



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

Nottinghamshire
Wildlife Trust
904946

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)
Ben Driver (Southern Conservation Officer) Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust	Name	Click here to enter text.
The Old Ragged School Brook Street Nottingham NG1 1EA	Address	Click here to enter text.
b	E-mail	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	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

We are unclear why the 'large' sites have been delayed and query why they can't be delivered more quickly. The causes of the delay should be looked at closely and solutions found as a matter of urgency. The situation should not be resolved by permitting new less sustainable village allocations.

The danger with identifying additional sites is that less sustainable 'village' developments will be delivered first and then the 'large sites' come forward. The consequences would be that more land is taken than is strictly necessary. Not only will this impact on the villages themselves, many of which will not have the infrastructure in place to cope with the increased population, spreading development 'wide and thin' would have more impacts on biodiversity than concentrating built development on identified sites at the edge of Nottingham, which will have their own Green Infrastructure built in. The approach would lead to a greater degree of habitat fragmentation across the landscape. The approach would also lead to increased unsustainable travel patterns (i.e. more journeys by private car), which would be contrary to sustainable development and would have further adverse impacts on wildlife.

This approach would also be contrary to Policy 3 of the Adopted LP Part 1 (Rushcliffe Core Strategy). The settlement hierarchy states, "The sustainable development of Rushcliffe will be through a strategy that supports a policy of urban concentration with regeneration for the whole of Greater Nottingham to 2028".

Beyond the main built-up areas of Nottingham (within Rushcliffe) and locations mentioned in paragraph 2b (i to vii, including North of Bingham, former RAF Newton, Cotgrave Colliery, East Leake, Keyworth, Radcliffe on Trent and Ruddington), homes will only be built "in other villages solely to meet local housing needs".

Proposed housing allocations should avoid damaging developments near SSSI's, Local Wildlife Sites and Local Nature Reserves and other nature reserves, as well as ensuring that both strategic and local wildlife corridors (GI) are maintained and not encroached upon, following good GI design practice. We are also concerned about biodiversity impacts on sites beyond known or designated sites. Many of the potential village allocations are very likely to have wildlife interest which has not been picked up simply because the sites have not yet been surveyed (i.e. they are on private land.

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.

These sites are large anyway, and we agree that expansion would not help resolve current shortfall in the short term.

Melton Road, with the sensitive woodland site Sharphill Wood, is already facing a large increase in population, which will put substantial pressure on this important Local Wildlife Site and Local Nature Reserve.

Any further expansion South of Clifton will have impacts on sensitive Fairham Brook, as well as declining farmland birds such as corn bunting, meadow pipit, and yellowhammer, along with grey wagtail, associated with the Fairham Brook.

With expanding Gamston, there is the danger of it merging with Tollerton, creating a major barrier for the movement of wildlife.

Question 3: Do you support housing development at:

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

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.

There are several large, recently completed housing estates on the southern edge of the town and the large allocation north of railway, which has planning approval

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.

Click here to enter text.

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.

Click here to enter text.

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)			✓
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)			✓

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

As we stated in the previous LPP2 consultation, we consider existing development at Cotgrave Colliery sufficient for the town.

If any of the above sites are considered, in terms of biodiversity, Cotgrave Forest and nearby plantations provide a valuable habitat and GI resource, identified as a 'focal area' in the Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Report for Rushcliffe. The following allocations could impact on such woodland habitat:

COT1 and 2– woodland to the north

Cot6 and Cot12 would form barriers to movement of wildlife through the woodland around the eastern edge of Cotgrave

Cot11 – there should be no further development towards the edge of the Grantham Canal which is both a designated Local Wildlife Site and a Green Corridor.. Close development will have a negative impact on its wildlife value

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.

Furhter land should not be allocated – East Leake has exceeded it's 400 home target, with approval of planning permission for 800 new homes over 8 sites

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

As stated in the previous consultation response and above, we consider existing sites on which planning permission has been granted are more than sufficient for East Leake, which has exceeded its housing allocation requirements.

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 are aware of the core strategy minimum of 450 houses and don't think this needs to be exceeded for reasons provided at Q1.

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>			✓
<i>Site KEY2 – Land off Selby Lane and Willowbrook (potential capacity around 15 homes)</i>			✓
<i>Site KEY3 – Land south of Selby Lane (potential capacity around 60 homes)</i>			✓
<i>Site KEY4 – Land off Nicker Hill (potential capacity around 450 homes)</i>			✓
<i>Site KEY5 – Hill Top Farm, Platt Lane (1) (potential capacity around 50 homes)</i>			✓
<i>Site KEY6 – Hill Top Farm, Platt Lane (2) (potential capacity around 80 homes)</i>			✓

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

Bearing in mind the 450 minimum new home target, the sites we think have the greatest known ecological constraints are:

KEY4 and KEY 7, which are adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site

KEY10 and 11 contains some ridge and furrow, which is an increasingly scarce feature and could be of archaeological and biodiversity interest, prominent hedgerows and an area of woodland at the north end of KEY 11 which is worthy of conserving for biodiversity and landscape reasons.

