

Stephen Pointer –

Nottinghamshire County Council

Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies – Preferred Housing Sites October 2017

**Q1 – Do you agree with the Council’s proposal that Local Plan Part 2 should identify enough land for around 2,550 new homes?**

Yes.

**Q2 - Do you agree with the Council’s proposed allocation of the Abbey Road Depot (WB01) for the development of around 50 new homes?**

Education

There are significant pressures for places at primary schools within West Bridgford, and indications of growing pressure at secondary phase. Expansion of existing schools in the West Bridgford Planning Area would not be possible, and a detailed assessment of the available provision at all schools suggests limited options to address DfE guidelines on sufficiency for in-year movement. The County Council would therefore wish to discuss the timescales for housing delivery and appropriate education infrastructure to support this allocation prior to the finalisation of the Local Plan Part 2.

Minerals and Waste Allocation WB01 – Abbey Road

This allocation resides on the site of land that has previously been used as a depot site, potentially for waste management. The use of the land for housing is appropriate provided that adequate replacement facilities are active elsewhere within the area.

The site is also within a Minerals Consultation and Safeguarding Area for Sand and Gravel, but as the site is within an urban area the likelihood of an extraction site being in close proximity is extremely unlikely.

The large scale developments highlighted in the Local Plan will deliver new schools to address place demand, but smaller scale housing delivery will create immediate pressure points.

**Q3 - 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 the Local Plan Part 2?**

No comment.

**Q4 - Do you agree with the Council’s proposal that no sites adjacent to Bingham should be allocated for housing development through the Local Plan Part 2?**

Education

There is an existing planning permission, and the S106 agreement provides for delivery of a new 1fe primary school. Proposals to delay the transfer of the site/school building are causing difficulties in an address of great demand for places and little capacity. The County Council supports no further housing sites being allocated adjacent to Bingham.

**Q5 – Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocate Greenfield land for housing development at Cotgrave for around 350 homes in total?**

No comment.

**Q6 – Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following sites at Cotgrave:**

- **COT01 – Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park**
- **COT09 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (1)**
- **COT10 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (2)**
- **COT11a – Land south of Hollygate Lane (3a)**

#### Education

Having reviewed the impact of the current building development within the catchment of the Cotgrave schools, it is anticipated that the pupil demand for places from a **maximum** of 350 additional dwellings could be accommodated in this Planning Area, subject to S106 developer contributions being agreed

**Q7 – Do you agree with our proposal that only sites EL01, EL02, EL04, EL05 AND EL08 should be allocated for housing development at East Leake?**

#### Education

It is recognised that local primary schools have no capacity or potential for expansion in order to accommodate further housing growth beyond what already has planning permission. The Local Authority would support the proposal that no further housing is allocated, but notes that a recent appeal decision at Rempstone Road has also now been allowed on appeal which should be taken into account.

#### Minerals and Waste Allocation EL01 Land North of Lantern Lane

A gypsum Minerals Safeguarding and Consultation Areas covers this site area. The County Council would advise that contact is made with British Gypsum regarding the history and future of gypsum working in the vicinity of the proposed site.

In addition, the northern section of the site is within approximately 300m of the Marblaegis Mine site. This northern section of the proposed housing site in particular may risk conflict with the mine and Nottinghamshire County Council would encourage any prospective developer of the site (given that EL01 is stated as already benefitting from planning permission) to engage with British Gypsum regarding the use of the site's northern section to avoid the potential for future housing development sterilising the mine site. Measures may have to be taken to ensure that housing on the site would not sterilise the facility.

Allocation EL02 East of Meeting House Close - A gypsum Minerals Safeguarding and Consultation Areas covers this site area. The County Council would advise that contact is made with British Gypsum regarding the history and future of gypsum working in the vicinity of the proposed site. Though the site is at least partially developed, it is advised that British Gypsum are still consulted prior to any future works.

Allocations EL04 East of Kirk Ley, EL05 Micropropagation Services and EL08 The Heavens A gypsum Minerals Safeguarding and Consultation Areas covers the site areas of these potential allocations. The County Council would advise that contact is made with British Gypsum regarding the history and future of gypsum working in the vicinity of the proposed site.

**Q8 – Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocated Greenfield land for housing development at Keyworth for around 580 homes in total?**

No comment.

