

Comment

Consultee ASLOCKTON PARISH COUNCIL Cllr Kath Auckland
(1073394)

Email Address

Address NORMANSTON
CLIFFHILL LANE
ASLOCKTON
NG13 9AP

Event Name Local Plan Part 2 Further Options

Comment by ASLOCKTON PARISH COUNCIL Cllr Kath Auckland

Comment ID 49

Response Date 28/03/17 11:13

Status Submitted

Submission Type Web

Version 0.1

Question 1

Do you agree with the Council's assessment of the present housing supply situation and that enough land will need to be identified by Local Plan Part 2 to accommodate around 2,000 new homes? Yes

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.

Priority should be placed on developing the strategic sites to meet the housing needs and care should be taken not to by pass these for the rural sites that may be quicker to develop but are unsustainable for anything other than local need.

Question 2

Do you agree with the Council's view that none of the three strategic allocations (Melton Road, Edwalton; South of Clifton; and East of Gamston/North of Tollerton) should be expanded as part of resolving the current shortfall in the amount of land that is available for housing development over the next few years? Don't know

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response

As most of the housing needs comes from the city and this is where employment, services and public transport are best located, APC supports the policy of sustainable urban extension and we feel this should be preferable to developing in key settlements, however we understand the speed of delivery has to be considered and can be a significant factor.

Question 3

There is, in our view, just one site on the edge of West Bridgford or Clifton that may be suitable for housing development and which could help tackle the current housing land supply shortfall. This is land at Simkins Farm at Adbolton Lane, West Bridgford, which has a potential capacity of around 40 homes. The site is shown on Figure 2 below. We would like to know whether or not you think it is suitable for housing development.

A number of other sites on the edge of West Bridgford or Clifton have been ruled out at this stage because they are not considered capable of being developed. If, however, you think there are any sites that should be developed we would like to know. It may be useful to refer to our Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) which identifies all those sites that have been put forward by developers and others as potentially suitable for housing development – please see <http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy/localplan/supportingstudies/strategiclandavailabilityassessment/>

Do you support housing development at:

Site HOL1 - Simkins Farm, Adbolton Lane, West Bridgford (potential capacity around 40 homes) Yes - all of site

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers. This could include comments on the services and facilities required to support development and the design, mix and layout of development.

The site is close to the city with all its amenities and a high proportion of the housing need stems from Nottingham City.

Question 4

Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should not allocate further greenfield land for housing development at Bingham in the plan period (up to 2028)? Don't know

Please provide any comments you wish to make in support of your response.

APC agrees with the Core Strategy that aims to concentrate most of the new development on the main urban area around Nottingham, with a further development at 5 key settlements, and development in "other villages" for local needs only. Therefore if suitable sites are available on green field at Bingham, APC feels this is preferable to developing in "other villages" where there are few or no amenities and poor public transport.

Question 5

Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for housing development at Cotgrave in the plan period (up to 2028)? Yes

Please provide any comments you wish to make in support of your response.

Due to the services and amenities at Cotgrave and its close proximity to Nottingham, it would appear to be a very sustainable location and would benefit from regeneration being an ex colliery town.

Question 6

If Local Plan Part 2 does allocate land at Cotgrave for housing development, the total amount identified will be dependent on a range of factors including the capacity of local facilities (e.g. schools, doctors' surgery) and infrastructure (e.g. local roads) to sustain new homes, the potential physical impact of development on locations around the town, including how the Green Belt would be affected, and how quickly particular sites would be able to deliver new homes. It will become clearer as development proposals become more certain what new or improved services and facilities are required to support new housing. The views of service providers such as Nottinghamshire County Council will be important in identifying what is required.

Do you have a view on the total number of new homes that should be accommodated on greenfield sites at Cotgrave up to 2028? If possible, please give reasons for your answer.

APC feels that housing should be prioritised in locations closest to the city of Nottingham as this is where most of the housing need stems from. It is also where the majority of employment is. However although not the nearest of the key settlements to Nottingham, it is adjacent to the A46 and commutable to Leicester. Therefore Cotgrave should have a higher percentage of new housing development than East Leake and Bingham that are distanced further from Nottingham.

