



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

Pickford 1092676
agent
Featherstones
652426

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)
Mr Pickford	Name	Featherstones PDD Ltd
C/O Agent	Address	Click here to enter text.
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.

We strongly disagree with the Council's assessment of its housing supply and more generally to its approach to delivering its housing requirement.

The Borough has a very serious housing land supply issue. It has failed to bring forward enough land in the right place, at the right time. This is due in part to the lack of delivery on almost all of the Borough's Strategic sites but also due to the significant delays in the preparation and adoption of the Local Plan Part 2.

It is essential that the Borough adopt a pragmatic approach to planning for the delivery of its minimum housing requirement together with realistic assumptions in relation to delivery on existing and proposed sites.

The Council's previous delivery assumptions as (set out in the Core Strategy) have proved to be unrealistic on almost all the strategic sites. The majority of large sites have experienced significant complications and delays.

It is critical that the Council's assumptions about the deliverability of sites is realistic and robust. In particular, and especially given past and recent experience, the assumptions should not be, individually and collectively, overly optimistic, such that the housing shortfall is down played and future delivery issues are inevitable.

Having regard to the recommendation of the Local Plans Expert Group, the Council's assessment of five year land supply should include lapse rates. This should be applied to all sites and given the lack of specific local evidence this should be set at 10% as recommended by the Experts Group.

A fundamental problem with the Council's approach to housing, is the lack of a sensible housing buffer, to provide flexibility and a suitable contingency against inevitable difficulties with some sites. The realities of the housing market (as experienced in Rushcliffe) are that some allocations and permissions are not implemented and others are delayed or delivered at slower rates than what might have been reasonably assumed. A contingency for this is essential, which means the need to plan for more permissions (more land for housing) than the minimum housing requirement.

The Local Plans Expert Group (LPEG) Report also recommended that;

'the NPPF makes clear that local plans should be required not only to demonstrate a five year land supply but also focus on ensuring a more effective supply of developable land for medium to long term (over the whole plan period), plus make provision for, and provide a mechanism for the release of, developable Reserve Sites equivalent to 20% of their housing requirement, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the NPPF' (para 11.4 of the LPEG Report).

Whilst there have been, and continue to be, major delays to the delivery of most of the Borough's strategic sites, experience at Cotgrave and East Leake demonstrates that delivery on sites can be consistently high if suitable sites are brought forward. Experience at East Leake in particular has shown how new houses can be brought forward quickly, when there are significant permissions granted on different sites.

There is no reason to believe that this experience could not be replicated in other villages across the Borough, provided sufficient sites are made available. Rushcliffe is a very strong housing market area and demand is unlikely to constrain delivery rates.

Having regard to the growth of East Leake, significantly more houses (than the minimum figures set out in the Core Strategy) could be accommodated in the larger villages of Keyworth, Ruddington, Cotgrave and Radcliffe.

There are also other villages in the Borough which are capable of accommodating some growth. This has now in part, been recognised by the Borough Council in the Further Options document. It acknowledges that new houses will need to be delivered on specific site allocations in the villages of East Bridgford, Gotham, Cropwell Bishop, Sutton Bonington and Tollerton. This approach is welcomed but there are other villages which are also capable of accommodating development and making a meaningful and sustainable contribution to meeting the Borough's challenging housing requirements and current supply shortfall. In particular, Aslockton, which has a wide range of services and facilities, and Costock which, also has good access to services and facilities as a result

of close proximity to and direct relationship with East Leake are suitable villages where additional development can be accommodated. Both villages are outside the Green Belt and have suitable sites available for development.

When allocating sites the Council should maximise housing supply via the widest possible range of sites, location and by size of site. A greater range of sites, by type and size, will improve the rate of delivery of new homes. Increasing sales outlets will increase overall delivery of housing. In general increasing the number of sales outlets available means increasing the number of housing sites. The maximum delivery is achieved not just because there are more sales outlets but because the widest possible range of products and locations are available to meet the widest possible range of demand.

This approach is also advocated in the Housing White Paper. The White Paper, 'Fixing Our Broken Housing Market' presents a range of measures to increase delivery and ensure housing requirements are met. A Key emphasis of the White Paper is to encourage development in villages and to support the development of small and medium sized sites. Under the Heading 'Supporting small and medium sized sites, and thriving rural communities' it states that changes are proposed to the NPPF to:

'Expect local planning authorities to identify opportunities for villages to thrive, especially where this would support services...'

As well as recognising the importance of development within villages to support local communities and contribute to housing delivery, the White Paper seeks to encourage greater variety in the form of housing local planning authorities plan for. In particular it emphasises the need to plan for more self and custom build housing and for specific sites to meet the needs of an ageing population.

The Local Plan Part 2 should respond positively to these requirements, both in terms of allocations within smaller villages, but also specific allocations for custom build schemes and retirement housing. Suitable sites are being promoted specifically for this purpose. The Borough Council should adopt a positive and innovative policy approach (as sought by Government) rather than ignoring these issues. As the White Paper recognises, an increase in the choice of sites, both in terms of size and locationally, together with policies and allocations which encourage different forms of housing, will greatly assist with improving the rate of delivery of new homes. These are important measures, made essential in Rushcliffe as a result of its supply issues.

