



Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies – Issues and Options

CEG 988577 agent
Nexus Planning
988578

Response Form

Please return by **5pm on Thursday 24 March 2016** to:
Planning Policy, Rushcliffe Borough Council
Civic Centre, Pavilion Road
Nottingham. NG2 5FE
Or to: localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Your Details		Agent details (where applicable)
CEG C/O Nexus Planning	Name	Amy Stone
	Address	Nexus Planning, Suite A, 3 Weybridge Business Park Addlestone Road, Weybridge, Surrey, KT15 2BW
	E-mail	a.

Housing Development

Housing Development at the Main Urban Area

Question 1: 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

No

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered NO, please could you identify which site(s) on the edge of West Bridgford or Clifton should be removed from Green Belt and identified as suitable for

development and why.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Housing sites within the Main Urban Area

Question 2: Which sites within West Bridgford should be allocated for housing development in the LAPP?

	Yes	No
Site WB1 – Abbey Road Depot (potential capacity around 50 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site WB2 – Central College (potential capacity around 90 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site WB3 – South of Wilford Lane (potential capacity around 200 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site WB4 – land between Lady Bay Bridge and Radcliffe Road (potential capacity around 25 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
At any other location (please specify which)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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.

Housing Development at the 'Key Settlements'

Bingham

Question 3: 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

No

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

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Cotgrave

Question 4: 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

No

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

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

East Leake

Question 5: *Do you agree that, apart from those eight sites that already have planning permission for housing development (as shown on Figure 3), further greenfield land should not be allocated for housing development at East Leake?*

Yes

No

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

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Keyworth

Question 6: 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 Figure 4) are appropriate in meeting the minimum target for 450 new homes at Keyworth over the plan period (up to 2028)?

Yes

No

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

Please see attached

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Radcliffe on Trent

Question 7: With respect to general directions around the village, do you support housing development:

	Yes	No
To the east of the village	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To the south of the village	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To the west of the village	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Question 8: Do you support housing development at:

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site RAD1 – land north of Nottingham Road (potential capacity around 300 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site RAD2 – land adjacent Grooms Cottage (potential capacity around 50 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site RAD3 – land off Shelford Road (potential capacity around 400 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site RAD4 – land north of Grantham Road to north of railway line (potential capacity around 900 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site RAD5 – land north of Grantham Road to south of railway line (1) (potential capacity around 200 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Site RAD6 – 72 Main Road (potential capacity around 7 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<i>Site RAD7 – land north of Grantham Road to south of railway line (2) (potential capacity around 180 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RAD8 – land south of Grantham Road (potential capacity around 20 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RAD9 – land at Radcliffe on Trent Golf Course (west) (potential capacity around 10 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RAD10 – land at Radcliffe on Trent Golf Course (east) (potential capacity around 10 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Any other location (please specify which)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Ruddington

Question 9: With respect to general directions around the village, do you support housing development:

	Yes	No
To the north of the village	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To the north east of the village	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To the east of the village	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To the south of the village	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To the west of the village	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Question 10: Do you support housing development at:

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<i>Site RUD1 – land to the west of Wilford Road (south) (potential capacity around 180 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RUD2 – land to the west of Wilford Road (north) (potential capacity around 440 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RUD3 – land adjacent to St Peter’s Junior School (potential capacity around 60 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RUD4 – Easthorpe House and adjacent land (potential capacity around 15 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RUD5 – land south of Flawforth Lane (potential capacity around 40 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RUD6 – land at Loughborough Road (potential capacity around 30 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RUD7 – land north west of Asher Lane (potential capacity around 250 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RUD8 –land west of Pasture Lane (potential capacity around 370 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site RUD9 –land south of Landmere Lane (potential capacity around 10 homes)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site RUD10 – land adjacent to Landmere Farm (potential capacity around 5 homes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Any other location (please specify which)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Housing sites within key rural settlements

Question 11: Should any sites within ‘key settlements’ be allocated for development in the LAPP?

