

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

Response from Nottinghamshire Campaign to Protect Rural England

27th November 2017

Please contact
Bettina Lange (Policy
Adviser)

Please also refer to our March 2017 response to the Rushcliffe Further Housing Options (Local Plan Part 2) consultation, which is attached again with this communication.

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?*

No because any further Greenfield allocations at Cotgrave would encroach into open countryside and detract from the attractive, intact Cotgrave Wolds.

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 ?*

The Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan has already allocated land 50 more homes than the target for the village. Any change to that should be agreed with Keyworth Parish Council and the people of the village.

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?*

Assessments were made at Core Strategy stage regarding the number of new homes the village and its facilities would be able to accommodate. This included consultation with local people. We are not aware of any change which would justify further housing land allocations. If anything, facilities have deteriorated, for example the health centre in the village is now so over capacity that it takes several weeks to get an appointment.

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

*Site RAD03 – Land off Shelford Road
(estimated capacity around 400 homes) :*

We do not support the allocation of this site. This is the largest of the proposed new sites at Radcliffe and the one with the most severe landscape impact. It would encroach into open countryside and adversely affect currently unobstructed views and (partly because of this) detract from local amenity – footpaths in the area are well used.

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?*

No because the village has few facilities and only a skeletal bus service.

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?*

No because the village has few facilities and a poor bus service.

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?*

We support in principle the re-development of this brownfield site. The village has very few facilities however although a reasonable bus service. It will be important that the bus service is maintained or enhanced.

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

We support in principle the re-development of this brownfield site. The village has very few facilities however and no meaningful bus service, which will have to be improved to make the site sustainable.

Notts CPRE response to the Rushcliffe Further Housing Options (Local Plan Part 2) consultation

March 2017

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

We appreciate the pressures resulting from 5 year housing land requirement and the consequences of the large strategic sites not delivering, or not at anything like the pace the Core Strategy assumed. However, we would like more information on the reasons for non-delivery or under-delivery and the action Rushcliffe have taken to try and improve delivery rates. The reasons may well be outside Rushcliffe's control, in which case allocating more land is unfair. But even where the reasons are beyond Rushcliffe's control, more information would instil some confidence at least that the situation is in hand and that Rushcliffe will not be faced with allocating yet more greenfield sites in a year's time in what increasingly appears a less than strategic approach. Piecemeal planning is not what the Plan-led planning system is intended for.

Know

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

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.

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)

Possibly part of the site provided if the development does not detract from the Skylarks nature reserve, one of the few nature reserve 100% accessible for wheelchair users and specifically created for their use.

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.

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 in the circumstances. We accept Rushcliffe's argument that extending the site already allocated to the north of Bingham would not contribute to the 5 year housing land supply, and it is our view that any other sites around Bingham would lead to encroachment into the countryside and near-coalescence.

.....
No

.....
Don't know

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

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 any further Greenfield allocations at Cotgrave would encroach into open countryside and detract from the attractive, intact Cotgrave Wolds.

.....
Don't know

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

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.*

see answer to question 5

Question 7: *Do you support housing development at:*

Yes –

all of site

Yes –

but only

part of site

No

No to all – see answer to question 5

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. 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.

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 but we would like to be reassured that the excess 400 homes in excess of the target for East Leake have been taken into account in calculating overall housing land supply

.....
No

.....
Don't know

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

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

Question 9: Do you support housing development at:

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

No to all as the suitable ones have already been allocated

Site EL9 – Land south of West Leake Road (potential capacity around 50 homes)

Site EL10 – Land north of West Leake Road (potential capacity around 75 homes)

Site EL11 – Brook Furlong Farm (potential capacity around 70 homes)

Site EL12 – Land off Rempstone Road (north) (potential capacity around 235 homes)

Site EL13 – Land off Rempstone Road (south) (potential capacity around 120 homes)

Site EL14 – Land north of Lantern Lane (2) (potential capacity around 360 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.

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.*

The Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan has already allocated land 50 more homes than the target for the village. Any change to that should be agreed with Keyworth Parish Council and the people of the village.

