



## Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies – Further Options

# Response Form

Please return by **5pm on Friday 31 March 2017** to:  
 Planning Policy, Rushcliffe Borough Council  
 Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road  
 Nottingham. NG2 7YG  
 Or to: [localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk](mailto:localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk)

Please note that your comments can be directly entered through the Borough Council's online consultation system: <http://rushcliffe-consult.objective.co.uk/portal>

Your Details	Agent details (where applicable)	
<b>East Bridgford Parish Council</b>	<b>Name</b>	Click here to enter text.
c/o The Clerk Springdale 4 Granby lane Plungar Nottingham NG130JJ	<b>Address</b>	Click here to enter text.
	<b>E-mail</b>	Click here to enter text.

### Housing Development

#### Housing Land Supply

**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** .....

**No** .....

**Don't know** .....

✓

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

East Bridgford Parish Council (EBPC) supports the principle that development near to main areas of employment and economic activity, with appropriate infrastructure, is preferable to development in rural areas.

Rural sites should not be used to make up shortfalls caused by slow development elsewhere. Sites which have been identified in a previous Local Plan should be developed first. If sites with planning permission are not developed within a certain timescale, there should be a mechanism for enforcement or penalties to prevent 'land banking' or 'rationing' to increase site values on company accounts.

### Housing Sites adjacent to the Main Urban Area

**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?

<b>Yes</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>No</b> .....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Don't know</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

The proximity of these areas to the city and access to this and other centres of economic activity is important. It is also easier to adjust infrastructure changes to meet the increased needs of the development.

**Question 3:** Do you support housing development at:

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of</b>	<b>No</b>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------

	site		
Site HOL1 – Simkins Farm, Adbolton Lane, West Bridgford (potential capacity around 40 homes)	✓		
Any other location (please specify which)			

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.

See comments in Q1 & 2

## Housing Development at the 'Key Settlements'

### Bingham

**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** .....

**No** .....

**Don't know** .....

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

Bingham is sufficiently large to meet the criteria of the principle referred to in the response to Q1 & 2

### Cotgrave

**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** .....



**No** .....

**Don't know** .....

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

*Cotgrave is sufficiently large to meet the criteria of the principle referred to in the response to Q1 & 2*

**Question 6:** *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.*

No

**Question 7:** *Do you support housing development at:*

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site COT1 – Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park (potential capacity around 240 homes)</i>			
<i>Site COT2 – Land at Main Road (potential capacity around 50 homes)</i>			
<i>Site COT3 – Land rear of and to the west of Main Road (potential capacity around 125 homes)</i>			
<i>Site COT4 Land off Woodgate Lane (potential capacity around 80 homes)</i>			

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site COT5 – Bakers Hollow (potential capacity around 60 homes)</i>			
<i>Site COT6 – The Brickyard, Owthorpe Road (potential capacity around 100 homes)</i>			
<i>Site COT7– Land behind Firdale (2) (potential capacity around 65 homes)</i>			
<i>Site COT8 – Land behind Firdale (potential capacity around 95 homes)</i>			
<i>Site COT9 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (1) (potential capacity around 140 homes)</i>			
<i>Site COT10 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (2) (potential capacity around 40 homes)</i>			
<i>Site COT11 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (3) (potential capacity around 250 homes)</i>			
<i>Site COT12– Land south of Plumtree Lane (potential capacity around 250 homes)</i>			
<i>Any other location (please specify which)</i>			

*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.*

*No response made*

### **East Leake**

**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 at Figure*

5), further greenfield land should not be allocated for housing development at East Leake?

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

**Don't know** .....

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

East Leake fits some of the criteria in the comments made in Q1 & 2 having economically-active areas within easy access

**Question 9:** Do you support housing development at:

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
Site EL9 – Land south of West Leake Road (potential capacity around 50 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site EL10 – Land north of West Leake Road (potential capacity around 75 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site EL11 – Brook Furlong Farm (potential capacity around 70 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site EL12 – Land off Rempstone Road (north) (potential capacity around 235 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site EL13 – Land off Rempstone Road (south) (potential capacity around 120 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site EL14 – Land north of Lantern Lane (2) (potential capacity around 360 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Any other location (please specify which)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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.

