

Planning Policy  
Rushcliffe Borough Council  
Civic Centre  
Pavilion Road  
West Bridgford  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG2 5FE

30<sup>th</sup> March 2017

085 MR 300317 MR

[e-mail: localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk](mailto:localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk)

Dear Sir

## **RUSHCLIFFE LOCAL PLAN PART 2: LAND AND PLANNING POLICIES: FURTHER OPTIONS**

I write on behalf of my client William Davis Ltd with regard to the Local Plan Part 2 Land and Planning Policies (LAPP) Further Options consultation. My clients are a house building company who own the land at Shelford Road, Radcliffe on Trent that is the subject of an outline planning application currently being considered by the Borough Council for the development of up to 400 dwellings, plus permission for a primary school, a health centre and associated infrastructure (13/02329/OUT).

### **Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies**

#### ***Housing Land Supply***

The Borough Council will recall the comments submitted on behalf of William Davis in March 2016, in relation to the Issues and Options Consultation, that welcomed the preparation of Part 2 of the Local Plan and its intention to facilitate appropriate and sustainable development to meet the identified housing needs in the Borough. Those representations highlighted that given the continued delay in the delivery of the allocated strategic sites in Part 1 of the Local Plan (the Core Strategy), rapid progress is now required to review the Green Belt around the Key Settlements identified in Policy 3 of the Core Strategy, and allocate sufficient sites for residential development to ensure that the residual housing needs in the plan period are met (taking account of the delay in the delivery of the strategic sites). That is critical if “*the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the market area*” are to be met, and a 5 year housing land supply is maintained as required by the NPPF (para 47).

William Davis, therefore, support the position set out in Section 2 of the Further Options Consultation Paper, to allocate additional land to make up for the expected shortfall in the delivery of new housing in the plan period from the large strategic sites allocated for development in the adopted Core Strategy.

Moreover it is noted that if the LAPP is adopted by 2018 the remaining plan period will only be 10 years (to 2028). That is somewhat less than the 10 year period specified in the NPPF (para 157). A comprehensive review of Part 1 of the Local Plan, including consideration of the level of housing need in the Housing Market Area through a new SHMA will be, therefore, be required as a priority following the adoption of the LAPP to ensure that the Borough Council continues to positively plan for longer terms housing needs. In the interim, however, it would be sensible and consistent with the NPPF (para 85) to examine the potential for safeguarding sites to provide further flexibility and ensure a continual land supply is provided to meet future needs beyond the plan period.

In light of the above position William Davis do, however, continue to have concerns in respect of the further delay (of almost a year to the anticipated adoption date) to the already prolonged programme for the preparation of the LAPP, and suggest that the Borough Council urgently consider how the timescale can be compressed and/or suitable sites for sustainable development can be brought forward for development in tandem with the preparation of the LAPP. In particular, they would like to urge the Borough Council to progress as soon as possible with a Preferred Options consultation, with the inclusion of their application site at Radcliffe in order to meet the identified housing needs for that settlement and the wider Borough.

### ***Main Urban Area***

William Davis' response to the Issues and Options Consultation set out their view that no other sites should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for development on the edge of West Bridgford or Clifton (including the extension of the existing strategic allocations), because of the concerns with the delays in their delivery that is now becoming very evident, and their ability therefore, to deliver the level of development required to meet the identified needs in the required timescale. In relation to **Question 2**, therefore, William Davis do support the Council's view that none of the three strategic allocations should be expanded in order to resolve the current shortfall in the amount of land available in the short to medium term.

### ***Radcliffe on Trent***

William Davis' response to the Issues and Options Consultation also highlighted that, to address the increasing shortfall in the housing land supply arising from the delay in the delivery of the Strategic Sites, a number and variety of appropriate and sustainable development sites away from the main urban area, notably in the identified key settlements such as Radcliffe on Trent, are required to come forward at the earliest opportunity to accelerate the supply of housing and meet identified needs throughout the plan period to 2028. They, therefore, welcome the acknowledgement in the LAPP Further Options Consultation Paper that it is now necessary to accommodate more than the minimum of 400 new dwellings on greenfield sites on the edge of Radcliffe on Trent identified in the Core Strategy.

Radcliffe on Trent is an important population and service centre in the Borough, and it has been recognised as an entirely appropriate and sustainable focus for growth. Indeed, there is significant capacity for additional development. There has been relatively little development over the last 20 years, and the SHLAA has identified a number of sites that could be suitable. Indeed, the Borough Council are currently considering William Davis' outline planning application (as referred to above) that would provide 400 dwellings by itself when approved.

In relation to **Question 12**, the total number of new homes that should be built on greenfield sites around Radcliffe will ultimately depend on both the capacity of the settlement and an assessment of those specific sites. However, the technical work submitted to support William Davis' planning application also examined the potential cumulative impact of a separate planning application for a further 300 dwellings (but was subsequently refused), and that clearly demonstrated the capacity of the village (with appropriate mitigation) to accommodate at least 700 dwellings.

Indeed, substantial additional development would have a number of benefits for the settlement as it would assist in meeting the draft Neighbourhood Plan objectives relating to regeneration and the retention of services in the settlement. For example, the secondary school has experienced a declining school role as a result of the aging settlement population, and additional development in the village can help address that. Additional development could also help to ensure the delivery of essential community infrastructure required to meet the needs arising from the planned growth.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries in respect of the comments made above, but in the meantime I would be grateful if you could confirm safe receipt of this letter by return.

Yours sincerely

**Mark Rose**  
**Director**