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

Question 11: *Do you support housing development at:*

**Yes –
all of
site
Yes –
but
only**

**part of
site
No**

Site KEY1 – Land east of Willow Brook (potential capacity around 40 homes)

Site KEY2 – Land off Selby Lane and Willowbrook (potential capacity around 15 homes)

Site KEY3 – Land south of Selby Lane (potential capacity around 60 homes)

Site KEY4 – Land off Nicker Hill (potential capacity around 450 homes)

Site KEY5 – Hill Top Farm, Platt Lane (1) (potential capacity around 50 homes)

Site KEY6 – Hill Top Farm, Platt Lane (2) (potential capacity around 80 homes)

Site KEY7 – Shelton Farm, Platt Lane (potential capacity around 160 homes)

Site KEY8 – Land between Platt Lane and Station Road (potential capacity around 180 homes)

Site KEY9 – Land north of Debdale Lane (1) (potential capacity around 110 homes)

Site KEY10 – Land south of Debdale Lane (1) (potential capacity around 230 homes)

Site KEY11 – Land south of Debdale Lane (2) (potential capacity around 200 homes)

Site KEY12 – Land north of Debdale Lane (2) (potential capacity around 160 homes)

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.

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.*

Assessments were made at Core Strategy stage regarding the number of new homes the village and its facilities would be able to accommodate. This included consultation with local people. We are not aware of any change which would justify further housing land allocations. If anything, facilities have deteriorated, for example the health centre in the village is now so over capacity that it takes several weeks to get an appointment.

Question 13: *Do you support housing development at:*

Yes –

**all of
site**

Yes –

**but
only
part of
site**

No to both as both are adjacent to the Trent Valley Way and are very well used as local amenity. Development of RAD11 would in addition obscure currently open views. During the preparation of the Core Strategy, provision of smaller homes suitable for older people was established as a clear local housing need. Most developers are not interested in providing this type of home. As both sites have been out forward by developers, it is unlikely that allocating them will contribute to meeting local housing need.

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.

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.

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.

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 adverse landscape impact far less severe than elsewhere e.g. Cotgrave

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

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 no

East Bridgford no

Gotham don't know

Sutton Bonington don't know

Tollerton don't know

Any other settlement (please specify which)

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

Cropwell B has very few facilities and a poor bus service (no evening or Sunday service, so not possible to live there without personal access to a car). Any development on Greenfield sites around the village would have an adverse impact on landscape and openness of the countryside.

Bus service to East Bridgford is better but it uncertain how long this currently marginally viable commercial Trent Barton service will survive, and few facilities in the village.

Gotham has a better bus service and easier access to facilities in East Leake, but development could have adverse landscape impact on Gotham Moor and the hills west of Gotham.

Tollerton has some facilities and access to the main urban area. The bus service is currently only just adequate (hourly in the evening) but with good potential for increased frequency given demand. However, any development to the East of the village would have an adverse impact on landscape and the current openness of the countryside.

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.*

Question 19: *Do you support housing development at:*

Yes –

**all of
site**

Yes –

**but
only**

**part of
site**

No see answer to question 17

Site CBI1 – Land to the south of Nottingham Road and east of Kinoulton Road (potential capacity around 30 homes)

Site CBI2 – Land north of Memorial Hall (1) (potential capacity around 75 homes)

Site CBI3– Land north of Memorial Hall (2) (potential capacity around 60 homes)

Site CBI4 – Land north of Fern Road (2) (potential capacity around 30 homes)

Site CBI5 – Land north of Fern Road (1) (potential capacity around 250 homes)

Site CBI6 – Land to the north of Fern Road (3) (potential capacity around 70 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.

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.

see answer to question 17

Question 21: *Do you support housing development at:*

Yes –

all of

site

Yes –

but

only

part of

site

No see answer to question 17

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.

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.*

see answer to question 17

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

Yes –

**all of
site**

Yes –

**but
only**

**part of
site**

No

see answer to question 17

*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)*

*Site GOT3 – Land north of Kegworth Road/Home Farm
(east) (potential capacity around 20 homes)*

*Site GOT4 – The Orchards, Leake Road (potential
capacity around 50 homes)*

*Site GOT5 – Land east of Gypsum Way/The Orchards
(potential capacity around 200 homes)*

*Site GOT6 – East of Leake Road (potential capacity
around 45 homes)*

*Site GOT7 – Land east of Hill Road (potential capacity
around 160 homes)*

Site GOT8 – Land south of Moor Lane (potential capacity around 15 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.

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.*

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)

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.

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.

Question 27: Do you support housing development at:

Yes –

all of

site

Yes –

but

only

part of

site

No to all due to impact on landscape and local amenity

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)

Site TOL3 – Land east of Tollerton Lane (potential capacity around 50 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.

Question 28: Please identify any matters related to housing development which are

not covered here or elsewhere.