No response made

### Keyworth

**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.

We support some development in this area – see coment in Q1 & 2 – but have no comment re numbers

**Question 11:** Do you support housing development at:

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site KEY1 – Land east of Willow Brook (potential capacity around 40 homes)			
Site KEY2 – Land off Selby Lane and Willowbrook (potential capacity around 15 homes)			
Site KEY3 – Land south of Selby Lane (potential capacity around 60 homes)			
Site KEY4 – Land off Nicker Hill (potential capacity around 450 homes)			
Site KEY5 – Hill Top Farm, Platt Lane (1) (potential capacity around 50 homes)			
Site KEY6 – Hill Top Farm, Platt Lane (2) (potential capacity around 80 homes)			

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site KEY7 – Shelton Farm, Platt Lane (potential capacity around 160 homes)</i>			
<i>Site KEY8 – Land between Platt Lane and Station Road (potential capacity around 180 homes)</i>			
<i>Site KEY9 – Land north of Debdale Lane (1) (potential capacity around 110 homes)</i>			
<i>Site KEY10 – Land south of Debdale Lane (1) (potential capacity around 230 homes)</i>			
<i>Site KEY11 – Land south of Debdale Lane (2) (potential capacity around 200 homes)</i>			
<i>Site KEY12 – Land north of Debdale Lane (2) (potential capacity around 160 homes)</i>			
<i>Site KEY13 – Hillside Farm (potential capacity around 60 homes)</i>			
<i>Site KEY14 – Land south of Bunny Lane (potential capacity around 410 homes)</i>			
<i>Any other location (please specify which)</i>			

*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.*

*No response made*

### **Radcliffe on Trent**

**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.*



*Development should be limited to the A52 corridor – not to the north in the direction of Shelford*

**Question 13:** Do you support housing development at:

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
Site RAD11 – North of Holme Lane (potential capacity around 115 homes)			
Site RAD12 – Land to the north of Shelford Road (potential capacity around 180 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 comment in Q12. It is also important to preserve the Trent Valley landscape and vista*

### **Ruddington**

**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.

*We support some development in this area (see comment in Q1 & 2 )*

**Question 15:** Do you support housing development at:

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
Site RUD11 – Old Loughborough Road (potential capacity around 40 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site RUD12 – Land to the east side of Loughborough Road (potential capacity around 60 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site RUD13 – Land opposite Mere Way (potential capacity around 170 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site RUD14 – Croft House (potential capacity around 25 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Any other location (please specify which)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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.

No response made

### Housing development at ‘other villages’

**Question 16:** Do you agree that, apart from the site to the south of Abbey Road, 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** .....

**No** .....

**Don't know** .....



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

No further response made

**Question 17:** Should Local Plan Part 2 identify the following 'other' villages as suitable for a limited level of housing growth on greenfield sites?

	Yes	No	Don't know
Cropwell Bishop			✓
East Bridgford		✓	
Gotham			✓
Sutton Bonington			✓
Tollerton			✓
Any other settlement (please specify which)			

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

Generally, EBPC does not support development into the green belt around the above villages ( see comment in Q 1 & 2) but feels unable to comment on the specific proposals for the other villages concerned.

The Parish Plan in 2003 and the work being done on a new Community Plan show very strong opinions in the village (East Bridgford ) against development which extends the village envelope. The appraisal for the Community Plan also shows that, for any development, the need is for small bungalows for the increasing number of older and/or single residents.

As a result of the Parish Plan 2003, East Bridgford was one of the first villages to have a rural exception scheme for affordable homes which were for people with a local connection whose needs were identified in a Housing Needs Survey. EBPC recognises that such schemes can meet the needs of people who would not be able to afford the existing costs of housing in Rushcliffe villages.

### **Cropwell Bishop**

**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.*

No response made

**Question 19:** *Do you support housing development at:*

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site CBI1 – Land to the south of Nottingham Road and east of Kinoulton Road (potential capacity around 30 homes)</i>			
<i>Site CBI2 – Land north of Memorial Hall (1) (potential capacity around 75 homes)</i>			
<i>Site CBI3– Land north of Memorial Hall (2) (potential capacity around 60 homes)</i>			
<i>Site CBI4 – Land north of Fern Road (2) (potential capacity around 30 homes)</i>			
<i>Site CBI5 – Land north of Fern Road (1) (potential capacity around 250 homes)</i>			

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
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.

