specific question was asked a significant number of comments supported the provision of a Park and Ride service.</td>
<td>Long term</td>
<td>Notts County Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following key issues were considered:

1. The major development proposed to the north of the railway line.
2. The future of Warner’s Paddock.
3. Long-term future planning of Bingham’s development.

Whilst planning permission is already in place for the development north of the railway line there remains an appetite to try and influence the form of development there including the type of homes built, the provision of land for leisure facilities and improvement of infrastructure. A strong concern has been expressed that without good links across the railway line, particularly for pedestrian access there is a risk of two separate communities developing.

Nearly 60% of the respondents identified affordable housing for rent or purchase as their highest priority with a preference throughout the development for smaller 1 or 2 bedroom properties (48%) over the large 3 to 5 bedroom houses (20%). There was also a high priority demand for bungalows (43%) and warden-aided housing (43%). Traditional house designs were favoured over modern designs (79% to 65%) and just under half the respondents supported the provision of land for self-build homes. (N.B. Government guidelines issued in 2015 now require Local Planning Authorities to plan for self-build/custom-build developments). The strongest demand (93%) was for adequate on-street as well as private car parking in all new developments.

In the light of the future development north of the railway line there was very strong support in favour of retaining all the current pedestrian links across the railway line. The Moor Lane crossing drew support from 78% of the respondents.

The main general comments made on planning matters are that Bingham cannot take any more development and that the provision of infrastructure is not matching housing development. Specifically, schools, medical facilities, roads, car parking and shops were identified as problems.

Since devising the questionnaires, discussions have started between Bingham Town Council and the landowner, the Crown Estate, about a long-term lease of Warner’s Paddock to Bingham Town Council. Public opinion strongly favours (64%) that it should be left as it is.

Nearly all respondents to both questionnaires wanted a say in the longer-term future planning of Bingham and there was near unanimous support (98%) for the development of a statutory Neighbourhood Plan, particularly should there be any emerging further development proposals to extend the town.

In this context it is interesting that in the schools’ questionnaire they were asked if they had a view on whether Bingham should stay the same size or get bigger. 39% wanted Bingham to grow. Working with the student representatives it seems that they may have considered this an opportunity to provide improved local shopping, restaurants and recreational facilities, provide more local job opportunities and better transport links to surrounding villages. All of this is in keeping with their view of Bingham as a local ‘hub’. While about half of them would like to live in Bingham as adults (46%) only 26% would like to work here. Concerns were expressed regarding the limited capacity of Toot Hill School to deal with much more population growth and the need to protect and develop more green spaces.
Planning

Steps should be taken to give Bingham residents a greater say in any future development proposals affecting the town. Short/medium term Bingham Town Council, Rushcliffe Borough Council and Crown Estate.

Bingham Town Council should use its powers to prepare a ‘Neighbourhood Plan’ at the appropriate time. Short term Bingham Town Council.

Detailed proposals for new development on land with permission to the north of the railway line should include provisions as recommended in this report. Short/medium term Bingham Town Council, Rushcliffe Borough Council, Crown Estate and Developers.

All current pedestrian crossings should be retained across the railway line. Short term Network Rail, Notts. County Council, Bingham Town Council.

All current pedestrian crossings should be retained across the railway line. Short term Network Rail, Notts. County Council, Bingham Town Council.

**Table: Action, Indicative Timescale, and Potential Lead/Support Body**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>INDICATIVE TIMESCALE (Short/Medium/Long term)</th>
<th>POTENTIAL LEAD/SUPPORT BODY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steps should be taken to give Bingham residents a greater say in any future development proposals affecting the town.</td>
<td>Short/medium term</td>
<td>Bingham Town Council, Rushcliffe Borough Council and Crown Estate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham Town Council should use its powers to prepare a ‘Neighbourhood Plan’ at the appropriate time.</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Bingham Town Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed proposals for new development on land with permission to the north of the railway line should include provisions as recommended in this report.</td>
<td>Short/medium term</td>
<td>Bingham Town Council, Rushcliffe Borough Council, Crown Estate and Developers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All current pedestrian crossings should be retained across the railway line.</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Network Rail, Notts. County Council, Bingham Town Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All current pedestrian crossings should be retained across the railway line.</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Network Rail, Notts. County Council, Bingham Town Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Bingham Community-led Plan Steering Group does not have any powers to carry out the actions identified in the questionnaire. The group is therefore limited to oversight of the recommended actions in this report.

