

# FREETHS

Rushcliffe Borough Council  
Planning Policy  
Rushcliffe Arena  
Rugby Road  
West Bridgford  
Nottingham  
NG2 7YG

Direct dial: +4 Direct fax: +44  
(0)115 859 9642 Switchboard: +44  
(0)115 936 9369 Email: m

27 November 2017

Our Ref: MBA/2003/2138722/1

By Email

Dear Sir/Madam

**Re: Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2 Preferred Options Consultation – Land and Planning Policies Document**

I refer to the above consultation and set out below representations in response to the Land and Planning Policies (LAPP) Preferred Options document on behalf of our client Mr and Mrs Bailey of The Warren, 15 Cherry Holt Lane, East Bridgford.

This letter supports the OBJECTION to the proposed allocation of Sites EBR6 and EBR7 at East Bridgford (Question 17) as submitted via the enclosed consultation response form.

Our client resides to the immediate west of site EBR6, on the eastern edge of the settlement and within the East Bridgford Conservation Area. Our client has no objection in principle to the level of development proposed for the settlement but considers that there are more appropriate and less harmful options for securing the level of development proposed in the LAPP.

It is recognised that the Council has some difficult decisions to make in order to accommodate the level of housing requirement set out by the adopted Core Strategy and that Green Belt release is inevitable. However, there are a number of reasons why we consider that sites EBR6 and EBR7 should not be allocated and these are set out below.

**Green Belt**

The NPPF, at Paragraph 80, sets out the five purposes of the Green Belt. It is accepted that the site and largely East Bridgford in general is not under threat from coalescence through the merging of settlements. Further it is agreed that there are unlikely to be any specific urban regeneration projects within the settlement.

However, we consider that the land proposed for allocation by EBR6 and EBR7 continues to serve purpose as Green Belt through restricting the sprawl of the settlement, assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and most significantly in this particular instance preserving the special character of the adjacent heritage asset in respect of the East Bridgford Conservation Area.

The Green Belt Detailed Review comments in respect of the test of checking unrestricted sprawl that the proposed allocation adjoins the built up parts of the village on two sides. This is of course true of many parts of the Green Belt around the village and is a characteristic of the edge of the settlement. Whilst it is noted that the report claims that the defensible boundary of the Green Belt is weak to the north and east of the site, it is submitted that actually the boundary is quite clear in that it follows the form of the settlement edge. The Fosters Close development is perhaps an anomaly, but this was granted under the provision of a rural exception development, and should not be seen to devalue the purpose of the surrounding Green Belt.

In practice it is recognised that any release of Green Belt on the edge of East Bridgford, providing it is of comparative size, is likely to have similar impacts on the tests of 'sprawl' and 'encroachment into the countryside' as EBR6 and EBR7. However, it is strongly submitted that the proposed allocation would cause significant harm to the setting of the conservation area and the Green Belt should be maintained in this location to protect this heritage asset. This is explored in more detail below.

### **Impact on the Conservation Area**

The conservation area boundary is situated to the immediate west of the proposed allocated sites EBR6 and EBR7 with the properties on Cherryholt Lane, including our client's, forming a low density soft edge to the conservation area set in front of a listed building and a number of other buildings identified as being 'positive' in the East Bridgford Conservation Area Appraisal. In addition there are a large number of trees within the conservation area which are identified as 'significant', again in the Conservation Area Appraisal. It is submitted that development on EBR6 and EBR7 would have a significantly adverse impact on the setting of the Conservation Area and as identified in the Green Belt Detailed Review document (P181), specifically in relation to these sites, "*the Green Belt protects the setting of the Conservation Area.*" The Housing Site Selection Interim Report (September 2017) and the Heritage Assets Assessment conclude that the impacts on the conservation area are limited but we submit that this underplays the adverse effects on its setting. The Green Belt Detailed Review, again on P181, recognises that the removal of these sites from the Green Belt and their subsequent development may have an impact on the setting of the conservation area.

The indicative plan submitted by the site's promoter to the previous consultation and the number of dwellings proposed for allocation is at a much higher density than Cherryholt Lane and the northern section of the conservation area and would present a much harsher settlement edge, eroding the leafy green characteristics of the current settlement boundary. Whilst the development on Fosters Close is somewhat unfortunate in terms of its intrusion into the openness of the Green Belt, its separation from the conservation area reduces its harm and should not be seen as a justifiable reason to infill this part of the Green Belt.

The East Bridgford Townscape Appraisal identifies the view north from Cross Lane to EBR6 as a view of a positive landscape and this re-inforces our concern over the importance of the site to the setting of the conservation area. The Town Appraisal also recognises the value of the hedgerow on

Closes Side Lane. The Council's supporting evidence suggests that access may be taken from Fosters Close, but the developer's submission is that a new separate access will be taken from Closes Side Lane and further hedgerow removal to facilitate both the access and the required visibility splay along this road would unacceptably erode its character.