Yes

No

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.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Housing development at 'other villages'

Question 12: Do you agree that the LAPP should not allocate any land for housing development at 'other villages' across the Borough?

Yes

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.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Question 13: Should we allocate any sites for purely 'affordable housing' at 'other villages' across the Borough?

Yes

No

Please provide any comments in support of your response. If you answered YES, it would be helpful if you are able to identify which site(s) should be allocated for purely affordable housing development.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Accessibility and wheelchair housing standards

Question 14: *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

No

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

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Question 15: *Should the LAPP allocate any specific sites for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation?*

Yes

No

Please provide any comments in support of your response. If you answered YES, it would be helpful if you are able to identify which site(s) should be allocated.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Custom and self-build housing

Question 16: *How should we specifically meet needs for custom and self-build housing across Rushcliffe?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other issues

Question 17: Please identify any matters related to housing development which are not covered here or elsewhere.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Green Belt

Alterations to existing Green Belt 'inset' boundaries

Question 18: Do you support the alterations recommended by the draft Rushcliffe Green Belt Review (Part 2b) to the Green Belt inset boundaries at:

	Yes	No
<i>Cotgrave</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Cropwell Bishop</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>East Bridgford</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Keyworth</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Radcliffe on Trent</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Yes	No
<i>Ruddington</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Tollerton</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Please provide any comments in support of your response.</i>		
<p style="text-align: right;">(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)</p>		

Creation of new Green Belt ‘inset’ boundaries

Question 19: *Do you support the Green Belt inset boundaries recommended by the draft Rushcliffe Green Belt Review (Part 2b) for:*

	Yes	No
<i>Bradmore</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Bunny</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Cropwell Butler</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Gotham</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Newton</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Plumtree</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Yes	No
Shelford	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Upper Saxondale	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide comments to support your response.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

‘Safeguarding land’ within the Green Belt

Question 20 *Should we designate any further ‘safeguarded land’ within Rushcliffe?*

Yes

No

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

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other matters

Question 21: Please identify any matters related to Green Belts and Green Belt policy not covered here or elsewhere.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Employment Provision and Economic Development

Allocation of land for employment development

Question 22: Should we allocate any new sites for employment development in Rushcliffe?

Yes

No

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.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Remaining rural employment land allocations

Question 23: *Should the following sites (as shown on Figures 8 to 10) continue to be allocated for employment development?*

	Yes	No
<i>Sites at Chapel Lane, Bingham</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site at Hollygate Lane, Cotgrave</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Site at Hathern Works, Sutton Bonnington</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Bunny Brickworks and British Gypsum Works

Question 24: Should the following sites (as shown on Figures 11 and 12) continue to be identified as suitable for employment redevelopment?

	Yes	No
Bunny Brickworks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
British Gypsum Works, Gotham	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Langar and Langar Airfield

Question 25: Should the LAPP allow for employment development to take place on the three areas at Langar, as defined on Figure 13?

Yes

No

Please provide comments in support of your response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know whether you think the boundaries of the three defined areas are in the right place or whether one or more of them should be altered and, if so, how?

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Existing employment sites

Question 26: *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

No

Please provide comments in support of your response. If you answered NO, it would be helpful to identify what alternative approach you think we should take.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Centres of Excellence

Question 27: *Should the LAPP include further policy in relation to the Centres of Excellence?*

Yes – further detailed policy is required

No – there is sufficient policy already within Core Strategy Policy 5.....

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know what policy should be included in the LAPP and whether any land should be allocated to allow for the expansion of any of the sites.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Rural Diversification

Question 28: *Should the LAPP include further policy in relation to rural diversification?*

Yes – further detailed policy is required

No – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. Core Strategy Policy 5).....

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know what policy should be included in the LAPP.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other matters

Question 29: Please identify any matters related to economic development and employment land provision not covered here or elsewhere.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Regeneration

Question 30: Should the following sites be identified as suitable for regeneration and be allocated as such through the LAPP?

