

Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2. Housing Site Selection Interim Report.

OBSERVATIONS FROM EAST BRIDGFORD PARISH COUNCIL

to Rushcliffe Borough Council. Village consultation on 25th October 2017

HOUSING NEED

The East Bridgford Parish Council have relied on the responses made by 353 households to the Community Plan Questionnaire circulated by the Community Plan Group in 2016. These indicated that 90% of the respondents would prefer to see East Bridgford remain as it is; surrounded by the Green Belt, insulated from main roads by green fields and trees.

Nevertheless the Council accepts that population growth and national policies require additional houses to be located somewhere. Nottinghamshire County Council and Rushcliffe BC are obliged to meet this additional housing need by identifying sites with development potential.

Following the first round consultation, in March 2017, the Local Development Plan Group proposes development of four sites which have been suggested by land owners and developers in East Bridgford on the eastern fringe of the village. One of these sites, EBR10, was offered after the March review. All fall within the location suggested by the Community Plan Questionnaire and the findings of the first round Green Belt Review. The combined land provides space for 100 homes between 2019 and 2024. It is obvious that the opportunities for 'infill' development have now gone and only expansion into the Green Belt will provide for the increase in housing need.

The Council believes that population growth over the last 50 years has been beneficial for the Community and village life. Although open spaces and orchards within the village have been lost, houses in Holloway Close and Croft Rise have provided homes for young families and Ludgate Drive, Burnham Close and Walnut Tree Lane have provided homes for new village families, helping to support village shops, clubs and health services provision. The Parish Council believes that some future growth could be equally beneficial.

The Parish Council is prepared to accept housing development provided that the additional houses bring with them additional open space, play areas, improved services and traffic controls. These and other benefits can be provided to meet the extra need through a partnership of land owner, developer, the Parish Council and RBC.

The Parish Council accepts and supports the Community Plan Group and its proposals, as set out below.

COMMUNITY Plan Group has made proposal

'Based on the Community Plan Questionnaire response, if village expansion is inevitable, this should be accommodated in the Green belt towards the A46 or towards Kneeton. The Questionnaire also highlights the need for more public open space and a hard play area (MUGA) is requested by young people. It is unlikely that the scattered number of small sites, identified by RBC, will be able to provide either of these and for this reason the group propose a development site contiguous to EBR8 and the omission of sites EBR6 and EDR7 north of Closes Side Lane.'

The Parish Council understand that the two land owners intend to offer their land (shown on PlanTG1:01 as sites A & B) for consideration as development land and for its removal from the Green Belt which will provide land stretching between Butt Lane and Close Side Lane. If this can be designed as a single area, with a mixed single and two storey development, including starter homes and homes for the elderly

as well as the 4 and 5 bedroom houses beloved of developers, the open space provision within the larger area should provide sufficient space for a Multi Use Games Area and a tree belt along the village edge which is lacking on this eastern boundary. We believe that this land offer should replace areas EBR6 and EBR7 and provide a basis for well designed village expansion. Building activity would be contained within the larger site area

The Parish Council support this proposal as answering many of the concerns expressed at the *Local Plan Part 2; Future Issues and Options*, attached below, and because the location provides access to existing sewerage system and traffic routes without passing through the village which is an important consideration for responders to the Questionnaire who considered traffic congestion a serious problem. The development should also include an on-site surface water management scheme to help reduce future flood risk.

This Strategic Plan also has the advantage of replicating the historic grid pattern of the village street network and the surrounding tree belt. The internal footpath network should be preserved and extended from Holloway Close. The surfacing and adoption of a length of Closes Side lane would be necessary to connect the new development to the village. The impact on historic assets would be minimal.

It is unlikely that all the land will become available at the same time and it is important that RBC or a Community based Land Cooperative take the necessary steps to provide a coherent plan for the future, to coordinate and control services and road layout, tree planting and housing mix, for the most beneficial outcome for the village community.

Traffic management should include an entrance chicane on Butt Lane, giving priority to east-going traffic, which, together with the 'no-through-road' sign proposed for Trent Lane, would make the village less attractive to through traffic. Restricted parking on Main Street, extending selected drive entrances to three car length 'no parking' sections would allow for passing traffic and, it is hoped, would postpone the day when a 'one way' circuit round the village is required.

The Parish Council urges RBC to follow the example of N&SDC to acquire the land and install road network and sewers prior to re-sale in suitable sections. This would provide LA control and ensure development of the Newton sites prior to East Bridgford (and Radcliffe)

EB Parish Council. 18.11.2017

Extract: Summary Local Plan Part 2; further issues and options.

415. Residents highlighted the following as constraints which could prevent further housing in East Bridgford:

- Inadequate services and facilities (around 25 comments);
- Inadequate road infrastructure and parking (around 20 comments);
- Flooding and surface water drainage (around 5 comments);
- Loss of community and village life (around 5 comments);
- Lack of housing for local people (around 5 comments);
- Loss of Green Belt (around 5 comments); Impact on historic assets (around 5 comments);
- Impact on wildlife;
- Loss of agricultural land;
- Disruption to villages; and
- Impact on house prices as issues

E B Parish Council/ Housing expansion