All steps will be taken to ensure that the potential lead and support bodies identified against each of the recommended actions are made aware of the contents of this report and it has been decided that at a future date the Steering Group will reconvene to carry out a review of progress.

The CLP website www.binghamcommunityledplan.org.uk will remain active until 2019 and it will be used to report progress from time to time.

### FUNDING THE PLAN

The income and expenditure incurred in the development of this plan are shown here as a guide to other groups that may be considering doing something similar. Note that a meeting place for the Steering Group was provided free of charge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>£2,338.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Lottery</td>
<td>£4,437.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total income</strong></td>
<td><strong>£6,775.50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open days and marketing</td>
<td>£1,207.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and distribution</td>
<td>£4,792.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>£523.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>£252.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>£6,775.50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

MEMBERSHIP OF THE STEERING GROUP

The membership of the steering group was established in July 2014 by co-opting those people who had indicated they would like to be part of it at the public meeting in March 2014 and who were able to attend the July meeting. These were:

Peter Allen       Chairman
Andrew Smith  Vice-chairman
Barrie Thomas  Treasurer
Joanne Brazell  Secretary
Tracey Kerry  BTC councillor
Tony Fox  BTC councillor
Simon Barnicott Pat Mason
Mike Baulcombe  Trevor Richmond
Peter Broekhuizen Becky Shaw
Val Fisher  Andrew Shelton
Jonathan Hammond Peter Walters
Alison Langford

Jenny Kirkwood of Rural Community Action Nottinghamshire (RCAN) attended as an external advisor.

Over time the make up of the steering group changed. Joanne Brazell resigned from the steering group. Becky Shaw took extended maternity leave without resigning. Jenny Kirkwood also left while on maternity leave and was replaced by Alex Raynor, though she returned in April 2016.

Additional members co-opted onto the committee include Jo Gretton (October 2014), Paul O’Neill (February 2015), Ann Lewis (September 2015) and Lis Leslie (November 2015).

Councillor Tracey Kerry was a non-attending member of the steering group, while Councillor Tony Fox was the nominated link between the steering group and the town council. He resigned from the council at the elections in May 2015, but retained his place on the steering group. During these elections two steering group members, Alison Langford and Andrew Shelton, were elected to the Bingham Town Council. They both continued to sit on the steering group; Alison Langford became the link councillor.

On Joanne Brazell’s resignation from the steering group in March 2015 Trevor Richmond became secretary, aided by Mike Baulcombe. He resigned from that post in December 2015 and was replaced by Pat Mason.
APPENDIX 2

TIMETABLE OF EVENTS

The idea for Bingham to have a Community-led Plan was formally launched at a well-attended public meeting in the old Methodist Hall on 31st March 2014. The steering group that was tasked to carry it out formally began work in July that year. (See Appendix 1 for steering group membership).

Meetings of the steering group were held on the third Monday of each month in the Bingham Town Council Offices.

Early in the life of the Steering Group it was decided to seek comment from the general public in order to prepare a community-led plan via a questionnaire that would be delivered to each household in Bingham.

Public consultation prior to setting a questionnaire took place at the following key events:

5th Dec 2014  Bingham Christmas Fair
28th, 29th & 31st Jan 2015  Open days in the old Methodist Hall

At these events comments were invited from the public about matters to do with the present and future Bingham that was of concern to them. Over 750 comments were recorded and these were used as a basis for drawing up the questionnaire.