### **Highway Safety**

In addition to the concerns regarding the impact on the conservation area and the character of the area, our client's wish to raise significant concern about creating a new access off Closes Side Lane. The lane is narrow and the creation of an additional access in close proximity to Cross Lane and Fosters Close is likely to cause conflict of vehicles. It is appreciated that at 40 dwellings the development is unlikely to create high volumes of traffic but our client's concern is with the existing rural nature of the lane, specifically its restricted width and the difficulty of vehicles pulling out of the proposed allocation site onto such a narrow lane. Further our client advises that traffic approaching the village from the north west will often use Cherry Holt Lane as an alternative route and this lane is also very narrow, with no pavements for pedestrians. Any increase in traffic using this route causes further safety concerns.

### **Alternative Site**

It is recognised that the Council has to ensure that sufficient land is allocated for housing to meet the Borough's Core Strategy requirements. The allocation of EBR8, to the north of Butt Lane is supported. This is located off Butt Lane and so via the main arterial route through the village with good pedestrian access to the village's facilities and services. However, it is submitted that there is potential for the allocation of EBR8 to be extended northwards, incorporating the next field. This area of land comprises approximately 2ha and would have similar development opportunities to Sites EBR6 and EBR7 in respect to numbers of dwellings.

A key benefit of extending EBR8 over and above allocating land at EBR6 and EBR7 is that it would have a lesser impact in heritage terms as the adjacent field to the north does not border the conservation area. East Bridgford's conservation area is extensive and whilst clearly this does not prohibit sensitive development in all cases adjacent to its boundaries, extending EBR8 northwards would represent a less harmful option. The extension of the village east in this location would be proportionate and respect the settlement pattern and would be no more harmful in Green Belt terms than the allocation of EBR6 and EBR7. Further the site would benefit from a more appropriate access via Butt Lane. It is noted that there is a right of way across the site, but this could be suitably and sensitively accommodated into any development layout.

From searching the Council's records, it is noted that at present there appears no SHLAA submission for this site. However, it is understood that the land owner is keen to promote the site for development and therefore a submission will be made shortly. This will assist in providing the evidence that the site is deliverable as a viable choice for allocation within the Local Plan.

### **Conclusion**

Our client objects to the proposed allocation of Sites EBR6 and EBR7. The land acts as an important landscape buffer to the adjacent conservation area and its development would have an unacceptably significant adverse impact on its setting. Principally, for this reason, it is submitted that the land should be retained within the Green Belt.

27 November 2017

Page 4

Our client recognises the need for housing and therefore has suggested an alternative site be considered for development through the extension of EBR8 northwards. This would represent a more logical extension of the village which would limit any harm to the conservation area and would provide a more appropriate vehicular access to development than sites EBR6 and EBR7.

Yours sincerely

This document is "unsigned" as it is electronically forwarded.  
If you require a signed copy then please contact the sender.

Mark Bassett

Principal Manager

Please respond by e-mail where possible

Enc: Completed Rushcliffe Preferred Housing Sites Consultation Response Form



# Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies – Preferred Housing Sites

## Response Form

Please return by **5pm on Monday 27 November 2017** to:  
 Planning Policy, Rushcliffe Borough Council  
 Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road  
 Nottingham. NG2 7YG  
 Or to: [localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk](mailto:localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk)

Please note that your comments can be directly entered through the Borough Council's online consultation system: <http://rushcliffe-consult.objective.co.uk/portal>

Your Details		Agent details (where applicable)
Mr and Mrs Bailey	<b>Name</b>	Mark Bassett
The Warren, 15 Cherry Holt Lane, East Bridgford, Nottingham, NG13 8LJ	<b>Address</b>	Freeths LLP, Cumberland Court, 80 Mount Street, Nottingham, NG1 6HH
Click here to enter text.	<b>E-mail</b>	

### Housing Development

#### Housing Land Supply

**Question 1:** Do you agree with the Council's proposal that Local Plan Part 2 should identify enough land for around 2,550 new homes?

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

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


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

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Housing Sites within the Main Urban Area

**Question 2:** Do you agree with the Council's proposed allocation of the Abbey Road Depot (site WB01) for the development of around 50 new homes?

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

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

You may like to give your views on what development should look like, in terms of the design, mix and layout of new housing and other uses (for example, open space) on site.

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Housing Sites adjacent to the Main Urban Area

**Question 3:** Do you agree with the Council's proposal that no sites adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham (within Rushcliffe) should be allocated for housing development through Local Plan Part 2?

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

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

Click here to enter text.

## Housing Development at the 'Key Settlements'

### Bingham

**Question 4:** Do you agree with the Council's proposal that no sites adjacent to Bingham should be allocated for housing development through Local Plan Part 2?

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

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

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### Cotgrave

**Question 5:** Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for housing development at Cotgrave for around 350 homes in total?

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

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

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Question 6:** Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following sites at Cotgrave:

	Yes	No
Site COT01 – Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park (estimated capacity around 170 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sites COT09 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (1); COT10 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (2); and COT11a – Land south of Hollygate Lane (3a) (estimated capacity around 180 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

For each of the proposed housing sites, you may like to give your views on what development should look like, in terms of the design, mix and layout of new housing and other uses (for example, open space) on site.

