

## Comment

Consultee	Mr Craig Baum (969011)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	33 Wibberley Drive Ruddington Nottingham NG11 6AL
Event Name	Local Plan Part 2: LAPP Issues and Options
Comment by	Mr Craig Baum
Comment ID	3
Response Date	2/11/16 11:29 PM
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

### Housing sites adjacent to the Main Urban Area

Beyond the allocation of these three major sites, however, we concluded in preparing the Core Strategy that there are no other locations around the main urban area of Nottingham (within Rushcliffe) which are suitable to be removed from Green Belt and then developed for housing or any other use. It is our view that this conclusion remains the right one at the present time.

If, however, you do not agree we would be interested to know which sites should be identified as suitable for development. It may be useful to refer to our Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) which identifies all those sites that have been put forward by developers and others as potentially suitable for housing development – please see

<http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy/localplan/supportingstudies/strategiclandavailabilityassessment>

**Do you agree with the Council's view that no other sites on the edge of West Bridgford or Clifton should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development.** Yes

### Which sites within West Bridgford should be allocated for housing development in the LAPP?

WB1 Abbey Road Depot (c.50 homes)	Yes
WB2 Central College (c.90 homes)	Yes
WB3 South of Wilford Lane (c.200 homes)	Yes
WB4 Land between Lady Bay Bridge and Radcliffe Road (c.25 homes)	No

**At any other location (please specify which in the box below)** No

**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.**

land at wb3 should be for young first time buyers as ideal for that age group and proximity to transport links into the city centre.

### ***Bingham***

**Do you agree that the LAPP should not allocate further greenfield land for housing development at Bingham in the plan period (up to 2028)?** Yes

### ***Cotgrave***

**Do you agree that the LAPP should not allocate further greenfield land for housing development at Cotgrave in the plan period (up to 2028)?** Yes

### ***East Leake***

The Core Strategy sets a minimum target of 400 new homes that need to be built on new greenfield sites at East Leake up to 2028.

Planning permission has recently been granted on eight greenfield sites around the village that will deliver around 800 new homes in total. The sites and details of their planning permissions are shown on Figure 3 below. All of the homes on these eight sites count against the minimum 400 minimum home target, which means therefore that the target has already been exceed by around 300 homes.

In our view, other than allocating these eight sites that already have planning permission, there is no need to identify any further land at East Leake for housing development over the plan period (up to 2028). To do so would put at risk the Core Strategy's focus to locate development within or adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham. There are also concerns over East Leake's capacity to support further development at this time and the affect that any further development would have on the character of the village.

**Do you agree that, apart from those eight sites that already have planning permission for housing development (as shown on the plan above), further greenfield land should not be allocated for housing development at East Leake?** Yes

### ***Keyworth***

The Core Strategy sets a target of a minimum of 450 new homes that need to be built on greenfield sites at Keyworth up to 2028. There are, as yet, no sites with planning permission which would count against this target.

The draft Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan, which was prepared by Keyworth Parish Council and consulted on between December 2014 and January 2015, includes proposals to allocate the following three sites to meet the 450 minimum housing target:

- . Land north of Bunny Lane, Keyworth (site KEY A)
- . Land off Nicker Hill, Keyworth (site KEY B)
- . Land off Platt Lane, Keyworth (site KEY C)

These sites are shown on Figure 4 below. Further details on these proposals are contained within the draft Neighbourhood Plan, which is available to view at:

- . <http://www.keyworthparishcouncil.org/neighbourhood-plan-documents/>

These proposals have been the subject of extensive local consultation already. However, work on the draft Neighbourhood Plan has not been taken much further forward since it was consulted on between December 2014 and January 2015. This is because of complications that have arisen in respect of whether or not neighbourhood plans can alter Green Belt boundaries in order to then enable land to be allocated for development. It would appear that neighbourhood plans cannot alter the Green Belt and, therefore, because of this, we also need to consider in preparing the LAPP which greenfield sites should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for development at Keyworth.

We are, therefore, asking at this Issues and Options stage whether the proposals for new housing set out in the draft Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan, with some subsequent amendments, are the right ones for meeting the village's minimum target for 450 new homes to be built on greenfield sites around the village?