	Yes	No
Bunny Brickworks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Former Islamic Institute, Flintham	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
At any other location (please specify which)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers. For any of the sites, this could include comments on the design, mix and layout of development and any services and facilities required to support development.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other matters

Question 31: Please identify any matters related to regeneration not covered here or elsewhere.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Retail Centres

Defining the boundary of centres and primary shopping areas

Question 32: Do you support the suggested centre boundaries, primary shopping areas, primary frontages and secondary frontages, as defined at Appendix C, for:

	Yes	No
<i>Bingham District Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>West Bridgford District Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Cotgrave Local Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Yes	No
<i>East Leake Local Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Keyworth (The Square) Local Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Keyworth (Wolds Drive) Local Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Radcliffe on Trent Local Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Ruddington Local Centre</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide comments to support your answers. If you answered NO for any one of the centres, we would be interested to know what alternations you think should be made.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Non-retail uses in centres

Question 33: *Do you have any comments to make on what the approach should be towards the proportion of A1 (shops) uses and non-A1 uses within the primary shopping areas of District and Local Centres?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Allocation of sites within or on the edge of retail centres

Question 34: *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?*

Yes

No

Please provide any comments you wish to make in support of response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know which land should be allocated, what for and why?

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Centres of Neighbourhood Importance

Question 35: *Should we designate those 'areas set out at Appendix D as Centres of Neighbourhood Importance (CoNI)? If so, are the boundaries correctly defined?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Question 36: Are there any other locations that should be defined as CoNIs?

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Question 37: Should a mix of Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5 be supported within CoNIs?

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Retail development in edge-of centre and out-of-town locations

Question 38: Should we set a local threshold requiring an impact assessment for all retail proposals with a gross floorspace of 500m² or more across the whole of Rushcliffe?

Yes

No

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered NO, we would be interested to know what you think the locally set threshold should be.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other matters

Question 39: *Please to identify any matters related to retail centres and retail development not covered here or elsewhere.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Design and Landscape Character

General Design

Question 40: *Should the LAPP include more detailed policy in relation to the design of new development*

Yes – further detailed policy is required

No – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. Core Strategy Policy 10).....

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

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Landscape Character

Question 41: *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.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other issues

Question 42: *Please identify any matters related to design and landscape character that are not covered here or elsewhere.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Historic Environment

Question 43: *Please identify any elements of the historic environment of Rushcliffe Borough that should be specifically identified in the LAPP?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Locally listed assets

Question 44: *Should we identify a local list of heritage assets within Rushcliffe Borough?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Question 45: *Please make any comments you have about what a local heritage assets policy should include or any other comments you have about the issue of locally listed heritage assets.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Development affecting designated heritage assets

Question 46: *Should we include within the LAPP policies on development affecting designated assets?*

Yes – policies are required for designated assets.....

No – they have sufficient policy protection already (e.g within the NPPF).....

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, please provide information about what such policies should include.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other issues

Question 47: *Please identify any matters related to the Historic Environment which are not covered here or elsewhere.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Renewable and low carbon energy generation

Question 48: *Should we identify areas of the Borough as suitable for renewable and low carbon energy generation?*

Yes

No

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

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Reducing carbon dioxide emissions

Question 49: *Should we introduce further policy in the LAPP on how development should contribute to reducing carbon dioxide emissions?*

Yes

No

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know what policy should be included in the LAPP.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Water efficiency standards

Question 50: *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

No

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

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Managing flood risk

Question 51: *Please make any comments you have about how we should define areas within Flood Zones 2 and 3 where windfall site development is appropriate in flood risk terms, subject to the application of the exception test.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Question 52: *Is there a need for any further policy on managing flood risk and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems?*

Yes

No

Please provide any information in support of your response.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other issues

Question53: *Please identify any matters related to climate change, flood risk and related issues that are not covered here or elsewhere.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity

Green infrastructure networks

Question 54: Which types of land use should also be incorporated into the Green Infrastructure network?

