

Local Plan 2014: Borough-wide shortfall in the delivery of new homes – CB102 and CB105.

Apparently this plan identified Cropwell Bishop as one of five key settlements in the delivery of new development in the rural areas of the Borough. On the basis of discussions with your staff at the public consultation, this was less to do with a thorough analysis of the needs of the Borough, whereby relevant settlements were identified, and more to do with which settlements put forward land for purchase, upon which new housing development could take place. A good example of this would be a comparison of Cropwell Bishop (potentially 160 new homes) and Cropwell Butler (zero new homes) – shouldn't an analysis of appropriate settlements have given them equal standing in the Borough plan? Apparently the choice of settlement hinges upon whether the community has a shop and other relevant facilities – perhaps the Planning Authority should encourage Cropwell Butler residents to stop knocking down large houses and building even larger replacements, and further encourage them to build relevant facilities that have been closed and expunged from their community over the years. I'm sure this also applies to the other settlements identified in the Borough-wide plan.

Is Cropwell Bishop a suitable village for a limited level of housing growth on greenfield sites?

Yes, if necessary, and with concomitant development of the village infrastructure, the village could cope with a further 50 – 60 new houses. If you accept that all village settlements have a centre that has been established over the years, then it would make sense to retain this in all efforts to expand the community. In Cropwell Bishop's case, this suggests land to the South of Nottingham Road is the natural choice for any planned expansion for new homes. Apparently this has been rejected as development here would impact the "visual sensitivity" assessment of the village. I think you are a little too late to be worrying about this...check out the existing 'agricultural' contractor site development on the way out of the village on Nottingham Road and the proposed Chicken Farm development near the A46. It would appear "visual sensitivity" is not a criteria used in the assessment of these developments, which are presumably allowed under Borough Planning Authority control.

Reasons for limiting development:

The new housing development in Cotgrave was poorly planned, to the extent that it is already appears to be impacting resources here in Cropwell Bishop e.g. the village school, which has insufficient places to accommodate more pupils;

The road network is already close to capacity at key points during the day – Cropwell Bishop is on the 'rat-run' for commuters from the Vale into/out of Nottingham/Leicester/Newark. Increasing the flow of traffic at the beginning/end of each day as villagers transport their children to/from school, will only exacerbate the current problems.

Whilst the Health Centre may be able to accommodate more patients, access to the centre, in terms of traffic flow and car-parking, is already close to capacity.

The CB102 site only serves to elongate the village profile, thereby exacerbating the traffic flow problems identified earlier. CB105 will feed larger volumes of traffic into Hoe View Road and Church Street – significant congestion is inevitable at these junctions onto Nottingham Road.

Planners appear to justify the choice of development sites by stating that residents can easily walk to facilities in the village – there's only one flaw in this argument...the vast majority of villagers do not walk anywhere in the village, they use their cars...one of many wrong assumptions made in the planning process.

Current problems with the village sewerage system after heavy rain suggest it is close to capacity handling current demand. Adding to the village housing stock is unlikely to alleviate these problems for the residents of Church Street.

The land is water-logged and often floods – this was evident when the first large-scale housing development took place in the 1970's. The developers had to return to dig a ditch, sufficient to accommodate the run-off from the field. Until this was done, the houses on the limit of the current estate had water streaming through their gardens out onto Hoe View Road. N.B. residents at the North end of the proposed CB102 development are still subject to waterlogged gardens after a period of rain... so the 'solution' has not been entirely successful.

It was interesting to watch the surveyors undertaking their work on CB102 after the first Consultation Meeting – despite wearing knee-length rubber boots, these struggled in keeping their feet dry. Strangely enough, one whole area of the field wasn't surveyed as meticulously as perhaps it should have been. A local equestrian added some interest to the survey by galloping through the flood water – reminded me of wild horses galloping through the marshes in the Camargue. Let's hope future occupants of these plots see it as favourably and are equally entertained. Please publish the name of the company/organisation residents can sue when this water runoff plan goes wrong...as it surely will.

As the scale of development proposed will contribute little or nothing to improving the infrastructure in the village, I suggest any development that does take place, is kept to a minimum.

An example of the contribution made by the Planning Inspectorate: they made three visits to the village to assess traffic flows surrounding the new Co-op store development. Perhaps the Inspector's time would have been better spent, with a day repeatedly travelling along Nottingham Road, between the Memorial Hall and Fern Hill to have a better understanding of traffic flows and the effect of on-street parking on the free-flow of traffic through the village. It's good to see that important planning decisions are made on the basis of rigorous research and robust analysis of the data collected.