If you do not agree with the proposed sites identified in the Neighbourhood Plan, we would be interested to know which greenfield site(s) should be identified instead. Further potential sites are set out in our SHLAA or you may wish to suggest a site(s) not included in the SHLAA.

**Do you agree that the draft Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan's proposals to allocate land north of Bunny Lane (site KEY A), land off Nicker Hill (site KEY B) and land off Platt Lane (site KEY C) (as shown on the plan above) are appropriate in meeting the minimum target for 450 new homes at Keyworth over the plan period (up to 2028)?** No

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

Key B is a key viewpoint from Nicker Hill over the entire borough towards the city centre and at the highest part of the village. The land between Platt Lane and Station Rd to Plumtree is much more suited for development being lower quality environmental impact land.

**With respect to general directions around the village, do you support housing development:**

**To the east of the village** Yes  
**To the south of the village** Yes  
**To the west of the village** Yes

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

With its secondary education establishment and core transport links this is a suitable area to develop.

We would also like to know what you think about the suitability of each of those individual sites shown on the plan below and whether, in each case, the site should or should not be allocated for housing development. For any one site, it should be noted that there may be the option to develop only part of the site rather than its whole.

The development of any one of these sites would be likely to result in impacts which require mitigation and also opportunities to improve the local area. We would need to consider the facilities and services required, the type and design of housing, and how the site would be accessed by car and public transport, amongst a number of other issues.

**Do you support housing development at:**

**Site RAD1 – land north of Nottingham Road (potential capacity around 300 homes)** No

<b>Site RAD2 – land adjacent Grooms Cottage (potential capacity around 50 homes)</b>	No
<b>Site RAD3 – land off Shelford Road (potential capacity around 400 homes)</b>	Yes - all of the site
<b>Site RAD4 – land north of Grantham Road to north of railway line (potential capacity around 900 homes)</b>	Yes - all of the site
<b>Site RAD5 – land north of Grantham Road to south of railway line (1) (potential capacity around 200 homes)</b>	Yes - all of the site
<b>Site RAD6 – 72 Main Road (potential capacity around 7 homes)</b>	Yes - all of the site
<b>Site RAD7 – land north of Grantham Road to south of railway line (2) (potential capacity around 180 homes)</b>	Yes - all of the site
<b>Site RAD8 – land south of Grantham Road (potential capacity around 20 homes)</b>	No
<b>Site RAD9 – land at Radcliffe on Trent Golf Course (west) (potential capacity around 10 homes)</b>	No
<b>Site RAD10 – land at Radcliffe on Trent Golf Course (east) (potential capacity around 10 homes)</b>	No
<b>Any other location (please specify which)</b>	No

**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.**

**With respect to general directions around the village, do you support housing development:**

<b>To the north of the village</b>	Yes
<b>To the north east of the village</b>	Yes
<b>To the east of the village</b>	Yes
<b>To the south of the village</b>	No
<b>To the west of the village</b>	No

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

South is the boundary to the country park and should be protected. West already has been developed with nearly 400 homes in the last decade and further development would link it to Clifton losing its village status. These edges must be maintained.

We would also like to know what you think about the suitability of each of those individual sites shown on Figure 6 and whether, in each case, the site should or should not be allocated by the LAPP for housing development. For any one site, it should be noted that there may be the option to develop only part of the site rather than its whole.

The development of any one of these sites would be likely result in impacts which require mitigation and also opportunities to improve the local area. We would need to consider the facilities and services required, the type and design of housing, and how the site would be accessed by car and public transport, amongst a number of other issues.

