



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

Harker&Groombridge 1074091 agent  
Anthony Aspbury  
235686

## 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)
Alison Harker & Angela Groombridge	Name	Denise Knipe
Andrew Granger & Co. Ltd 2 High Street Loughborough Leicestershire LE11 2PY	Address	20 Park Lane Business Centre Park Lane Basford Nottingham NG6 0DW
r	E-mail	

### 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.

*We consider that the Council's trajectory set out at Appendix A of the Further Options document is still hugely over-optimistic in respect of housing delivery assumptions on most of its strategic sites, both in terms of lead in and starting delivery times and annual delivery rates. This will have implications initially for five year supply and in the case of the South of Clifton and East of Gamston, the overall quantum of delivery achieved in the plan period to 2028 against the trajectory.*

*The Council should plan more positively to account for the highly likely scenario of under delivery against the trajectory and increase the Part 2 Plan provision to a minimum 2500 dwellings. Some of the key settlements have significant capacity for further growth beyond the current level proposed to date in the Part 2 Local Plan, have a good level of local services and facilities and excellent public transport connections into the urban area.*

*In our opinion the current growth proposed for Bingham and the level of commitments for East Leake, which lies outwith the extent of the Nottingham Green Belt, represents sufficient and realistic growth for these respective settlements and no further allocations should be contemplated. There is however scope, particularly at Ruddington where only 250 dwellings were suggested in the Core Strategy (a substantially lower figure than that proposed for the other key settlements) and at Cotgrave where no allocations have been proposed beyond the former Cotgrave Colliery brownfield Regeneration Scheme which does not directly abut the built up area of the town.*

*Beyond the Key Settlements, Rushcliffe also has a number of other large villages with good local facilities and with capacity for proportionate growth. The suggested figure of 2,500 homes spread through the key settlements as described above and larger villages as covered in this consultation can comfortably be accommodated through the hierarchy.*

*The Green Belt Review offers the opportunity to provide a greater amount and distribution of housing through the Borough, without substantially diluting the urban focus of the core strategy. The Council must glean from their experiences with the Melton Road Edwalton SUE and the Cotgrave Colliery site, that large sites invariably have a long lead in time and this needs to be factored into the Part 2 Local Plan and Green Belt review now through additional allocations and more realistic delivery assumptions in the housing trajectory. The additional settlements proposed for consideration are all strong and sustainable market areas and further allocations would greatly assist the Borough in achieving and maintaining a five year housing land supply.*

## **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?

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

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

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

In response to Q1 , We raised concern that the sites South of Clifton and East of Gamston would not deliver the housing provision currently assumed in the housing trajectory. In this context there is no merit in further expanding these sites as they will not resolve the current housing shortfall.

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

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
Site HOL1 – Simkins Farm, Adbolton Lane, West Bridgford (potential capacity around 40 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. This could include comments on the services and facilities required to support development and the design, mix and layout of development.

[Click here to enter text.](#)

## 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.

*We agree with the Council's rationale for not developing more houses at Bingham as it will not address the current housing land supply shortfall.*

### **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.

*The Core Strategy currently only makes provision for circa 470 homes at the former Cotgrave Colliery which physically lies beyond the settlement of Cotgrave. There are however a number of suitable options for greenfield development around Cotgrave on sites that are well related to the settlement pattern. Cotgrave has a good level of local services, a local employment area and planned investment in the regeneration of its town centre*

**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.

In response to Question 1, we indicated that the Borough Council should be planning for an additional 2500 dwellings through its Part 2 Local Plan. As one of the key settlements that is relatively unconstrained from a technical and environmental perspective, upwards of 300 dwellings could comfortably be located on sites in Cotgrave over and above the committed colliery site. We have no comment however on behalf of our client in respect of the site options.

**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>
Site COT1 – Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park (potential capacity around 240 homes)			
Site COT2 – Land at Main Road (potential capacity around 50 homes)			
Site COT3 – Land rear of and to the west of Main Road (potential capacity around 125 homes)			
Site COT4 Land off Woodgate Lane (potential capacity around 80 homes)			
Site COT5 – Bakers Hollow (potential capacity around 60 homes)			
Site COT6 – The Brickyard, Owthorpe Road (potential capacity around 100 homes)			
Site COT7 – Land behind Firdale (2) (potential capacity around 65 homes)			
Site COT8 – Land behind Firdale (potential capacity around 95 homes)			

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
Site COT9 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (1) (potential capacity around 140 homes)			
Site COT10 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (2) (potential capacity around 40 homes)			
Site COT11 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (3) (potential capacity around 250 homes)			
Site COT12 – Land south of Plumtree Lane (potential capacity around 250 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.