Perhaps this heralds what will happen here in the future delivery of new homes:

Public Consultation (box ticked) – make sure all assessment/evaluation/documentation tells the same story that points toward the preferred site(s) of choice;

A couple of rounds of the consultation process (more box-ticking to let the residents feel like they have had the opportunity to object);

Call in the Planning Inspectorate to deal with the final appeal (for this read parachute in an 'expert' and allow their views to override the residents and their elected representatives)...job done.

It would have been nice to have received some reassurance from the consultation meetings arranged for the benefit of Cropwell Bishop residents...regrettably all they have done is confirm their worst fears.

Kevin Edwards

[t](#)

204 Hoe View Road
Cropwell Bishop
NG12 3DJ

Online response

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

Respondent no: **1143952**

Respondent		Agent details (where applicable)
Mrs Philippa Edwards	Name	
	Organisation	
1143952	ID number	

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?

Answer

Don't Know

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

Houses may be needed but not at risk of developing green field sites. There should be infilling and usage of brown field sites.

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?

Answer

Yes

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.

It should be counted as the houses have not yet been built - this ia the sort of area that makes sense to build on.

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?

Answer

Yes

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

These sites make sense as transportation links are very good . Tram in Clifton and excellent bus service in Edwalton. They are also closer to city centre and shopping.

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?

No

Answer

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

They have an excellent bus service to the city - every 10 minutes so people are more likely to take the bus. They also have a train line into Nottingham and Grantham - which has also seen improvements.

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?

Answer**Yes**

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

Cot 9 and 10 would be infilling and make sense. But 11a is too far out and will cause too much congestion at the junction.

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

	Answer
Site COT01 – Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park (estimated capacity around 170 homes)	Yes
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)	Yes

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.

Not 11a see above

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?

Answer

Yes

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

Except I think 300 is too many at 104

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?

Answer

Yes

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

Good transport network and amenities

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

	Answer
Site KEY4a – Land off Nicker Hill (1) (estimated capacity around 150 homes)	Yes
Site KEY8 – Land between Platt Lane and Station Road (estimated capacity around 190 homes)	Yes
Site KEY10 – Land south of Debdale Lane (1) (estimated capacity around 190 homes)	No
Site KEY13 – Hillside Farm (estimated capacity around 50 homes)	Yes

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.

Key 8 has two possible access roads. Key13 is close to village centre. Key 4a is not adjacent to other homes and should not cause distress to residents. Key 10 however will cause distress to residents living there.

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?

Answer	Yes
--------	-----

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

Only that which cannot be used for leisure.

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

	Answer
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.	Yes
Site RAD02 – Land adjacent Grooms Cottage (estimated capacity around 50 homes)	Yes
Site RAD03 – Land off Shelford Road (estimated capacity around 400 homes)	No
Site RAD05a – Land north of Grantham Road to south of railway line (1a) (estimated capacity around 140 homes)	Yes
Site RAD06 – 72 Main Road (estimated capacity around 5 homes)	Yes
Site RAD13 – The Paddock, Nottingham Road (estimated capacity around 75 homes)	Yes

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.

A village can accommodate smaller developments but not the size of Rad 03. The other sites are smaller and infill. Transport network is excellent through Radcliffe and ideal for accommodating extra homes and population.

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?

Answer

Yes

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

Close to city centre.

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

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

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.

Close to city centre and good transport links. Small developments more easily accommodate extra traffic.

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?

Answer

No

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

Too far out of Nottingham. Land floods. Small infilling more preferable for a small community. The school is not big enough to accommodate all these houses. The transport infrastructure is too poor to accommodate all these extra people. Poor bus service so everyone will need to exit the village by car. This is also the highway for other villages beyond Cropwell Bishop eg Langar.

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

	Answer
Site CBI02 – Land north of Memorial Hall(1) (estimated capacity around 90 homes)	No
Site CBI05 – Land east of Church Street (estimated capacity around 70 homes)	Yes

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.