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers. For any of the sites, this could include comments on the services and facilities required to support development and the design, mix and layout of development.

APC feels they are not in a position to comment on individual sites

Question 8

Do you agree that, apart from those eight sites that already have planning permission for housing development (sites EL1 to EL8 as shown below), further greenfield land should not be allocated for housing development at East Leake? Don't know

Please provide any comments you wish to make in support of your response.

By its location, about 10 miles from Nottingham, it is one of the furthest of the key settlements from Nottingham and would appear not to be a preferred location however APC does not know the area in detail to know if further development would be sustainable with its existing infrastructure.

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers. For any of the sites, this could include comments on the services and facilities required to support development and the design, mix and layout of development.

APC feels unable to comment on individual sites.

Question 10

Do you have a view on the total number of new homes that should be built on greenfield sites at Keyworth up to 2028? If possible, please give reasons for your answer.

With such a large number of possible sites and being located nearer to Nottingham, APC feels that there should be proportionately more development at Keyworth than more rurally located key settlements of East Leake and Bingham. APC is surprised and disappointed at the lack of planning permissions when Keyworth has a neighbourhood plan in place.

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers. For any of the sites, this could include comments on the services and facilities required to support development and the design, mix and layout of development.

APC feels unable to comment on individual sites.

Question 12

Do you have a view on the total number of new homes that should be built on greenfield sites at Radcliffe on Trent up to 2028? If possible, please give reasons for your answer.

Due to the closeness of Radcliffe to Nottingham, it is the second closest of all the key settlements, APC feels that Radcliffe should be developed in preference to more rural locations even if improvements to services are required. Being on the same route to Nottingham as Bingham, both rail and road, it would seem logical that Radcliffe should have at least the same level of development as Bingham, and as several smaller sites should be quicker to develop than the large one at Bingham, this should be a significant factor in Radcliffe's favour.

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers. For any of the sites, this could include comments on the services and facilities required to support development and the design, mix and layout of development.

APC feels unable to comment on individual sites.

Question 14

Do you have a view on the total number of new homes that should be accommodated on greenfield sites at Ruddington up to 2028? If possible, please give reasons for your answer.

APC feels that as Ruddington is adjacent to West Bridgford it should almost come under the strategic policy of urban extension and would therefore be the most preferable of the key settlements, and should undergo significant development. Ruddington benefits from its closeness to Nottingham, many amenities and a Country Park.

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers. For any of the sites, this could include comments on the services and facilities required to support development and the design, mix and layout of development.

APC feels unable to comment on individual sites.

Question 16

Do you agree that, apart from the site to the south of Abbey Lane, Aslockton with planning permission for up to 75 new homes, Local Plan Part 2 should not allocate greenfield land for housing development at Aslockton and Whatton in the plan period (up to 2028)? Yes

Please provide any comments you wish to make in support of your response.

Aslockton has already grown from 387 households (2011 census) to currently 410, an increase of 6% by small developments and conversions. With the 75 on Abbey Lane, there will be a further increase of 19%, Aslockton has already undergone considerable expansion for a small village with so few

facilities - there is **no** supermarket, **no** secondary school, and **no** doctors surgery, and with limited public transport the expansion will already increase car-borne travel. APC feels that the additional 75 houses more than satisfies any local need and as such the village should only further accommodate very small individual development such as conversions, annexes etc.

Question 17

The villages which we have identified as potentially suitable to accommodate a limited level of housing development on greenfield sites are as follows:

- . Cropwell Bishop;
- . East Bridgford;
- . Gotham;
- . Sutton Bonington; and
- . Tollerton

These particular villages have been identified because, while they do not provide for a full range of facilities as is the case at West Bridgford and the key settlements, the basic level of facilities (e.g. schools; doctors' surgery) that are available are deemed capable of potentially supporting a relatively limited level of housing growth without compromising the strategy set out in Local Plan Part 1 (Core Strategy) for the distribution of new housing.

Should Local Plan Part 2 identify the following 'other' villages as suitable for a limited level of housing growth on greenfield sites?

Cropwell Bishop	. Yes
East Bridgford	. Yes
Gotham	. Yes
Sutton Bonington	. Yes
Tollerton	. Yes

Any other settlement (please specify which)

Please provide any comments you wish to make in support of your response.