**Do you support housing development at:**

<b>Site RUD1 – land to the west of Wilford Road (south) (potential capacity around 180 homes)</b>	Yes - all of site
<b>Site RUD2 – land to the west of Wilford Road (north) (potential capacity around 440 homes)</b>	Yes - part of site
<b>Site RUD3 – land adjacent to St Peter’s Junior School (potential capacity around 60 homes)</b>	Yes - all of site
<b>Site RUD4 – Easthorpe House and adjacent land (potential capacity around 15 homes)</b>	Yes - all of site
<b>Site RUD5 – land south of Flawforth Lane (potential capacity around 40 homes)</b>	Yes - all of site
<b>Site RUD6 - land at Loughborough Road (potential capacity around 30 homes)</b>	Yes - all of site
<b>Site RUD7 - land north west of Asher Lane (potential capacity around 250 homes)</b>	No
<b>Site RUD8 –land west of Pasture Lane (potential capacity around 370 homes)</b>	No
<b>Site RUD9 –land south of Landmere Lane (potential capacity around 10 homes)</b>	Yes - all of site
<b>Site RUD10 – land adjacent to Landmere Farm (potential capacity around 5 homes)</b>	Yes - all of site
<b>Any other location (please specify which)</b>	Yes - all of site

**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.**

The A60/Kirk lane junction is in dire need to be replaced with a traffic island. Taking a road off this island to land east of A60, North of Flawforth is another option.

Rud 7 is unsuitable as access is only available through the village.

Rud 8 is unsuitable as this would make Ruddington link into any development in Sth Clifton losing its village status.

Rud 1 and part of Rud 2 is most suitable especially as it's now within walking distance of the tram system!

**Should any sites within 'key settlements' be allocated for development in the LAPP?** Yes

**Please provide any comments in support of your response. If you answered YES, please could you identify which site(s) should be allocated for housing development.**

Bradmore could sustain a small rural expansion of approx 50 homes. Maybe a retirement village like at Clifton.

**Do you agree that the LAPP should not allocate any land for housing development at 'other villages' across the Borough?** No

**Please provide any comments in support of your response. If you answered NO, please could you identify which site(s) should be allocated for housing development.**

Bradmore.

**Should we allocate any sites for purely 'affordable housing' at 'other villages' across the Borough?** No

**Should we introduce policy in the LAPP to require a proportion of new homes to meet the enhanced Building Regulation standards for 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' and/or 'wheelchair user dwellings'.** Yes

**Should the LAPP allocate any specific sites for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation?** No

**Please identify any matters related to housing development which are not covered here or elsewhere.**

**Do you support the alterations recommended by the draft Rushcliffe Green Belt Review (Part 2b) to the Green Belt inset boundaries at:**

Cotgrave	Yes
Cropwell Bishop	Yes
East Bridgford	Yes
Keyworth	Yes
Radcliffe on Trent	Yes
Ruddington	Yes
Tollerton	Yes

Please provide any comments in support of your response.

Do you support the Green Belt inset boundaries recommended by the draft Rushcliffe Green Belt Review (Part 2b) for:

Bradmore	No
Bunny	Yes
Cropwell Butler	No
Gotham	Yes
Newton	No
Plumtree	Yes
Shelford	No
Upper Saxondale	No
Should we designate any further 'safeguarded land' within Rushcliffe?	No

Please provide comments in support of your response. If you answered YES, please could you identify which site(s) should be identified as 'safeguarded land'.

to avoid doubt in the future for potential buyers land should be designated either development or green belt.

Should we allocate any new sites for employment development in Rushcliffe? Yes

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, please could you identify which site(s) should be allocated for employment development.

Yes. Expansion of business park at Ruddington on East of roundabout where an exit slip was provided with light commercial.

Should the following sites (as shown on Figures 8 to 10) continue to be allocated for employment development?

Sites at Chapel Lane, Bingham	Yes
Site at Hollygate Lane, Cotgrave	Yes
Site at Hathern Works, Sutton Bonington	Yes

Should the following sites (as shown on Figures 11 and 12) continue to be identified as suitable for employment redevelopment?

Bunny Brickworks	Yes
------------------	-----

**British Gypsum Works, Gotham** Yes

**Should the LAPP allow for employment development to take place on the three areas at Langar, as defined on Figure 13?** No

**Should we continue to protect viable employment sites through the inclusion within the LAPP of a criteria based policy similar to Policy EMP4 of the Rushcliffe Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan?** Yes

**Should the LAPP include further policy in relation to the Centres of Excellence?** Yes - further detailed policy is required

**Should the LAPP include further policy in relation to rural diversification?** No - there is sufficient policy already (e.g. Core Strategy Policy 5)

**Please identify any matters related to economic development and employment land provision not covered here or elsewhere.**