CB105 some housing could be accommodated, (but not sure about the number) and a new link road into the school would be good. Not C102 as I disagree with your description and it is visually intrusive. It visually intrudes into the countryside and would adversely affect the rural setting of the village. It would make more sense to build a small development south of Nottingham road linking the two parts of the village. The access to site C102 is a huge problem for villagers if taken in through Hoe View Road. This road is substandard and visibility on exit is poor. Nearly two thirds of houses on this road do not have a garage or drive as they are old council houses so cars are parked on the roads at the north end. The exit is also dangerous in wintry weather. I have skidded here on several occasions even though I am driving very slowly towards the exit onto Nottingham Road. The north and north east corner of C102 flood in winter. It is a natural holding field for excess water. If this is channelled or drained it is likely to cause flooding in the village centre - which has happened in the past. If you have to build here a strip of woodland between the present homes and the field will be necessary to soak up the water - which means less houses can be built. If you still ignore all our concerns and insist on building - for the sake of the visual sensitivity of those who live along Hoe View Road it would be considerate to build bungalows along the East edge. Two reasons: We do not wish to have people looking into our bedroom windows. There are many retired couples in large houses in the village looking for bungalows now that their children have left home and they are looking to their future needs. Please insist on an area of woodland between present housing and any new development. This could in part offset the destruction of the green belt and also reduce the likelihood of flooding elsewhere. - A key issue in the country today.

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?

Answer

Yes

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

Small developments are the best idea.

Question 17: Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of

the following sites at East Bridgford

	Answer
Site EBR06 – Closes Side Lane (west) (estimated capacity around 20 homes)	Yes
Site EBR07 – Closes Side Lane (east) (estimated capacity around 20 homes)	Yes
Site EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane (estimated capacity around 15 homes)	Yes
Site EBR10 – Land south of Butt Lane (estimated capacity around 45 homes)	Yes

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.

Small developments are the best idea in village communities.

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?

Answer

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

Question 19: Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of

the following site at Gotham:

	Answer
Site GOT5a – Land east of Gypsum Way/The Orchards (1) (estimated capacity around 100 homes)	

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.

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?

Answer

Yes

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.

Just the sort of place that is ideal for housing development. Not greenfield site and not causing distress to neighbours.

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?

Richard Mapletoft

From: El-Rishmawy, Denise (BHGE) < 19 November 2017 19:57
Sent: Localdevelopment
To: Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies - objection
Subject:

To whom it may concern – Rushcliffe Borough Council

I would like to openly object to the building of 410 new homes in Ruddington that constitute a part of the 'Local Plan, part 2'.

My main concern is the impact of local services, including the schools, health centre and more importantly the level of congestion in the village. I live on Kirk Lane and every morning & evening, the traffic is backed up all the way along Kirk Lane in both directions. Increased traffic poses more risk to the village children as well as the detrimental environmental impact

I like to support the local shops, the variety are an absolute credit to Ruddington but as of late I'm struggling to find parking at any place in the village. I'm finding myself going around the village two or three times before I can find a place to park. On some occasions I have had to drive off and shop elsewhere (Morrisons) which is not what the village needs. This has certainly become worse in the last few months, since the building of other new homes in Ruddington.

I understand the need for new homes but just building new homes and not putting in plans for sustainability of local services is a disaster. Ruddington is a sought after place to live, still maintaining a village feel whilst being close to a great city centre in Nottingham and excellent motorway links. It is our duty to protect such a wonderful village for future generations, therefore that is why we would like to put forward my objection to 'Local plan, part 2'

Yours Faithfully,

Denise El-Rishmawy
Elias El-Rishmawy

27 Kirk Lane
Ruddington
Nottingham
NG2 6NN

Online response

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

Respondent no: **1144021**

Respondent		Agent details (where applicable)
Miss Margaret Evans	Name	
	Organisation	
1144021	ID number	

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?

Answer

Yes

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

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?

Answer

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.

The Abbey Road area is already heavily congested with traffic at all times of day, depot traffic currently ends around 5pm & doesn't operate at weekends easing local congestion, building further on this area will also reduce the urban greenspace between housing areas. This site is also of importance in local history as it houses the pump house & tram depots many of these buildings still stand. Another important consideration would be if the houses being built would be family homes as both of the local schools are oversubscribed

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?

Answer

No

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

Most people who live within do so for its reputation of being very green large urban sprawl such has been happening has put the countryside out of reach of many, you now need a car to access it from certain areas

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?

Answer

No

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

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?

Answer

No

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

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

Site COT01 – Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park
(estimated capacity around 170 homes)

Answer

No

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)

No

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.

--

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?

Answer

No

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

--

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?