**Q9 – Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following Keyworth Sites:**

- **KEY4a – Nicker Hill (1) (150 homes)**
- **KEY8 – Land between Platt Lane and Station Road (190 homes)**
- **KEY10 – land south of Debdale Lane (1) 190 homes)**
- **KEY13 – Hillside Farm (50 homes)**

Education

It is recognised that there are primary school capacity constraints at Keyworth, in terms of accommodating any housing growth beyond the Core Strategy's minimum housing requirement (450 homes).

A review of the existing school sites, number on roll, projections and potential indicates that it is possible that the pupils from an additional 130 dwellings over the current Local Plan numbers but NO MORE than that figure. This would be subject to S106 developer contributions.

**Q10 – 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?**

No comment.

**Q11 - Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following sites at Radcliffe on Trent:**

- **RAD01 – Land south of Nottingham Road (150 homes) with employment development to the west of the powerlines that separate the site**
- **RAD02 – Land adjacent Grooms Cottage (50 homes)**
- **RAD03 – Land off Shelford Road (400 homes)**

Education It is recognised that there are primary school capacity constraints at Radcliffe on Trent, particularly at the infant school, even in terms of accommodating the minimum level set by the Core Strategy (400 homes).

Further assessment and discussion is on-going within the Local Authority on this proposal and the County Council wishes to discuss further the education infrastructure to support these allocations prior to the completion of the Part 2 Local Plan.

Minerals and Waste Allocations RAD01 Land North of Nottingham Road, RAD06 72 Main Road and RAD13 The Paddock, Nottingham Road - These allocations fall within areas covered by a sand and gravel Minerals Safeguarding and Consultation Area. Their location, on the edge of, or within, areas of existing residential land use indicate that these allocations would be unlikely to be at risk of sterilising an area of the resource that has the potential to be worked.

**Q12 – Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocated greenfield land for housing development at Ruddington for around 410 homes in total?**

No comment.

**Q13 - Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following sites at Ruddington:**

- RUD01 – Land to west of Wilford Road (south) (180 homes)
- RUD05 – Land south of Flawforth Lane (50 homes)
- RUD11 – Old Loughborough Road (10 self-build homes)
- RUD13 – Land opposite Mere Way (170 homes)

#### Education

Expansion of James Peacock Infant School is not possible because of the site and planning constraints in this area. Any development in this Planning Area would rely on the growth of St Peter's C of E Junior School, and this is the subject of on-going discussion currently. The County Council wishes to discuss further the education infrastructure to support these allocations prior to the completion of the Part 2 Local Plan.

**Q14 – 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 comment.

**Q15 - Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following sites at Cropwell Bishop:**

- CB102 – Land north of Memorial Hall (1) (90 homes)
- CB105 – Land east of Church Street (70 homes)

#### Education

There is capacity for the local primary school to accommodate housing growth of this level

#### Minerals and Waste - Allocations CBI02 Land North of Memorial Hall and CBI05 Land of East of Church Street

A gypsum Minerals Safeguarding and Consultation Areas covers the area of these allocations. The County Council would advise that contact is made with British Gypsum regarding the history and future of gypsum working in the vicinity of the proposed site.

**Q16 - Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocated Greenfield land for housing development at East Bridgford for around 100 homes in total?**

No comment.

**Q17 - Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following sites at East Bridgford:**

- EBR06 – Closes Side Lane west(20 homes)
- EBR07 - Closes Side Lane east (20 homes)
- EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane (15 homes)
- EBR10 – Land to south of Butt Lane (45 homes)

#### Education

The school is over capacity and over-subscribed being a popular and successful school. There are limited options to expand the existing school as the site is constrained. Whilst the

housing development at the former RAF Newton site will have its own school provision, early arrivals from this development will create difficulties in ensuring a sufficiency of provision.

The County Council wishes to discuss further the education infrastructure to support these allocations prior to the completion of the Part 2 Local Plan.

**Q18 - Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocated Greenfield land for housing development at Gotham for around 100 homes in total?**

No comment.

**Q19 - Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following sites at:**

- **GOT5a – Land east of Gypsum Way/The Orchards (1) (100 homes)**

Education

There should be scope to increase local primary school capacity to support this level of growth, subject to appropriate developer contributions being received.

Minerals and Waste Allocation GOT05a Land East of Gypsum Way - A gypsum Minerals Safeguarding and Consultation Areas covers this site area. The County Council would advise that contact is made with British Gypsum regarding the history and future of gypsum working in the vicinity of the proposed site.