The questions were drafted by five working groups. These broadly covered:

- Community Services and Facilities
- Environment
- Transport
- Planning
- Business Development and Employment

The wording on the questionnaire was settled during the summer of 2015 and the decision was taken to have two versions: one for all households in Bingham; the other, a shorter one, for schools. The longer questionnaire was printed and delivered to each household, but a digital version of it was held on Survey Monkey accessible via the CLP website. The schools’ version was only available on the website.

7th September 2015  Start of distribution of 4500 copies of the questionnaire to all households, commercial and business addresses in Bingham. Copies were also given to market-stall holders and others who came to Bingham, but lived elsewhere.

26th September 2015  Collection of paper copies of questionnaire.

19th October 2015  Digital data entry via Survey Monkey on the CLP website was closed down. 1984 entries received, of which 1350 were submitted digitally. All entries on hard copy were converted to digital by this date.

16th November 2015  Access by students to the schools’ questionnaire on the website was closed down. 969 entries were received, all were digital.

The information received from the main questionnaire was analysed by the five working groups that set the questions. The first task was to read and classify all the free text contributions to the questions. This was completed by the 18th January.

The schools’ questionnaire was processed partly by a group of sixth formers from Toot Hill College and partly by members of the steering
group. The contribution by the school took place at two meetings with sixth formers from Toot Hill College on 13th (18 students) and 20th January (12 students). All the findings have been integrated into this one report.

18th January 2016  Steering Group agreed the structure of the final report and the publication policy.

15th March 2016  Completion of a first draft of the final report and submission to the Steering Group for critical comment.

27th March 2016  Completion of second draft of the report.

10th April 2016  Completion of third draft of the report.

20th April 2016  Completion of final draft.

25th April 2016  Approval of the final draft report.

17th May 2016  Preview of the report to Bingham Town Council.

6th June 2016  Publication of report.
APPENDIX 3

AGE AND GENDER DISTRIBUTION AND WHERE THE RESPONDENTS LIVE

The first section on both of the questionnaires asked for personal data in relation to age, gender and where they lived.

The total number of questionnaires returned was 2953. The total number of individuals, who declared their age, gender or where they lived, however was less than this because in some responses this information was withheld. In the case of gender where the questionnaires had been completed jointly by a husband and wife and both genders declared Survey Monkey returned a nil response because it could not decide whether to put male or female.

Response rate

The school responses constitute about 46% of the available children (2100) in Toot Hill School and College and the top classes in Carnarvon Primary School and Robert Miles Junior School. The adult responses cannot easily be calculated because in many cases only one person in a household completed it, in others where it was completed online more than one member of the household filled it in. If the responses are taken as a proportion of the number of questionnaires delivered the reply rate is 44%. If it calculated as a proportion of the number of adults in Bingham (calculated as about 7315 using a statistical breakdown of ages provided by the Office of National Statistics) the reply rate is about 28%.

Age of respondents

The age range of the respondents to the questionnaire is skewed towards the younger groups because a special questionnaire was designed for the schools and the head teachers made time available in school hours for their students to complete it. This ensured a high response rate.

![Age Range Bar Chart]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE RANGE</th>
<th>MAIN</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76 and above</td>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 to 75</td>
<td>461</td>
<td></td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 to 65</td>
<td>355</td>
<td></td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 55</td>
<td>336</td>
<td></td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 to 45</td>
<td>343</td>
<td></td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 35</td>
<td>208</td>
<td></td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td></td>
<td>383</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2932</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender
Overall there were more responses by females than males. 59% of the respondents in the main questionnaire were women. There was more of a balance among the students, with 51% being female.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>MAIN</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2893</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Home area
The figures for where they lived were different between the two questionnaires. Only 0.04% of the respondents answering the main questionnaire lived outside Bingham, while 48% of the students lived outside Bingham. Many of these came from the surrounding villages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>MAIN</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>2371</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>