	Yes	No
<i>Parks and County Parks</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>School playing fields</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Allotments</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Sports pitches</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Amenity space (e.g. information open space)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Golf courses</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Designated and non-designated nature conservation sites</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Flood alleviation areas</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Other (please specify which)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

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

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Question 55: *What are your views on the following:*

a) *Where are Rushcliffe's existing local Green Infrastructure corridors and how do they relate to the strategic priorities?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

b) *What evidence exists to support the identification of existing and proposed Green Infrastructure?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

c) *How should new Green Infrastructure corridors be identified? Does Core Strategy Policy 16 (part 3) provide suitable selection criteria?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

d) *Core Strategy Policy 16 (part 2d) refers to 'areas of identified deficit', where are these and how do they relate to the strategic priorities?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

e) *Once an identified network is established, does the Core Strategy provide sufficient policy guidance to ensure multi-functional Green Infrastructure is delivered, protected and enhanced?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

f) *How should the network be recognised within the Local Plan, for example should it be identified within the proposals map and supported by a detailed policy, or within a stand-alone Green Infrastructure Strategy?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Local Green Spaces

Question 56: *Are there any spaces in Rushcliffe that should be designed as a Local Green Space and what should a policy within the LAPP to ensure their protection from development include?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Protection of Parks and open space

Question 57: *Should the LAPP include further policy to protect parks and open space?*

Yes – further detailed policy is required

No – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. Core Strategy Policy 16).....

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know what policy should be included in the LAPP.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Open space, sports and recreation standards

Question 58: *Please make any comments you have about what the LAPP should include in respect of open space, sports or recreation space standards.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Biodiversity

Question 59: *In relation to improving the Biodiversity Network, what are your views on the following:*

- a) *Where are Rushcliffe's existing biodiversity networks, what habitats do they consist of and where do opportunities to enhance the network exist?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

- b) *What evidence exists to support the identification of existing and proposed biodiversity networks?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

c) *How should the networks be recognised in the LAPP?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

d) *Does Core Strategy Policy 17 sufficiently protect, restore and expand the biodiversity network without the need for further policy in the LAPP?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Question 60: *In relation to the protection of designated and non-designated nature conservation interests, what are your views on the following:*

a) *Does Core Strategy Policy 17 sufficiently cover the level of protection necessary for designated and non-designated sites or is further policy required in the LAPP?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

b) *Should the LAPP have a specific policy to protect and enhance ancient woodland and veteran trees and, if so, why?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

c) *Should the LAPP include a policy on biodiversity off-setting, to ensure compensation is delivered and, if so, why?*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other issues

Question 61: Please identify any matters related to Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity and recreation space which are not covered here or elsewhere.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Culture, Tourism and Sports Facilities

Question 62: Should we allocate any new sites for cultural, tourism or sports development in Rushcliffe?

Yes

No

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 development.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Question 63: Should the LAPP include further policy to determine proposals for new cultural and sporting facilities and/or to protect existing facilities?

Yes – further detailed policy is required

No – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. Core Strategy Policy 13).....

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know what policy should be included in the LAPP.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Safeguarded recreational facilities

Question 64: Should the LAPP also include policy to safeguard the following locations from development which would prejudice the ecological, recreational, tourism and commercial potential?

	Yes	No
<i>the River Trent</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>the River Soar</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>the Grantham Canal</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>the Great Central Railway</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Yes	No
<i>any other location (please specify which)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know what policy should be included in the LAPP.

If you answered YES in relation to the Grantham Canal, we would be interested to know whether you think a route should also be safeguarded for a new canal link between the existing canal and the River Trent.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other issues

Question 65: *Please identify any matters related to culture, tourism and sports facilities which are not covered here or elsewhere.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Contamination and Pollution

Contamination and land instability

Question 66: *Should we include more detailed policy in the LAPP in relation to the contamination and land instability.*

Yes – further detailed policy is required

No – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. within the NPPF).....

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

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Noise pollution

Question 67: *Should we include more detailed policy in the LAPP in relation to the noise pollution:*

Yes – further detailed policy is required

No – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. within the NPPF).....