### 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.

*There has been significant development in East Leake in recent years as this settlement lies beyond the Green Belt and there has been no requirement to demonstrate very special circumstances in the submission of housing applications. With Green Belt review now required as part of the Part 2 Local Plan process, it is time for other settlements previously constrained by tight Green Belt boundaries yet close to the urban area, such as Ruddington to accommodate higher levels of growth.*

**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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Site EL10 – Land north of West Leake Road (potential capacity around 75 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Site EL11 – Brook Furlong Farm (potential capacity around 70 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Site EL12 – Land off Rempstone Road (north) (potential capacity around 235 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Site EL13 – Land off Rempstone Road (south) (potential capacity around 120 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Site EL14 – Land north of Lantern Lane (2) (potential capacity around 360 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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.*

Click here to enter text.

**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 Neighbourhood Plan has identified 500 dwellings and two reserve sites. There would appear to be scope therefore to increase capacity to 500-600, a modest increase on the Core Strategy without conflict with the community's aspirations as reflected in the Neighbourhood Plan. We have no comment on behalf of this client on the site- specific selection process.

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

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
Site KEY1 – Land east of Willow Brook (potential capacity around 40 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site KEY2 – Land off Selby Lane and Willowbrook (potential capacity around 15 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site KEY3 – Land south of Selby Lane (potential capacity around 60 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site KEY4 – Land off Nicker Hill (potential capacity around 450 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site KEY5 – Hill Top Farm, Platt Lane (1) (potential capacity around 50 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site KEY6 – Hill Top Farm, Platt Lane (2) (potential capacity around 80 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site KEY7 – Shelton Farm, Platt Lane (potential capacity around 160 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site KEY8 – Land between Platt Lane and Station Road (potential capacity around 180 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site KEY9 – Land north of Debdale Lane (1) (potential capacity around 110 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
Site KEY10 – Land south of Debdale Lane (1) (potential capacity around 230 homes)			
Site KEY11 – Land south of Debdale Lane (2) (potential capacity around 200 homes)			
Site KEY12 – Land north of Debdale Lane (2) (potential capacity around 160 homes)			
Site KEY13 – Hillside Farm (potential capacity around 60 homes)			
Site KEY14 – Land south of Bunny Lane (potential capacity around 410 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.*

Click here to enter text.

### **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.*

*No observations but are aware that a Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for Radcliffe on Trent which must be accorded weight in terms of potential housing locations and minimum housing provision. We have no comment on behalf of this client on the site- specific selection process.*

**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)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site RAD12 – Land to the north of Shelford Road (potential capacity around 180 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.

[Click here to enter text.](#)

**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.

Ruddington received the smallest ‘minimum’ housing provision of the Rushcliffe key Settlements in the adopted Core Strategy notwithstanding its excellent range of facilities, public transport connections and immediate proximity to the Nottingham urban area. In our opinion, the settlement has capacity to accommodate at least double the minimum 250 dwellings currently proposed. Allocations totalling 500-600 dwellings could comfortably be accommodated on 2-3 site allocations across the village.

The respondents own site RUD 8 located west of Pasture Lane in Ruddington. The landownership encompasses all the land within RUD 8 (Field 1740) and the adjoining field to the south (Field 9503) which also extends between Pasture Lane to the east and the Fairham Brook with the built up area of Clifton beyond.

There is currently a ‘gap’ of approaching 600m between Pasture Lane and the Fairham Brook which marks the administrative boundary between Rushcliffe

*Borough and Nottingham City. Beyond the Fairham Brook there is a wooded scrubland of up to 100 metres depth and the site of the now demolished Fairham Community College.*

*The landowners aspirations for development of RUD 8 do not extend to any substantial erosion of the gap between Ruddington and Clifton and this has been recorded in previous representations submitted to the Green Belt Review Stage 1 (a)- of broad areas adjacent to the the Nottingham Principal Urban Area. A modest westward incursion on the level ground of no more than 150m together with a substantial woodland outer buffer would retain a clear defensible gap between Ruddington and Clifton, and soften the current hard built edge of the settlement created by the modern properties on the eastern side of Pasture Lane. The intervening open land between a partly developed RUD 8 and the Fairham Brook could be retained in agricultural production and /or in part its biodiversity enhanced through further habitat creation to mirror the Fairham Brook Nature Trail on the western (City) side of the watercourse. Alternatively the open land could be incorporated into an area of playing fields and facilities which reflect the open formal recreational uses served off Farnborough Road within the city.*