No response made

### **East Bridgford**

**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.

EBPC does not support any development in the green belt around East Bridgford – see detailed comments for Q21 and specific issues in the response to Q21 below

**Question 21:** Do you support housing development at:

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
Site EBR1 – Land behind Kirk Hill (east) (potential capacity around 15 homes)			✓
Site EBR2 – Land behind Kirk Hill (west) (potential capacity around 70 homes)			✓

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
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.

Firstly, the response to Q17 is repeated here.

“The Parish Plan in 2003 and the work being done on a new Community Plan show very strong opinions in the village against development which extends the village envelope. The appraisal for the Community Plan also shows that, for any development, the need is for small bungalows for the increasing number of older and/or single residents”

The Community Plan questionnaire in 2016 was completed by 354 households, representing 798 people, 44% of the 2011 census figure for the population. 92% opposed any further development. Building in the green belt is seen as ‘a problem’ (71% of replies) and 56 people felt strongly enough to write in asking for ‘protection of the green belt’. Many (53%) felt that the village was already ‘over-developed’ and this figure increased to 67% who opposed development involving the green belt. In response to preference in the event of further homes being built, 86% favoured infill, more intensive use of existing buildings or replacement with higher density development. Only 25% accepted new areas on the edge of the green belt in groups of dwellings no greater than 10.

*In addition, the following infrastructure and local issues are identified:*

*The sewage and water drainage systems are already over-stretched with incidents of sewage escape, blockages and flooding in some areas after heavy rain reported*

*The school has been increasing in size related to on-going development at Newton and has very limited space for further building*

*The amount of public open space per head of population is already below what is recommended*

*Traffic and parking on some roads is a recognised problem, particularly around the school on Kneeton Road when it opens or closes for the day.*

*The rural landscape is a major asset for the village, especially in relation to the conservation area and to listed buildings*

*In addition to the rural landscape, the Trent Valley escarpment and its vista are significant features to be protected. This includes the view from the Trent Valley up towards and across the escarpment.*

*As a result of the Parish Plan 2003, East Bridgford was one of the first villages to have a rural exception scheme for affordable homes which were for people with a local connection whose needs were identified in a Housing Needs Survey. EBPC recognises that such schemes can meet the needs of people who would not be able to afford the existing costs of housing in Rushcliffe villages.*

*Should any site be identified for development in the future, EBPC believes that it should not be given permission for development until all the brownfield sites (like Newton) and other previously-identified sites in the Local Plan, with or without current planning permission, have been fully developed. This moratorium should not include, however, any additional rural exception scheme identified as necessary in a Housing Needs Survey, solely for affordable homes such as an extension to the Foster's Close scheme.*

## **Gotham**

**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.*

*No response made*

--

**Question 23:** Do you support housing development at:

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site GOT1 – Land to the rear of former British Legion (potential capacity around 25 homes)</i>			
<i>Site GOT2 – Land north of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (west) (potential capacity around 50 homes)</i>			
<i>Site GOT3 – Land north of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (east) (potential capacity around 20 homes)</i>			
<i>Site GOT4 – The Orchards, Leake Road (potential capacity around 50 homes)</i>			
<i>Site GOT5 – Land east of Gypsum Way/The Orchards (potential capacity around 200 homes)</i>			
<i>Site GOT6 – East of Leake Road (potential capacity around 45 homes)</i>			
<i>Site GOT7 – Land east of Hill Road (potential capacity around 160 homes)</i>			
<i>Site GOT8 – Land south of Moor Lane (potential capacity around 15 homes)</i>			
<i>Any other location (please specify which)</i>			

*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.*

*No response made*



**Sutton Bonington**

**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.*

No response made

**Question 25:** *Do you support housing development at:*

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site SUT1 – Land north of Park Lane (potential capacity around 140 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Any other location (please specify which)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*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.*

No response made

**Tollerton**

**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.*

*No response made*

**Question 27:** *Do you support housing development at:*

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site TOL1 – Land at Burnside Grove (potential capacity around 180 homes)</i>			
<i>Site TOL2 – West of Tollerton Lane and North of Medina Drive (potential capacity around 360 homes)</i>			
<i>Site TOL3 – Land east of Tollerton Lane (potential capacity around 50 homes)</i>			
<i>Any other location (please specify which)</i>			