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

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Light pollution

Question 68: *Should we include more detailed policy in the LAPP in relation to light pollution:*

Yes – further detailed policy is required

No – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. within the NPPF).....

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

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Air quality

Question 69: *Should we include more detailed policy in the LAPP in relation to the air pollution:*

Yes – further detailed policy is required

No – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. within the NPPF).....

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

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other issues

Question 70: Please identify any matters related to contamination and pollution which are not covered here or elsewhere.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Transport

General transport policy

Question 71: Do you agree that no further local transport policy is required in the LAPP?

Yes—additional local policy is not needed.....

No – further local policy is needed (please identify what policy).....

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered NO, please provide information about what policy is needed.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Highway design and parking standards

Question 72: *Should we (please tick one):*

Continue to use the guidance in the 6Cs Highway Design Guide?

Set out and adopt an approach through the LAPP?.....

Adopt another approach (please set out what)?.....

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

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other issues

Question 73: *Please identify any matters related to transport which are not covered here or elsewhere.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Telecommunication Infrastructure

Question 74: *Should we include more detailed policy in the LAPP in relation to telecommunications:*

Yes – further detailed policy is required

No – there is sufficient policy already (e.g. within the NPPF).....

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

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Other issues

Question 75: *Please identify any matters related to telecommunications which are not covered here or elsewhere.*

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Question 76: Please identify any topics or issues which you consider need to be covered by the LAPP which are not addressed elsewhere in this document.

--

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Signed:		Date:	
----------------	--	--------------	--

Please return by **5pm on Thursday 24 March 2016** to:

Planning Policy
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Civic Centre, Pavilion Road
West Bridgford
Nottingham. NG2 5FE

Or to: localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Please note that your comments can be directly entered through the Borough Council's online consultation system: <http://rushcliffe-consult.objective.co.uk/portal>

Data protection: The details you submit to the Borough Council will be used in the Local Plan preparation and associated processes. Please note that comments and personal details cannot be treated as confidential and may be made available for public inspection both physically and/or through the Borough Council's website. We may publish all names, addresses and comments received, including on our website. We will use our best endeavours to not publish signatures, personal telephone numbers or email addresses.

Land at Nicker Hill Keyworth:

Representations to:

Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land
and Planning Policies Issues and
Options

on behalf of CEG

March 2016

Land at Nicker Hill Keyworth

Representations to: Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies
Issues and Options

on behalf of CEG

March 2016

London

Riverside House
Southwark Bridge Road
London SE1 9HA

t: +44 (0)20 7261 4240
w: nexusplanning.co.uk
@nexusplanninguk

Manchester

Eastgate
2 Castle Street, Castlefield
Manchester M3 4LZ

t: +44 (0)161 819 6570
w: nexusplanning.co.uk
@nexusplanninguk

Weybridge

Suite A, 3 Weybridge
Business Park, Addlestone Road,
Weybridge, Surrey KT15 2BW

t: +44 (0)1932 837 850
w: nexusplanning.co.uk
@nexusplanninguk

Nexus
Planning

Contents

1.0	Introduction.....	5
2.0	Question 6	6
3.0	Summary	9

Appendix 1 – Representations to the draft Keyworth NP (January 2015)

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 These representations are submitted on behalf of CEG who are promoting land off Nicker Hill, Keyworth as identified in the draft Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan and Rushcliffe Emerging Local Plan Part 2. These initial representations are made in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, in advance of a submission version of the DPD.
- 1.2 These representations principally relate to the following question in the consultation summary document:
- Question 6: 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 Fig 4) are appropriate in meeting the minimum target for 450 new homes at Keyworth over the plan period (up to 2028)?

2.0 Question 6 – 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 Figure 4 are appropriate in meeting the minimum target for 450 new homes at Keyworth over the plan period (up to 2028)?