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.

Given the Borough's housing supply issues all options for sustainable and deliverable development should be explored. There should be no arbitrary cap on the level of new development. The final numbers should be a result of an analysis of housing requirements and the suitability of sites within a village compared to the suitability of sites elsewhere.

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)	<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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Don't
know

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

Significant development is already proposed at Bingham. Further development now, would undermine the objectives of sustainable and manageable growth.

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.*

Given the Borough's housing supply issues all options for sustainable and deliverable development should be explored. There should be no arbitrary cap on the level of new development within villages. The final numbers should be a result of an analysis of housing requirements and the suitability of sites within a village compared to the suitability of sites elsewhere.

Question 7: Do you support housing development at:

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

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

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.

Significant development is already proposed at East Leake. Further development now, would undermine the objectives of sustainable and manageable growth.

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.

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.*

Given the Borough's housing supply issues all options for sustainable and deliverable development should be explored. There should be no arbitrary cap on the level of new development within villages. The final numbers should be a result of an analysis of housing requirements and the suitability of sites within a village compared to the suitability of sites elsewhere.

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"/>
<i>Site KEY9 – Land north of Debdale Lane (1) (potential capacity around 110 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site KEY10 – Land south of Debdale Lane (1) (potential capacity around 230 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site KEY11 – Land south of Debdale Lane (2) (potential capacity around 200 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site KEY12 – Land north of Debdale Lane (2) (potential capacity around 160 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Given the Borough’s housing supply issues all options for sustainable and deliverable development should be explored. There should be no arbitrary cap on the level of new development within villages. The final numbers should be a result of an analysis of housing requirements and the suitability of sites within a village compared to the suitability of sites elsewhere.

Question 13: *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 RAD11 – North of Holme Lane (potential capacity around 115 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site RAD12 – Land to the north of Shelford Road (potential capacity around 180 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.

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.*

Given the Borough’s housing supply issues all options for sustainable and deliverable development should be explored. There should be no arbitrary cap on the level of new development within villages. The final numbers should be a result of an analysis of housing requirements and the suitability of sites within a village compared to the suitability of sites elsewhere.

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)	<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.

[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.

Given the Borough's housing supply issues all options for sustainable and deliverable development should be explored. There should be no arbitrary cap on the level of new development within villages. The final numbers should be a result of an analysis of housing requirements and the suitability of sites within a village compared to the suitability of sites elsewhere.

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.

Given the Borough's housing supply issues all options for sustainable and deliverable development should be explored. There should be no arbitrary cap on the level of new development within villages. The final numbers should be a result of an analysis of housing requirements and the suitability of sites within a village compared to the suitability of sites elsewhere.

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.*

Given the Borough's housing supply issues all options for sustainable and deliverable development should be explored. There should be no arbitrary cap on the level of new development within villages. The final numbers should be a result of an analysis of housing requirements and the suitability of sites within a village compared to the suitability of sites elsewhere.

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)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Site EBR2 – Land behind Kirk Hill (west) (potential capacity around 70 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Site EBR3 – Land north of Kneeton Road (1) (potential capacity around 95 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Site EBR4 – Land north of Kneeton Road (2) (potential capacity around 150 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Site EBR5 – Land at Lammas Lane (potential capacity around 40 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Site EBR6 – Closes Side Lane (west) (potential capacity around 20 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Land south of Butt Lane immediately East of the village is a more sustainable and suitable site for development and should be allocated in the Local Plan. Details of the site and its suitability are set out on the attached statement and location plan.

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
<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:

	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
<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.

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.

**RUSHCLIFFE LOCAL PLAN PART 2: FURTHER OPTIONS
CONSULTATION**

REPRESENTATIONS ON BEHALF OF MR PICKFORD

Question 20: 'Other location' land south of Butt Lane, East Bridgford.

- 1.0 Land south of Butt Lane, immediately east of East Bridgford, is a suitable and sustainable location for development and should be allocated in the Local Plan.
- 2.0 The site is well related to the village, both terms of the form and character of the settlement and in terms of its proximity to services and facilities in the village. It is located in an area of the village where the Green Belt is less sensitive and the opportunity to accommodate change is greater than elsewhere.
- 3.0 The site can be accessed from Butt Lane and due to the location of the site, traffic from the development is unlikely to have a large impact on the traffic issues associated with other parts of the village.
- 4.0 The site wraps around the East Bridgford Heath Centre and is framed by Millenium Wood to the south and existing hedgerows. In this regard the site is well contained and there is the opportunity to reinforce existing landscape features to provide a strong new village and Green Belt edge.
- 5.0 The development of the site could provide the opportunity to deliver an extension to Millenium Wood, which could reinforce the existing landscape context and also provide the opportunity for extended public footpath routes.
- 6.0 The location of the site adjacent to the Health Centre also provides the opportunity to deliver an area for additional car parking for the Heath Centre. It is understood that the Health Centre currently suffers at peak times as a result of a lack of car parking.
- 7.0 The location of the site and the general principles which might inform the form development might take are shown on the attached Site Location and Development Framework Plan.

Land off Butt Lane, East Bridgford – Location and Framework Plan