*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.*

*No response made*

**Other issues**

**Question 28:** Please identify any matters related to housing development which are not covered here or elsewhere.

No response made

Please return by **5pm on Friday 31 March 2017** to:

Planning Policy  
Rushcliffe Borough Council  
Rushcliffe Arena  
Rugby Road  
Nottingham. NG2 7YG

Or to: [localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk](mailto:localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk)

Please note that your comments can be directly entered through the Borough Council's online consultation system: <http://rushcliffe-consult.objective.co.uk/portal>

**Data protection:** The details you submit to the Borough Council will be used in the Local Plan preparation and associated processes. Please note that comments and personal details cannot be treated as confidential and may be made available for public inspection both physically and/or through the Borough Council's website. We may publish all names, addresses and comments received, including on our website. We will use our best endeavours to not publish signatures, personal telephone numbers or email addresses.

## Response Form

Your Details		Agent details (where applicable)
East Bridgford Parish Council	Name	
c/o The Clerk Springdale 4 Granby lane Plungar Nottingham NG130JJ	Address	
pa	E-mail	

### 1. Green Belt Review Part 2 (b): Additional sites review

Do you agree or disagree with the review of the additional Green Belt sites around Rushcliffe's Key Settlements and other villages against the purposes for including land within the Green Belt? If you disagree, state why the assessment is incorrect and provide your Green Belt score and conclusions on Green Belt importance. Your comment should focus on the land's performance against Green Belt purposes.

#### Scoring System

The East Bridgford Parish Council (EBPC) accepts that it is necessary to try and establish a system which allows sites' importance within the Green Belt to be assessed against agreed criteria.

In general, the criteria are appropriate but sites in very rural communities may need further recognition of a wider range of fundamental issues, for example the quality of farmland or examples of historical farming developments, such as ridge and furrow.

EBPC feels that the overall descriptors of the score ranges, ie Low, Low/Medium, Medium/High and High are not helpful. A better concept would have been to refer to a spectrum.

However, if these words are needed at all, they should be restricted to Low, Medium and High only. The ranges suggested could be Low 7-10, with Medium 11-15, and High 16-20+, since a rural community site would be comparatively unlikely to score greater than 20 with the criteria defined as they are.

#### Sites around East Bridgford

It is disappointing that the sites selected for consideration are those on which the owners have indicated that they wish to seek planning permission for development. This leads to a random approach which is unlikely to lead to the best outcomes. A planning-based approach, for example identifying a specific site or sites which might match local and regional needs eg a development of affordable, integrated housing shielded by a tree belt etc might have been preferable.

Subject to comments which are made by EBPC in the Further Options Response Form, it is agreed that the scores of the sites around East Bridgford reflect the criteria used to produce them. However, EBPC suggests that the descriptors should be as follows (using the revised descriptor range suggested above).

Reference(s)	Score	New descriptor
EBR 1, 2 (EAS 7, SHLAA 87-89))	17	High
EBR3 (EAS1,SHLAA 701,703)	17	High
EBR4 (EAS2, SHLAA 702)	16	High
EBR5 (EAS3, SHLAA 90)	13	Medium
EBR6, 7 (EAS4, SHLAA 540,580)	13	Medium
EBR8 (EAS5, SHLAA 378)	13	Medium
EBR9 (EAS6, SHLAA 379)	15	Medium

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## 2. Please provide any others comments you wish to make

None

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Please return by **5pm 31 March 2017**

to: Planning Policy  
Rushcliffe Borough Council  
Rushcliffe Arena  
Rugby Road  
West Bridgford  
Nottingham  
NG2 7YG

Or to: [localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk](mailto:localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk)

Please note that your comments can be directly entered through the Borough Council's online consultation system: <http://rushcliffe-consult.objective.co.uk/portal>

**Data protection:** The details you submit to the Borough Council will be used in the Local Plan preparation and associated processes. Please note that comments and personal details cannot be treated as confidential and may be made available for public inspection both physically and/or through the Borough Council's website. We may publish all names, addresses and comments received, including on our website. We will use our best endeavours to not publish signatures, personal telephone numbers or email addresses.