**Q20 – Do you support the proposed allocation of the former Bunny Brickworks (BUN01) for a mixed use development of around 100 new homes and employment development?**

Education

This school (Bunny C of E Primary )is at capacity and indeed over-crowded currently and for the foreseeable future. 100 additional dwellings within the catchment would generate demand for an additional 21 places, which would require the addition of another classroom and additional facilities such as support space and toilet provision. The site of the school is appropriate for ½ form entry but may have highways issues. The proposed allocation should therefore require the provision of additional capacity at Bunny CoE Primary School to be funded by the proposed development.

Minerals and Waste - Allocation BUN01 Former Bunny Brickworks

This allocation would be directly adjacent to an established waste recycling facility (Bunny Materials Recycling Facility - Johnsons Aggregates and Recycling Ltd). This facility has planning permission for the open air storage and processing of aggregates and Incinerator Bottom Ash (IBA). As such there is the potential for disturbance to any sensitive neighbouring uses from dust, odour and noise. These impacts are controlled by existing planning conditions but the nature of these waste operations, and the specific wastes being managed, are nevertheless considered likely to give rise to complaints from any sensitive properties situated close to this site.

Consequently, there are serious reservations about the compatibility of the existing waste use and this housing allocation. The County Council is conscious that subsequent complaints by

future residents on environmental health grounds could restrict or prevent the continued operation of this existing facility.

National and local policies recognise that waste management facilities are an essential part of our infrastructure and the inappropriate development of sensitive uses, such as housing, adjacent to such sites could lead to the unnecessary loss of existing infrastructure.

Paragraph 8 of the National Planning Policy for Waste (Oct 2014), which sits alongside the National Planning Policy Framework, specifies that:

*'When determining planning applications for non-waste development, local planning authorities should, to the extent appropriate to their responsibilities, ensure that the likely impact of proposed, non-waste related development on existing waste management facilities, and on sites and areas allocated for waste management, is acceptable and does not prejudice the implementation of the waste hierarchy and/or the efficient operation of such facilities'*

At the local level Policy WCS10 of the adopted Waste Core Strategy (Dec 2013) safeguards existing authorised waste management facilities, including potential extensions to such sites. In applying this policy the County Council does not wish to unreasonably restrict development in the vicinity of safeguarded waste management sites but would, in this case, have concerns as to whether an adequate buffer is possible for any potential adjacent housing.

The County Council raised similar concerns in relation to previous proposals for housing on this site and it is likely that this will be a significant concern in relation to this and any future housing proposals at this location. The Council would wish to be satisfied that the proposed housing element of this proposal would not prejudice the continued operation, or future expansion, of the recycling site in accordance with Waste Core Strategy Policy WCS10 and the National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW) as quoted above.

The County Council would also draw attention to the remaining parts of paragraph 8 of the NPPW which seek to ensure that:

- new, non-waste development makes sufficient provision for waste management and promotes good design to secure the integration of waste management facilities with the rest of the development and, in less developed areas, with the local landscape. This includes providing adequate storage facilities at residential premises, for example by ensuring that there is sufficient and discrete provision for bins, to facilitate a high quality, comprehensive and frequent household collection service;*
- the handling of waste arising from the construction and operation of development maximises reuse/recovery opportunities, and minimises off-site disposal.*

## **Q21 – Do you support the proposed allocation of the former Islamic Institute at Flintham for the development of up to 95 new homes?**

### Education

This development represents an existing planning application and the LA is working with the Multi-Academy Trust to address expansion to provide places, subject to appropriate S106 contributions being agreed.

## **Q22 – Other Issues?**

### Strategic Highways -

In terms of strategic transport impact for the Rushcliffe Core Strategy use was made of the Greater Nottingham Transport Model and a series of junction improvements on the A52 (T)

were judged to be necessary to mitigate the impacts of planned growth in the Borough. Highways England have implemented two junction improvements and more schemes are programmed. Having reconsidered the Core Strategy transport evidence and the likely changes arising from the current Part 2 Local Plan proposal it is not considered necessary to rework the strategic transport traffic modelling. It is however recommended that Rushcliffe Borough Council revise the Memorandum of Understanding regarding delivery of supporting strategic transport infrastructure on the A52 /A606 such that newly allocated sites are also required to contribute financially to the package of strategic highway improvements.