

## Comment

<b>Consultee</b>	Ms Bettina Lange (1073959)
<b>Email Address</b>	
<b>Company / Organisation</b>	Notts CPRE
<b>Address</b>	50 Harris Road Nottingham NG9 4FB
<b>Event Name</b>	Local Plan Part 2 Further Options
<b>Comment by</b>	Notts CPRE (Ms Bettina Lange)
<b>Comment ID</b>	103
<b>Response Date</b>	31/03/17 12:20
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.1

### Question 1

<b>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?</b>	Don't know
---	------------

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

We appreciate the pressures resulting from 5 year housing land requirement and the consequences of the large strategic sites not delivering, or not at anything like the pace the Core Strategy assumed. However, we would like more information on the reasons for non-delivery or under-delivery and the action Rushcliffe have taken to try and improve delivery rates. The reasons may well be outside Rushcliffe's control, in which case allocating more land is unfair. But even where the reasons are beyond Rushcliffe's control, more information would instil some confidence at least that the situation is in hand and that Rushcliffe will not be faced with allocating yet more greenfield sites in a year's time in what increasingly appears a less than strategic approach. Piecemeal planning is not what the Plan-led planning system is intended for.

### 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 - but only part 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.**

Possibly part of the site provided if the development does not detract from the Skylarks nature reserve, one of the few nature reserve 100% accessible for wheelchair users and specifically created for their use.

**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)?**      Yes

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

In the circumstances. We accept Rushcliffe's argument that extending the site already allocated to the north of Bingham would not contribute to the 5 year housing land supply, and it is our view that any other sites around Bingham would lead to encroachment into the countryside and near-coalescence.

**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)?**      No

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

Any further Greenfield allocations at Cotgrave would encroach into open countryside and detract from the attractive, intact Cotgrave Wolds.

**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.**

see answer to question 5

### **Question 7**

There are a number of sites that have been put forward by developers and others as potentially suitable for housing development. These are shown 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 Figure 4 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:**

<b>Site COT1 - Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park (potential capacity around 240 homes)</b>	No
<b>Site COT2 - Land at Main Road (potential capacity around 50 homes)</b>	No
<b>Site COT3 – Land rear of and to the west of Main Road (potential capacity around 125 homes)</b>	No
<b>COT4 - Land off Woodgate Lane (potential capacity around 80 homes)</b>	No
<b>Site COT5 – Bakers Hollow (potential capacity around 60 homes)</b>	No
<b>Site COT6 – The Brickyard, Owthorpe Road (potential capacity around 100 homes)</b>	No
<b>Site COT7– Land behind Firdale (2) (potential capacity around 65 homes)</b>	No
<b>Site COT8 – Land behind Firdale (potential capacity around 95 homes)</b>	No
<b>Site COT9 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (1) (potential capacity around 140 homes)</b>	No
<b>Site COT10 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (2) (potential capacity around 40 homes)</b>	No
<b>Site COT11 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (3) (potential capacity around 250 homes)</b>	No
<b>Site COT12– Land south of Plumtree Lane (potential capacity around 250 homes)</b>	No

**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.**

see answer to question 5

### 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?** Yes

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

but we would like to be reassured that the excess 400 homes in excess of the target for East Leake have been taken into account in calculating overall housing land supply

### Question 9

If, however, extra housing land does need to be allocated at East Leake, there are a number of sites that have been put forward by developers and others as potentially suitable for housing development. These are also shown below (sites EL9 to EL14). We would like to know what you think about the suitability of each of the six sites and whether each one 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 EL9 – Land south of West Leake Road (potential capacity around 50 homes)** No

**Site EL10 – Land north of West Leake Road (potential capacity around 75 homes)** No

**Site EL11 – Brook Furlong Farm (potential capacity around 70 homes)** No

**Site EL12 – Land off Rempstone Road (north) (potential capacity around 235 homes)** No

**Site EL13 – Land off Rempstone Road (south) (potential capacity around 120 homes)** No

**Site EL14 – Land north of Lantern Lane (2) (potential capacity around 360 homes)** No

**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.**

The suitable ones have already been allocated.

### 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.**

The Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan has already allocated land 50 more homes than the target for the village. Any change to that should be agreed with Keyworth Parish Council and the people of the village.

### 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.**

Assessments were made at Core Strategy stage regarding the number of new homes the village and its facilities would be able to accommodate. This included consultation with local people. We are not aware of any change which would justify further housing land allocations. If anything, facilities have deteriorated, for example the health centre in the village is now so over capacity that it takes several weeks to get an appointment.