Answer

No

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

--

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

Answer

	Answer
Site KEY4a – Land off Nicker Hill (1) (estimated capacity around 150 homes)	No
Site KEY8 – Land between Platt Lane and Station Road (estimated capacity around 190 homes)	No
Site KEY10 – Land south of Debdale Lane (1) (estimated capacity around 190 homes)	No
Site KEY13 – Hillside Farm (estimated capacity around 50 homes)	No

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.

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?

Answer

No

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

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

	Answer
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.	No
Site RAD02 – Land adjacent Grooms Cottage (estimated capacity around 50 homes)	No
Site RAD03 – Land off Shelford Road (estimated capacity around 400 homes)	No
Site RAD05a – Land north of Grantham Road to south of railway line (1a) (estimated capacity around 140 homes)	No
Site RAD06 – 72 Main Road (estimated capacity around 5 homes)	No
Site RAD13 – The Paddock, Nottingham Road (estimated capacity around 75 homes)	No

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.

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?

Answer

No

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

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

Answer

Site RUD01 – Land to the west of Wilford Road (south)
(estimated capacity around 180 homes)

No

Site RUD05 – Land south of Flawforth Lane
(estimated capacity around 50 homes)

No

Site RUD11 – Old Loughborough Road
(estimated capacity around 10 self and custom-build homes)

No

Site RUD13 – Land opposite Mere Way (estimated capacity around 170 homes)

No

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.

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?

Answer

No

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

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

Answer

Site CBI02 – Land north of Memorial Hall(1)
(estimated capacity around 90 homes)

No

Site CBI05 – Land east of Church Street
(estimated capacity around 70 homes)

No

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.

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?

Answer	No
---------------	-----------

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

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

	Answer
Site EBR06 – Closes Side Lane (west) (estimated capacity around 20 homes)	No
Site EBR07 – Closes Side Lane (east) (estimated capacity around 20 homes)	No
Site EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane (estimated capacity around 15 homes)	No
Site EBR10 – Land south of Butt Lane (estimated capacity around 45 homes)	No

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.

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?

Answer	No
---------------	-----------

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

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

	Answer
Site GOT5a – Land east of Gypsum Way/The Orchards (1) (estimated capacity around 100 homes)	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.

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?

Answer	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.

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?

Answer

No

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

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.

John King

From: matthew evley <f7 November 2017 13:31
Sent: Localdevelopment
To: Response to the Local Plan Part 2 Preferred Housing Sites consultation
Subject:

Dear Sir

I would like to respond to the Local Plan Part 2 Preferred Housing Sites as a Cotgrave resident, specifically to the Cotgrave proposals.

My responses:

Question 5: No I do not agree that greenfield land should be allocated for 350 homes in total. It is too many for the access points (see my response to Question 6)

Question 6: **Site COT01** – No I do not support it for the following reasons:

I object to COT01 being designated for housing because the site does not have sufficient access/egress to/from it as there will only be one junction along the short 80 meter frontage with Hollygate Lane, which is not sufficient for 180 dwellings. COT9, 10 and 11a together are designated for 170 dwellings but have a combined frontage of 540 meters along Hollygate Lane and a combined 280 meters with Colston Gate, which is much more suitable. The current development in the Country Park, with c.450 dwellings, has three access points; two junctions with Hollygate Lane (one being a large roundabout) and one with Stragglethorpe Road.

With only a single access if it was blocked residents, and more importantly emergency services, would not have access. It will also cause congestion at that junction at peak times.

My view is that COT01 can only be considered if there were substantially less dwellings planned. I suggest 20-50 based on current number of dwellings with a single point of access/egress (being The Old Park, East Acres, Morkinshire Cottages/Lane/Crescent, Mill Lane). Nowhere in Cotgrave is there anything near an area of 170 dwellings with a single point of access/egress.

Sites COT09, COT10, COT11a: I do not support these. Cotgrave has had 450 recently.

Regards

M. Evans.

From:
To: Local Plan 2 - Cropwell Bishop
Subject: 16 October 2017 14:15:10
Date:

Thank you for recent correspondence. I write in advance of the Consultation on 18 October, as I may be away.

Based on previous consultations and the Plan 2 Document Sept 2017, I make the following observations, mainly directed at TRAFFIC IMPACT.