APC supports the Core Strategy that "other villages" should only have development for local needs only. However if the housing shortfall has to be reluctantly developed in "other villages" than those with the most amenities should be the most sustainable or easily made sustainable. Therefore as all the villages listed have a doctors surgery, shops, post office and a primary school, APC feels these are preferable sites to other more rural villages with few or no amenities.

Question 18

If greenfield land is allocated for housing development at Cropwell Bishop, do you have a view on the total number of new homes that should be built up to 2028? If possible, please give reasons for your answer.

APC feels that with the abundance of proposed sites at the various key settlements these should be absorbing more of the shortfall than the "other villages" even if this involves improvements to services and infrastructure - the more facilities than are provided within a town should reduce the need to travel by car.

Of the five proposed "other villages" Cropwell Bishop has the basic amenities expected of a medium sized village (doctors surgery, primary school, post office, shops etc) but in addition provides some local employment with having a business park and the Creamery. Therefore APC feels that Cropwell Bishop should have a higher percentage than East Bridgford and Gotham.

Question 19

There are a number of sites that have been put forward by developers and others as potentially suitable for housing development at Cropwell Bishop. These are shown on the plan below. Most of the sites, if identified as suitable for housing development, should be able to deliver new homes relatively quickly and, therefore, contribute to resolving the current shortfall in the amount of land that is available for housing development over the next few years.

We would like to know what you think about the suitability of each of those individual sites shown on the plan below and whether, in each case, the site should or should not be allocated for housing development. For any one site, it should be noted that there may be the option to develop only part of the site rather than its whole.

The development of any one of these sites would be likely to result in impacts which require mitigation and also opportunities to improve the local area. We would need to consider the facilities and services required, the type and design of housing, and how the site would be accessed by car and public transport, amongst a number of other issues.

Do you support housing development at:

Site CBI1 – Land to the south of Nottingham Road and east of Kinoulton Road (potential capacity around 30 homes)

Site CBI2 – Land north of Memorial Hall (1) (potential capacity around 75 homes)

Site CBI3– Land north of Memorial Hall (2) (potential capacity around 60 homes)

Site CBI4 – Land north of Fern Road (2) (potential capacity around 30 homes)

Site CBI5 – Land north of Fern Road (1) (potential capacity around 250 homes)

Site CBI6 – Land to the north of Fern Road (3) (potential capacity around 70 homes)

Any other location (please specify which)

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers. For any of the sites, this could include comments on the services and facilities required to support development and the design, mix and layout of development.

APC feels unable to comment on individual sites.

Question 20

If greenfield land is allocated for housing development at East Bridgford, do you have a view on the total number of new homes that should be built up to 2028? If possible, please give reasons for your answer.

APC agrees that as East Bridgford has the basic level of facilities (ie doctor's surgery) and as such is better suited to absorb new housing than more rural locations with fewer facilities.

Question 21

There are a number of sites that have been put forward by developers and others as potentially suitable for housing development at East Bridgford. These are shown on the plan below. Most of the sites, if identified

as suitable for housing development, should be able to deliver new homes relatively quickly and, therefore, contribute to resolving the current shortfall in the amount of land that is available for housing development over the next few years.

We would like to know what you think about the suitability of each of those individual sites shown on the plan below and whether, in each case, the site should or should not be allocated for housing development. For any one site, it should be noted that there may be the option to develop only part of the site rather than its whole.

The development of any one of these sites would be likely to result in impacts which require mitigation and also opportunities to improve the local area. We would need to consider the facilities and services required, the type and design of housing, and how the site would be accessed by car and public transport, amongst a number of other issues.

Do you support housing development at:

Site EBR1 – Land behind Kirk Hill (east) (potential capacity around 15 homes)

Site EBR2 – Land behind Kirk Hill (west) (potential capacity around 70 homes)

Site EBR3 – Land north of Kneeton Road (1) (potential capacity around 95 homes)

Site EBR4 – Land north of Kneeton Road (2) (potential capacity around 150 homes)

Site EBR5 – Land at Lammas Lane (potential capacity around 40 homes)

Site EBR6 – Closes Side Lane (west) (potential capacity around 20 homes)

Site EBR7 – Closes Side Lane (east) (potential capacity around 20 homes)

Site EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane (potential capacity around 20 homes)

Site EBR9 – Land to the south of Springdale Lane (potential capacity around 30 homes)

Any other location (please specify which)

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers. For any of the sites, this could include comments on the services and facilities required to support development and the design, mix and layout of development.

