



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

Langar
Investments&NCH
A 1073111 agent
Hardwick 954670

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

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)
Steve Brandon	Name	Alan Hardwick
Langar Investments & Nottingham Community Housing Association c/o Agent	Address	rg+p Ltd. 130 New Walk LEICESTER LE1 7JA
Click here to enter text.	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.

It is acknowledged and agreed that the Council will need to identify additional sites to deliver its required Housing Land Supply. Whilst a calculation of anticipated supply is provided in Appendix A, there is no justification or reasoning of the reasons behind the delay, and as such, the calculation may not be sufficiently robust, with the potential need for numbers above 2,000 units. As such we remain uncertain that the Council has considered sufficient flexibility that it can demonstrate, even with the additional units, a five year supply of deliverable housing land.

As identified, larger sites are often challenging to deliver due to significant infrastructure constraints associated with the scale of such strategic allocations. Such delays inevitably have an impact on achieving a five year housing land supply, specifically when allocations for such supply are based on the successful and timely delivery of such large sites.

It is also evident from a number of appeal decisions across the country that the housing target is just that, a target, and not a limit to housing supply and as such it may be opportune to allocate more than the proposed 2,000 units. With specific regard to Rushcliffe, an appeal following the adoption of the Core Strategy (APP/P3040/A/14/2227522) dated December 2015 for land in Aslockton also identified a need to address previous shortfalls in delivery, and that this should be addressed via the Sedgfield method, and as such in the first five years of the plan. It does not appear that this previous shortfall has been included within the calculations within Appendix A, providing for the increased housing requirement against the Core Strategy's housing trajectory. A further, more recent appeal at Aslockton (APP/P3040/W/16/3143126) further reduces the Council's supply to 3.43 years, but does acknowledge the efforts being made in ensuring the delivery of the strategic sites, still highlighting the uncertainty of the proposed delivery across the district.

To this regard, the calculations are welcomed, but are not considered to provide sufficient evidence that they are adequately robust.

There is a need for the allocation of such smaller and medium sized sites as proposed in this Local Plan Part 2 consultation as has been highlighted in the Government's steer within the recently published White Paper.

In addition, the LP Part 2 allows for the potential allocation of 'safeguarded land', according with para. 85 of the NPPF that LPAs should, where necessary, designate safeguarded land between built up areas and the Green Belt, to be protected from development in the short to medium term, but to meet the development needs beyond the plan period.

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.

Following the response provided to Question 1 it is clear that there are issues with regards to the delivery of strategic allocations based on the infrastructure delays associated with such large sites. As such, to allocate additional land over the plan period to the already delayed strategic allocations would fail to address the identified shortfall in housing land supply at present, and as anticipated over the plan period.

Question 3: Do you support housing development at:

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<i>Site HOL1 – Simkins Farm, Adbolton Lane, West Bridgford (potential capacity around 40 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. 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.

As per the consultation, the allocation of additional housing land would not address the current shortfall in supply.

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, as identified within the Core Strategy is a 'key' and sustainable settlement with regards to the ranges of services and facilities which it offers. As such, it provides a suitable area for the provision of additional housing land to meet identified need through the allocation of greenfield land.

This will be further enhanced by the allocated development for housing and employment at the former Cotgrave Colliery site. The allocation of additional greenfield allocations alongside this will jointly maximise the potential for regenerating the Town Centre, according with Core Strategy Policy 6.4, and help

balance the uncertainty of the exact amount of housing which may be delivered on the Cotgrave Colliery site.

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.

It is considered that Cotgrave as a 'key settlement' with a significant allocation at the Cotgrave Colliery site will result in further improvements to the sustainability of Cotgrave as a place to live and work.

In allocating further housing sites to an already sustainable settlement, with a large strategic allocation for further employment development will support the development of a sustainable and successful community. In allocating further housing to the settlement it will reduce the need to travel for employment and result in the provision of a balanced community with further opportunities to support and develop the key services within the settlement.

Question 7: Do you support housing development at:

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
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)			✓

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site COT7– Land behind Firdale (2) (potential capacity around 65 homes)			✓
Site COT8 – Land behind Firdale (potential capacity around 95 homes)			✓
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.

COT02 provides an available and deliverable site in single ownership adjacent to the sustainable settlement of Cotgrave, within 800 metres walking distance (10 minute walk) from the centre of the site a large number of key services are offered, including two public houses, petrol station (including shop), retail x4, post office, primary school, supermarket, church x2. A number of further services and retail opportunities are available within a further 200m walk (1km, 13 minute walk). The site is bounded by a single residential dwelling to the north, and farm dwelling surrounded by a woodland copse to the south, the main settlement of Cotgrave from Mill Lane then continues to the south of the farm. To the west lie agricultural fields, with further fields to the east and Cotgrave Country Park, and then the Colliery Site beyond. The site boundary is formed by an established, substantial hedgerow to the north, and west (fronting Main Road), which along with the woodland and Country Park provide restricted views from the key public vantage points.

The site, identified as providing up to 50 dwellings would be able to provide a mix of housing to meet local need, including the provision of 40 affordable homes being a mix of two and three bedroom units in an area of established housing

demand. A registered provider, Nottingham Community Housing Association, is committed to the development the site with regards to the affordable provision, with the two companies holding a joint venture partnership and currently working on delivery of schemes within the greater Nottingham area. The current mix is proposed as a predominantly shared ownership scheme, with some rent to buy plots to assist local residents and the next generation to get a hold on the housing ladder. Langar Investments and NCHA are jointly committed to delivering housing on the site, and have the funds aligned to commence construction, with a potential start date by the end of 2017.