1. CBI05. Butler Road. 35 houses at say 1.5 cars per house equals approx 50 cars, mostly emerging at rush hour with business commuting and school run, plus additional school transport through the village. A car park for school traffic will add to pressure at this junction, where traffic already "cuts the corner".
2. There is no provision for a fenced play area for under 5's. The green edge to the site could be moved to the middle as a "green" and safe play area.
3. Traffic emerging from this site will use Hoe View Road to access Nottingham Road, rather than queue through the village, school traffic and the congestion at the junction of the Wheatsheaf Pub and the proposed Co-op. (Marstons/Co-op) This will put additional traffic pressure on Hoe View Road, which is already an fast road for many vehicles.
4. CBI02. Land north of Memorial Hall 1. 90 houses at say 1.5 cars per house equals approx 135 cars, mostly leaving the site via Mercia Close between 07.45 and 08.45 for business commuting and school run.
5. Traffic Department may wish to make their own estimate of load at key periods and impact on safety at that junction. Add together CBI02+traffic avoiding village centre + traffic from existing houses, school busses and delivery vehicles. Hoe View Road onto Nottingham Road is already a difficult junction as there is limited visibility of traffic coming into the village at speed. Workers cars from the Creamery park along Nottingham Road adding to congestion. Whilst there is "no record of any accidents". Significant increased traffic will proportionately increase the risk. A full survey and projection is required BEFORE committing to 90 houses.
6. CBI02. The access road crosses the Bridle Path. What provision is proposed to retain the Bridle Path PLUS a green belt margin before property boundaries? I propose a broad boundary area with a Hawthorne hedge in sympathy with current field boundaries from Mercia Close access to the extent of the development. NO DEVELOPERS TRAFFIC on the Bridle path.
7. CBI02. On what basis is the mix of housing decided? "Two to five bedroom high quality homes". Houses should be limited to TWO STOREY dwellings in sympathy with the village rural aspect.
8. Consultation. I trust that objective planning issues, traffic safety and rural access will not be diminished in the plan to build on Green Belt Land. Recent developments have been approved in the face of local opinion, Parish Council and Rushcliffe Borough Council quantified objections.

We, as villagers will have to live with these developments long after the landowners and developers have gone.

9. What are "potential receptors"?

Mr. R J Eyre, 208 Hoe View Road. Cropwell Bishop.

Sent from my iPad

From:
To: Re: Local Plan2 - September update. CROPWELL BISHOP
Subject: 25 October 2017 07:51:27
Date:

Thank you for prompt reply. Consultations can only be valid if they are based on factual information. Davidson's presentation had little fact in it and most questions could not be answered - layout, housing mix, drainage, traffic load, infrastructure.....

In addition, each presentation is taken individually by the host. I look forward to a total impact survey on village life if ALL of this development is implemented.

I will resend my traffic assessment as Davidsons had no figures, even from their "expert".

Regards, Bob Eyre. Cropwell Bishop

Sent from my iPad

> On 24 Oct 2017, at 09:37, Localdevelopment <Localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk> wrote:
>
> Dear Mr Eyre
>
> Apologies for this. The information that we store on the sites is held in a database. Whilst it appears that the highways and access section of the database was amended with the latest information that we hold in relation to access, the conclusion was not amended to reflect this update. This will be rectified and updated on our website over the next day or so. For the avoidance of doubt, I attach the latest correspondence that we have had from a highways perspective.
>
> The information which we hold on the sites in the database is a snapshot in time and will be updated as further information arises and will be republished at each subsequent consultation stage.
>
> I hope that this helps
>
> Regards
> Planning Policy
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Robert Eyre [<mailto:j>]
> Sent: 23 October 2017 17:20
> To: Localdevelopment
> Subject: Local Plan2 - September update. CROPWELL BISHOP
>
> Davidsons Homes presented their proposal for CBI/A, Land north of Memorial Hall 90 houses. Access via MERCIA AVENUE, onto Hoe View Road.
>
> This contradicts the statement in the RBC September update, page 85, last line -
>
> "Access is a significant constraint as development greater than 50 units would require direct access onto Nottingham Road and significant alterations to infrastructure".
>
> Davidsons were not aware of this at their presentation, nor of many other details. Extremely vague as to make it an almost worthless exercise.
>
> Comments please. R J Eyre

>

> Sent from my iPad

>

> _____

>

> This transmission is intended for the named addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive or protectively marked material up to RESTRICTED and should be handled accordingly. Unless you are the named addressee (or authorised to receive it for the addressee) you may not copy or use it, or disclose it to anyone else. If you have received this transmission in error please notify the sender immediately. All GCSX traffic may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation.

> <NCC response_Cropwell B site 10 July 2017Redacted.pdf>