APC feels unable to comment on individual sites.

Question 22

If greenfield land is allocated for housing development at Gotham, do you have a view on the total number of new homes that should be built up to 2028? If possible, please give reasons for your answer.

APC feels that due to the close proximity of Gotham to Nottingham and its amenities, it is better suited to increase in size than more rural locations. It is also noted that the speed of delivery is a significant factor.

Question 23

There are a number of sites that have been put forward by developers and others as potentially suitable for housing development at Gotham. These are shown on the plan below. Most of the sites, if identified as suitable for housing development, should be able to deliver new homes relatively quickly and, therefore, contribute to resolving the current shortfall in the amount of land that is available for housing development over the next few years.

We would like to know what you think about the suitability of each of those individual sites shown on the plan below and whether, in each case, the site should or should not be allocated for housing development. For any one site, it should be noted that there may be the option to develop only part of the site rather than its whole.

The development of any one of these sites would be likely to result in impacts which require mitigation and also opportunities to improve the local area. We would need to consider the facilities and services required, the type and design of housing, and how the site would be accessed by car and public transport, amongst a number of other issues.

Do you support housing development at:

Site GOT1 – Land to the rear of former British Legion (potential capacity around 25 homes)

Site GOT2 – Land north of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (west) (potential capacity around 50 homes)

Site GOT3 – Land north of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (east) (potential capacity around 20 homes)

Site GOT4 – The Orchards, Leake Road (potential capacity around 50 homes)

Site GOT5 – Land east of Gypsum Way/The Orchards (potential capacity around 200 homes)

Site GOT6 – East of Leake Road (potential capacity around 45 homes)

Site GOT7 – Land east of Hill Road (potential capacity around 160 homes)

Site GOT8 – Land south of Moor Lane (potential capacity around 15 homes)

Any other location (please specify which)

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers. For any of the sites, this could include comments on the services and facilities required to support development and the design, mix and layout of development.

APC feels unable to comment on individual sites.

Question 24

If greenfield land is allocated for housing development at Sutton Bonington, do you have a view on the total number of new homes that should be built up to 2028? If possible, please give reasons for your answer.

APC feels that Sutton Bonington being the furthest of the 5 "other villages" from Nottingham should have the lowest number of houses but as there is the one proposed site that can be delivered quickly, APC feels this is a reasonable number considering the level of amenities in the village.

Question 25

There is one site that has been put forward by a landowner as potentially suitable for housing development at Sutton Bonington. This is shown on the plan below. The site, if identified as suitable for housing development, should be able to deliver new homes relatively quickly and, therefore, contribute to resolving the current shortfall in the amount of land that is available for housing development over the next few years.

We would like to know what you think about the suitability of the site shown on the plan below and whether it should or should not be allocated for housing development. For any one site, it should be noted that there may be the option to develop only part of the site rather than its whole.

The development of the site would be likely to result in impacts which require mitigation and also opportunities to improve the local area. We would need to consider the facilities and services required, the type and design of housing, and how the site would be accessed by car and public transport, amongst a number of other issues.

Do you support housing development at:

Site SUT1 – Land north of Park Lane (potential capacity around 140 homes) . Yes - all of site

Any other location (please specify which)

Question 26

If greenfield land is allocated for housing development at Tollerton, do you have a view on the total number of new homes that should be built up to 2028? If possible, please give reasons for your answer.

APC feels that due to the very close proximity of Tollerton to Nottingham and its amenities, it is the best positioned of the "other villages", Therefore APC feels Tollerton should have a higher percentage than the more rural locations. It is also noted that the speed of delivery is a significant factor.

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers. For any of the sites, this could include comments on the services and facilities required to support development and the design, mix and layout of development.

APC feels unable to comment on individual sites.