The site would also be able to accommodate open space/play provision of contribute to the enhancement of existing facilities within the settlement through the provision of an transfer of land to the Parish or District Councils (providing 4,000 square metres for a school, or other community use development).

The site is not constrained by flood risk, contamination or known heritage or habitat/ecology assets, nor are any such constraints known in the immediate surroundings.

The size of the site and its relatively square form will allow for the provision of a well considered internal layout to provide a positively planned housing development with adequate surveillance of properties and good connectivity to the existing centre via an existing highway footpath link, with the opportunity for an additional footway to be provided to the eastern side of Main Road.

In addition the development of the site would provide opportunities for biodiversity enhancement of the existing hedgerow, potential for additional tree planting to the boundaries and SuDS provision on site.

The overall landscape strategy identified for the site is to 'Enhance and Restore' being an are of "relatively uniform character of arable fields with prominent village fringes. Urban elements are frequent and exert a strong influence. Man-made elements and landform have a localised influence on character". As identified above, the site provides an opportunity to enhance the landscape setting well related to the adjacent woodlands and Country Park.

The site will also deliver the required infrastructure to support the proposed development through relevant Section 106 contributions for affordable housing, highways, education and others as may be deemed relevant to the site.

In terms of additional sites:

COT01 – Possible, the site is a logical extension to Cotgrave in terms of the relationship to existing services, with limited site constraints (the identified being highway capacity and multiple ownership. Careful consideration would be needed with regards to the adjacent industrial uses, and the adjacent Country Park.

COT03 – Possible, the site may be suitable for development subject to overcoming the potential access issues. The site is in a sustainable location with good connectivity to the settlement.

COT04 – No, the site comprises Grade 2 agricultural land (paragraph 112 of the NPPF) which should be protected. In addition constraints are identified in terms of access and the proximity to the Sewage Works to the north of the site. The site is also over 1km from the nearest services from the centre of the site, with poor

pedestrian links, and thus less sustainable than other proposals within the settlement.

COT05 – No the site comprised Grade 2 agricultural land which should be protected (paragraph 112 of the NPPF).

COT06 – No, the site is identified as a contaminated site and includes a significant area of established planting providing a link between two established areas of woodland.

COT07 and COT08 – No, the sites are over one kilometre from the services within the settlement with unconnected routes which would likely result in the increased use of the private motor vehicles. 07 also comprises Grade 2 agricultural land which should be retained (Paragraph 2 of the NPPF).

COT 09 – No, the site is subject to a number of constraints including flood risk and highway capacity concerns. In addition the site is prominent by virtue of the existing topography which would result in a strong visual encroachment into the Green Belt from public vantage points.

COT 10 – Yes, the site forms a logical infill for development in a positive sustainable location in close proximity to the centre of Cotgrave with existing housing to two boundaries.

COT011 – No, the site should not be promoted due to its prominence within the landscape by virtue of the existing topography. The development of the site would result in a visible encroachment into the countryside and fail to accord with the principles of the Green Belt designation within this location. Areas of the site are also at risk of flooding and bounds the canal which is an identified local wildlife site. Concerns have also been raised with regards to highways capacity, as well as the site being one of the most distant from the village centre, with poor pedestrian links, resulting in a likely increase in the use of private motor vehicles. As such, given the cumulative impacts of the identified constraints it is not considered to be suitable for development.

COT012 – No, the site comprises Grade 2 agricultural land which should be retained (Paragraph 2 of the NPPF). Further the site is remote from the centre and services of Cotgrave, with limited pedestrian connection opportunities other than via Plumtree Road which would result in a development remote from the core of the settlement and encourage the use of the private motor vehicle.

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.

Click here to enter text.

Question 9: Do you support housing development at:

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

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.

Click here to enter text.

Question 11: Do you support housing development at:

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

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

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.*

Click here to enter text.

Question 13: Do you support housing development at:

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

Click here to enter text.

Question 15: Do you support housing development at:

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

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.

Whilst not supporting the development at Aslockton, it is not considered that and additional housing should be supported in a minor settlement with limited services. To promote additional housing in such an unsustainable location by virtue of limited services would be unsustainable and fail to accord with the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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.

Such minor settlements with limited services are unsustainable location by virtue of limited services and restricted transport links and would result in unsustainable and as such fail to accord with the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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:*

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<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>			
<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:*

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<i>Site EBR1 – Land behind Kirk Hill (east) (potential capacity around 15 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site EBR2 – Land behind Kirk Hill (west) (potential capacity around 70 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site EBR3 – Land north of Kneeton Road (1) (potential capacity around 95 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site EBR4 – Land north of Kneeton Road (2) (potential capacity around 150 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site EBR5 – Land at Lammas Lane (potential capacity around 40 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site EBR6 – Closes Side Lane (west) (potential capacity around 20 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site EBR7 – Closes Side Lane (east) (potential capacity around 20 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane (potential capacity around 20 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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:

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

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<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:*

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site SUT1 – Land north of Park Lane (potential capacity around 140 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.](#)

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:

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site TOL1 – Land at Burnside Grove (potential capacity around 180 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Click here to enter text.

Other issues

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

Click here to enter text.

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

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.