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## East Leake

**Question 7:** Do you agree with our proposal that only sites EL01, EL02, EL04, EL05 and EL08 (as shown at Figure 4) should be allocated for housing development at East Leake?

<b>Yes</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>No</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)



## Keyworth

**Question 8:** Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for housing development at Keyworth for around 580 homes in total?

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

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

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Question 9:** Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following sites at Keyworth.

	Yes	No
Site KEY4a – Land off Nicker Hill (1) (estimated capacity around 150 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site KEY8 – Land between Platt Lane and Station Road (estimated capacity around 190 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site KEY10 – Land south of Debdale Lane (1) (estimated capacity around 190 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site KEY13 – Hillside Farm (estimated capacity around 50 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

For each of the proposed housing sites, you may like to give your views on what development should look like, in terms of the design, mix and layout of new housing and other uses (for example, open space) on site.

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Radcliffe on Trent

**Question 10:** Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for housing development at Radcliffe on Trent for around 820 homes in total?

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

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

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Question 11:** Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following sites at Radcliffe on Trent.

	Yes	No
Site RAD01 – Land north of Nottingham Road (estimated capacity around 150 homes), with employment development to the west of the powerlines that separate the site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site RAD02 – Land adjacent Grooms Cottage (estimated capacity around 50 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site RAD03 – Land off Shelford Road (estimated capacity around 400 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site RAD05a – Land north of Grantham Road to south of railway line (1a) (estimated capacity around 140 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Yes	No
Site RAD06 – 72 Main Road (estimated capacity around 5 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site RAD13 – The Paddock, Nottingham Road (estimated capacity around 75 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

*For each of the proposed housing sites, you may like to give your views on what development should look like, in terms of the design, mix and layout of new housing and other uses (for example, open space) on site.*

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Ruddington

**Question 12:** *Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for housing development at Ruddington for around 410 homes in total?*

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

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

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Question 13:** *Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following sites at Ruddington.*

	Yes	No
Site RUD01 – Land to the west of Wilford Road (south) (estimated capacity around 180 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site RUD05 – Land south of Flawforth Lane (estimated capacity around 50 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site RUD11 – Old Loughborough Road (estimated capacity around 10 self and custom-build homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site RUD13 – Land opposite Mere Way (estimated capacity around 170 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

*For each of the proposed housing sites, you may like to give your views on what development should look like, in terms of the design, mix and layout of new housing and other uses (for example, open space) on site.*

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Housing Development at the 'Other Villages'

### Cropwell Bishop

**Question 14:** *Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for housing development at Cropwell Bishop for around 160 homes in total?*

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

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

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Question 15:** Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following sites at Cropwell Bishop.

	Yes	No
Site CBI02 – Land north of Memorial Hall(1) (estimated capacity around 90 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site CBI05 – Land east of Church Street (estimated capacity around 70 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

For both of the proposed housing sites, you may like to give your views on what development should look like, in terms of the design, mix and layout of new housing and other uses (for example, open space) on site.

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### East Bridgford

**Question 16:** Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for housing development at East Bridgford for around 100 homes in total?

<b>Yes</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>No</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Question 17:** Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following sites at East Bridgford

	Yes	No
Site EBR06 – Closes Side Lane (west) (estimated capacity around 20 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Site EBR07 – Closes Side Lane (east) (estimated capacity around 20 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Site EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane (estimated capacity around 15 homes)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site EBR10 – Land south of Butt Lane (estimated capacity around 45 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

For each of the proposed housing sites, you may like to give your views on what development should look like, in terms of the design, mix and layout of new housing and other uses (for example, open space) on site.

See Supporting Letter

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Gotham

**Question 18:** Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for housing development at Gotham for around 100 homes in total?

Yes .....

No .....

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

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Question 19:** Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following site at Gotham:

	Yes	No
Site GOT5a – Land east of Gypsum Way/The Orchards (1) (estimated capacity around 100 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

You may like to give your views on what development should look like, in terms of the design, mix and layout of new housing and other uses (for example, open space) on site.

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Bunny Brickworks

**Question 20:** Do you support the proposed allocation of the former Bunny Brickworks (site BUN01) for a mixed development of around 100 new homes and employment development?

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

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

You may like to give your views on what development should look like, in terms of the design, mix and layout of new housing and other uses (for example, open space) on site.

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Flintham – Former Islamic Institute

**Question 21:** Do you support the proposed allocation of the former Islamic Institute at Flintham for the development of up to 95 new homes?

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

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

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Other Issues

**Question 22:** Please identify any matters related to housing development which are not covered here or elsewhere and which you wish to raise.

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Please return by **5pm on Monday 27 November 2017** to:

Planning Policy,  
Rushcliffe Borough Council  
Rushcliffe Arena  
Rugby Road  
Nottingham. NG2 7YG

Or to: [localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk](mailto:localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk)

Please note that your comments can be directly entered through the Borough Council's online consultation system: <http://rushcliffe-consult.objective.co.uk/portal>

**Data protection:** The details you submit to the Borough Council will be used in the plan making process and may be in use for the lifetime of the Local Plan and associated processes in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. 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. By sending the Council your details you will automatically be informed of future consultations on planning policy documents unless you indicate otherwise.