*RUD 8 is strategically placed to access a wide range of services and facilities within both Ruddington and Clifton and is directly accessible to regular bus services operating along Clifton Lane.*

*Whilst it is clearly acknowledged that partial development of the eastern fringe of RUD 8 will reduce the physical gap between Ruddington and Clifton, the potential for landscaping and screening is immense and the perception of the gap could actually be increased through a range of environmental enhancements that the landowners are prepared to consider.*

*A development advanced on these parameters could deliver in the order of 100-150 dwellings in a location where service infrastructure and road access along Pasture Lane are already in place.*

**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)			✓

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site RUD12 – Land to the east side of Loughborough Road (potential capacity around 60 homes)			✓
Site RUD13 – Land opposite Mere Way (potential capacity around 170 homes)			✓
Site RUD14 – Croft House (potential capacity around 25 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.*

*Sites RUD 11, RUD 12 and RUD 13 are located beyond (east of) the A60 which is seen as a strong defensible Green Belt boundary and a strong edge to the main built up area of Ruddington. Furthermore, in our view RUD 11 is isolated from the settlement of Ruddington as the Council's Green Belt Review concurs; RUD 12 would, in our opinion have a detrimental impact on the setting of the Listed Easthorpe House; and RUD 13 would encroach into open Green Belt countryside away from the established urban fabric of the settlement.*

*It is our view that the A60 is a material and defining constraint to development and significant residential development should not be supported east of the Loughborough Road where householders would have to cross the main road to access all the services and facilities within Ruddington village. In this context we also consider that sites RUD4, RUD5, RUD6 and RUD 14 should not be considered further as potential residential allocations in the Part 2 Local Plan.*

## 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.*

Click here to enter text.

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

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

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

*All these settlements provide a basic range of services and facilities and can support a modest, proportionate level of allocated growth. Tollerton is excluded as*

*it is in the immediate vicinity of the Land East of Gamston strategic site where major housing expansion is already planned. We have no specific preference amongst the options identified in the respective settlements below and would suggest that around 50 homes per settlement is appropriate on the basis that the Local Plan Part 2 needs to plan positively for a minimum 2500 additional dwellings across the Borough outside of the urban area.*

### **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.*

Click here to enter text.

**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>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site CBI2 – Land north of Memorial Hall (1) (potential capacity around 75 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site CBI3– Land north of Memorial Hall (2) (potential capacity around 60 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site CBI4 – Land north of Fern Road (2) (potential capacity around 30 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site CBI5 – Land north of Fern Road (1) (potential capacity around 250 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site CBI6 – Land to the north of Fern Road (3) (potential capacity around 70 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.*

Click here to enter text.

### **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.*

Click here to enter text.

**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>
<i>Site EBR1 – Land behind Kirk Hill (east) (potential capacity around 15 homes)</i>			
<i>Site EBR2 – Land behind Kirk Hill (west) (potential capacity around 70 homes)</i>			
<i>Site EBR3 – Land north of Kneeton Road (1) (potential capacity around 95 homes)</i>			

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site EBR4 – Land north of Kneeton Road (2) (potential capacity around 150 homes)</i>			
<i>Site EBR5 – Land at Lammas Lane (potential capacity around 40 homes)</i>			
<i>Site EBR6 – Closes Side Lane (west) (potential capacity around 20 homes)</i>			
<i>Site EBR7 – Closes Side Lane (east) (potential capacity around 20 homes)</i>			
<i>Site EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane (potential capacity around 20 homes)</i>			
<i>Site EBR9 – Land to the south of Springdale Lane (potential capacity around 30 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.*

Click here to enter text.

## **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.*

Click here to enter text.



**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.*

Click here to enter text.

**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.*

Click here to enter text.

**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.*

Click here to enter text.

## **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.*

Click here to enter text.

**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>
Site TOL1 – Land at Burnside Grove (potential capacity around 180 homes)			✓
Site TOL2 – West of Tollerton Lane and North of Medina Drive (potential capacity around 360 homes)			✓
Site TOL3 – Land east of Tollerton Lane (potential capacity around 50 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.

Click here to enter text.

**Other issues**

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

The Borough Council once again has an opportunity to address years of under provision and under delivery of housing in the Borough and rectify the unrealistic assumptions on delivery on its strategic sites which have seen them lose planning appeals soon after the adoption of the Core Strategy on the basis of a five year supply deficiency.

*The Council has done the groundwork on deliverable options within its settlements away from the urban area and it is evident that there is significant capacity to identify sustainable development sites and relieve the short term pressures on the strategic sites which have yet to commence and are highly unlikely to deliver their first homes as early as the Council's April 2016 Housing Trajectory currently indicates.*

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.