KEY5 supports a linear area of woodland between the allocation and British Geological Survey site, which should be retained for biodiversity and landscape

reasons.

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.

We don't think Radcliffe on Trent needs to exceed it's 400 minimum target for reasons given in the answer to Q1

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)			✓
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.

Bearing in mind the 400 minimum total, we don't support housing development but we do think RAD11 and 12 are more sensible than the other sites shown on Figure 7.

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 don't think Ruddington needs to exceed it's 250 new home minimum target for reasons given in the answer to Q1

Question 15: Do you support housing development at:

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site RUD11 – Old Loughborough Road (potential capacity around 40 homes)			✓
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.

In our response to the previous LPP2 Issues and Options consultation we stated we'd prefer not to see encroachment close to the Fairham Brook, west of Ruddington, or to the east of the A60. However, RU11 to 14 are east of the A60 but we consider taking forward these sites preferable to the RU1 to 10 because they are near a main road and compact, not effecting sites of known wildlife interest, such as Fairham Brook or other LWSs and would have less of a landscape scale impact than the large sites such as RU1, 2, 6 and 7.

--

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.

We agree with RBCs view that it would not be sustainable, based on existing service and infrastructure provision, for any further greenfield sites to be identified for housing development at Aslockton or Whatton. Furthermore, there are sensitive features, such as River Smite and a large concentration of grasslands, some of which have archaeological and biodiversity value and such grasslands are scarce in Rushcliffe, so are worthy of safeguarding.

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

	Yes	No	Don't know
Cropwell Bishop		✓	
East Bridgford		✓	

	Yes	No	Don't know
Gotham	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sutton Bonington	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tollerton	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Any other settlement (please specify which)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

No for the reasons provided in Q1

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.

We are of the view that no allocations are required at Cropwell Bishop –see answer to Q1

Question 19: Do you support housing development at:

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

	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.

There are potential impacts on Grantham Canal and entire loss of Hoehill Pasture LWS in relation to CB12 and 13. Taking forwards sites CB1 and 14 would result in loss of valuable grassland (a habitat that is relatively scarce in the district), hedges and a pond. CB15 and 16 is very large and considered unsustainable and a major intrusion, fragmenting habitats at a landscape level.

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.*

We are of the view that no allocations are required at East Leake –see answer to Q1

Question 21: Do you support housing development at:

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site EBR1 – Land behind Kirk Hill (east) (potential capacity around 15 homes)			✓
Site EBR2 – Land behind Kirk Hill (west) (potential capacity around 70 homes)			✓
Site EBR3 – Land north of Kneeton Road (1) (potential capacity around 95 homes)			✓
Site EBR4 – Land north of Kneeton Road (2) (potential capacity around 150 homes)			✓
Site EBR5 – Land at Lammas Lane (potential capacity around 40 homes)			✓
Site EBR6 – Closes Side Lane (west) (potential capacity around 20 homes)			✓
Site EBR7 – Closes Side Lane (east) (potential capacity around 20 homes)			✓
Site EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane (potential capacity around 20 homes)			✓
Site EBR9 – Land to the south of Springdale Lane (potential capacity around 30 homes)			✓
Any other location (please specify which)			✓

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

EB 2,3 and 4 are very large, considered unsustainable and a major intrusion at a landscape level. Although we don't support any of the sites, we consider EB4,5 and 7 most logical as they resemble 'infil' but would result in loss of valuable grassland habitats, which are relatively scarce in much of Rushcliffe.

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.*

We are of the view that no allocations are required at Gotham –see answer to Q1

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

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<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>			✓

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	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.

Whilst we don't support any of the developments, we consider GOT1 particularly vulnerable as it supports good quality grassland/ scrub habitat and is part of a well defined green corridor, linking to Gotham Sandbanks SSSI.

GOT 5 and 7 are also particularly undesirable as they are adjacent to Local Wildlife Site and represent a major intrusion into the landscape, with the loss of valuable grasslands, scrub, in-field and hedgrows trees and a loss of a dense network of hedges.

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.

We are of the view that no allocations are required at Sutton Bonington –see Q1

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)			✓
Any other location (please specify which)			✓

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	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.

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.

We are of the view that no allocations are required for Tollerton for the reasons given in the answer to Q1.

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)			✓
Site TOL2 – West of Tollerton Lane and North of Medina Drive (potential capacity around 360 homes)			✓

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

Particularly in relation to TOL3, there is a danger that the village could merge with the large Gamston allocation to the north. This would be undesirable for the character of the village and would form a barrier to the movement of wildlife across the landscape.

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.