### Question 13

The plan below identifies sites on the edge of Radcliffe on Trent that have been put forward by developers and others as potentially suitable for housing development. We have already asked for views on the suitability for development of sites RAD1 to RAD10 as part of the Issues and Options consultation stage which we undertook early last year.

Since last year's consultation a further two sites (RAD11 and RAD12) have been put forward by developers and others as potentially suitable for housing development. We would also like to know what you think about the suitability of each of these two sites (as shown on the plan below) and whether each one 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 RAD11 – North of Holme Lane (potential capacity around 115 homes)**      No

**Site RAD12 – Land to the north of Shelford Road (potential capacity around 180 homes)**      No

**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.**

Both are adjacent to the Trent Valley Way and are very well used as local amenity. Development of RAD11 would in addition obscure currently open views. During the preparation of the Core Strategy, provision of smaller homes suitable for older people was established as a clear local housing need. Most developers are not interested in providing this type of home. As both sites have been out forward by developers, it is unlikely that allocating them will contribute to meeting local housing need.

### 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)?**      Don't know

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

Adverse landscape impact is far less severe than elsewhere e.g. Cotgrave.

**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?**

<b>Cropwell Bishop</b>	. No
<b>East Bridgford</b>	. No
<b>Gotham</b>	. Don't know
<b>Sutton Bonington</b>	. Don't know
<b>Tollerton</b>	. Don't know

**Any other settlement (please specify which)**

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

Cropwell Bishop has very few facilities and a poor bus service (no evening or Sunday service, so it is not possible to live there without personal access to a car). Any development on greenfield sites around the village would have an adverse impact on landscape and openness of the countryside.

The bus service to East Bridgford is better but it is uncertain how long this currently marginally viable commercial Trent Barton service will survive, and there are few facilities in the village.

Gotham has a better bus service and easier access to facilities in East Leake, but development could have adverse landscape impact on Gotham Moor and the hills west of Gotham.

Tollerton has some facilities and access to the main urban area. The bus service is currently only just adequate (hourly in the evening) but with good potential for increased frequency given increased demand. However, any development to the East of the village would have an adverse impact on landscape and the current openness of the countryside.

**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)** . No

**Site CBI2 – Land north of Memorial Hall (1) (potential capacity around 75 homes)** . No

**Site CBI3– Land north of Memorial Hall (2) (potential capacity around 60 homes)** . No

**Site CBI4 – Land north of Fern Road (2) (potential capacity around 30 homes)** . No

**Site CBI5 – Land north of Fern Road (1) (potential capacity around 250 homes)** . No

**Site CBI6 – Land to the north of Fern Road (3) (potential capacity around 70 homes)** . No

**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.**

see answer to question 17

**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.**

see answer to question 17

**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:**

<b>Site EBR1 – Land behind Kirk Hill (east) (potential capacity around 15 homes)</b>	.	No
<b>Site EBR2 – Land behind Kirk Hill (west) (potential capacity around 70 homes)</b>	.	No
<b>Site EBR3 – Land north of Kneeton Road (1) (potential capacity around 95 homes)</b>	.	No
<b>Site EBR4 – Land north of Kneeton Road (2) (potential capacity around 150 homes)</b>	.	No
<b>Site EBR5 – Land at Lammas Lane (potential capacity around 40 homes)</b>	.	No
<b>Site EBR6 – Closes Side Lane (west) (potential capacity around 20 homes)</b>	.	No
<b>Site EBR7 – Closes Side Lane (east) (potential capacity around 20 homes)</b>	.	No
<b>Site EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane (potential capacity around 20 homes)</b>	.	No
<b>Site EBR9 – Land to the south of Springdale Lane (potential capacity around 30 homes)</b>	.	No

**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.**

see answer to question 17

**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.**

see answer to question 17

**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.**

see answer to question 17

## **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)**

**Any other location (please specify which)**

**Question 27**

There are a number of sites that have been put forward by developers and others as potentially suitable for housing development at Tollerton. 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 TOL1 – Land at Burnside Grove (potential capacity around 180 homes)**      No

**Site TOL2 – West of Tollerton Lane and North of Medina Drive (potential capacity around 360 homes)**      No

**Site TOL3 – Land east of Tollerton Lane (potential capacity around 50 homes)**      No

**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.**

due to impact on landscape and local amenity