**Should the following sites be identified as suitable for regeneration and be allocated as such through the LAPP?**

**Bunny Brickworks** Yes

**Former Islamic Institute, Flintham** Yes

**Do you support the suggested centre boundaries, primary shopping areas, primary frontages and secondary frontages, as defined at Appendix C of the LAPP (and shown above), for:**

**Bingham District Centre** Yes

**West Bridgford District Centre** Yes

**Cotgrave Local Centre** Yes

**East Leake Local Centre** Yes

**Keyworth (The Square) Local Centre** Yes

**Keyworth (Wolds Drive) Local Centre** Yes

**Radcliffe on Trent Local Centre** Yes

**Ruddington Local Centre** Yes

**Should we allocate land for new retail or other commercial development in or around any of Rushcliffe's district or local centres, or elsewhere in the Borough?** No

**Should we set a local threshold requiring an impact assessment for all retail proposals with a** No



**gross floorspace of 500m2 or more across the whole of Rushcliffe?**

**Other matters**

**Please to identify any matters related to retail centres and retail development not covered here or elsewhere.**

**Should the LAPP include more detailed policy in relation to the design of new development?** No - there is sufficient policy already (e.g. Core Strategy Policy 10)

**Please make any comments you have about what should be included in the LAPP in respect of the landscape character, including whether there are any areas of locally valued landscape requiring additional protection.**

Greater tree planting at green belt boundaries to villages.

**Should we identify a local list of heritage assets within Rushcliffe Borough?**

Yes. And also key areas like the transport heritage centre.

**Should we include within the LAPP policies on development affecting designated assets?** Yes - policies are required for designated assets

**Should we identify areas of the Borough as suitable for renewable and low carbon energy generation?** Yes

**Should we introduce further policy in the LAPP on how development should contribute to reducing carbon dioxide emissions?** Yes

**Should we introduce further policy in the LAPP to require the lower optional Building Regulations standard of 110 litres per person per day water use.** Yes

There is a requirement in Core Strategy Policy 2 of the NPPF that development should not increase flood risk elsewhere by reducing surface water run-off through the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (known as SUDS).

**Is there a need for any further policy on managing flood risk and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems?** Yes

**Which types of land use should also be incorporated into the Green Infrastructure network?**

**Parks and Country Parks** Yes

**School playing fields** Yes

**Allotments** Yes

<b>Amenity space (e.g. open space)</b>	Yes
<b>Golf courses</b>	Yes
<b>Designated and non-designated nature conservation sites</b>	Yes
<b>Flood alleviation areas</b>	Yes
<b>Should the LAPP include further policy to protect parks and open space?</b>	No - there is sufficient policy already (e.g. Core Strategy Policy 16)
<b>Should we allocate any new sites for cultural, tourism or sports development in Rushcliffe?</b>	No
<b>Should the LAPP include further policy to determine proposals for new cultural and sporting facilities and/or to protect existing facilities?</b>	No - there is sufficient policy already (e.g. Core Strategy Policy 13)
<b>Should the LAPP also include policy to safeguard the following locations from development which would prejudice the ecological, recreational, tourism and commercial potential?</b>	
<b>the River Trent</b>	Yes
<b>the River Soar</b>	Yes
<b>the Grantham Canal</b>	Yes
<b>the Great Central Railway</b>	Yes
<b>Should we include more detailed policy in the LAPP in relation to the contamination and land instability.</b>	No - there is sufficient policy already (e.g. within the NPPF)
<b>Should we include more detailed policy in the LAPP in relation to the noise pollution:</b>	Yes - further detailed policy is required
<b>Should we include more detailed policy in the LAPP in relation to light pollution:</b>	Yes - further detailed policy is required
<b>Should we include more detailed policy in the LAPP in relation to the air pollution:</b>	Yes - further detailed policy is required
<b>Do you agree that no further local transport policy is required in the LAPP?</b>	Yes - additional local policy is not needed
<b>Should we (please choose one option)</b>	Continue to use the guidance in the 6Cs Highway Design Code?
<b>Should we include more detailed policy in the LAPP in relation to telecommunications:</b>	Yes - further detailed policy is required

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

Policy on new developments and fibre access.