2.1 Yes.

Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan

2.2 In May 2013 CEG was invited by the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group to submit information in relation to Land at Nicker Hill to inform its emerging Neighbourhood Plan. This was submitted in the form of a vision document setting out a concept for the site including the potential development mix and character areas. The document set out how the site would meet the housing needs of Keyworth and importantly the much needed provision of ‘Extra Care’ given the village’s ageing demographic and shortage of elderly accommodation. The submission formed part of the Steering Group’s evidence base informing on-going work on the Neighbourhood Plan, Following numerous local consultation events.

2.3 At an Extraordinary Meeting of the Parish Council on 12th November 2014, policies for the draft Neighbourhood Plan were approved for the purposes of an ‘Issues and Options’ consultation. This period of consultation ran from 12 weeks from the 6th December 2014.

2.4 The Draft NP Policy H1: Housing Strategy, allocates 480 house at the following three sites within the Borough;

- **H1.1** Land off Nicker Hill, Keyworth, (9 hectares) 200 dwellings including a minimum of 80 for the elderly (either as an extra care facility or as sheltered bungalows);
- **H1.2** Land off Platt Lane (4 hectares) 80 dwellings to be delivered as either a retirement village or similar; and
- **H1.3** Land off Bunny Lane (9 hectares) 200 dwellings which must ensure the delivery of a 4 ha linear public park to form the western boundary to the settlement.

2.5 In January 2015 CEG submitted detailed representations supporting the allocation of the Land off Nicker Hill within the draft Neighbourhood Plan. These representations are attached at Appendix 1.

- 2.6 The lengthy process of Neighbourhood Plan preparation, involving the local community, has culminated to date in the emerging allocations, including land at Nicker Hill. Notwithstanding this, Neighbourhood Plans cannot formally review Green Belt boundaries. However, as summarised below there is a clear government support for ensuring local communities dictate local policies for their areas, including the location of housing development.

Role of Neighbourhood Planning

- 2.7 The Localism Act 2011 introduced statutory neighbourhood planning in England. The aim of the legislation is to **empower local communities** to use the planning system to promote appropriate and sustainable development in the area.
- 2.8 The NPPF Paragraph 183 outlines that:
- ‘Neighbourhood planning gives communities direct power to develop a shared vision for the neighbourhood and deliver the sustainable development they need’.*
- 2.9 Paragraph 184 of the NPPF goes on to say that:
- ‘Neighbourhood planning provides a powerful set of tools for local people to ensure that they get the right types of development for their community’.*
- 2.10 As affirmed in the NPPF Neighbourhood plans are a powerful tool giving communities greater control over planning, allowing local people to decide the future development of their area, including where new homes and businesses should be built, what they should look like and what local infrastructure is needed.
- 2.11 By the end of 2015 over 80 communities had progressed through the stages of neighbourhood planning and had a ‘*made*’ plan or order in place. It is anticipated that the number of communities taking up neighbourhood planning will continue to grow and that it will play an increasingly central role within local planning authority’s planning service.
- 2.12 In the 2015 autumn statement the Chancellor of the Exchequer (George Osborne) made known the Government’s commitment to neighbourhood planning with announcements including assurance that local communities can allocate land for housing through neighbourhood plans, even if the land is not allocated for housing in the local plan.
- 2.13 Speaking during the second reading of the Housing and Planning Bill in late 2015 Brandon Lewis (Housing and Planning Minister) outlined that;

‘This government is continuing the huge shift of power from Whitehall to the townhall and to local people. More than 8 million people now live in areas that have had or will have their say on planning in their neighbourhood, and more areas are coming forward everyday’¹.

- 2.14 Whilst it is fully understood that neighbourhood plans cannot review Green Belt boundaries, Keyworth Parish Council, and the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, have established a spatial distribution strategy based upon their evidence production. That emerging plan is in accordance with the policies of the adopted Rushcliffe Core Strategy in that it satisfactorily accommodates the housing requirement set out in the ‘higher level’ plan. Significant weight should therefore be given to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan policies in terms of housing distribution.

Nottingham Derby Green Belt

- 2.15 In September 2014 a Green Belt review was undertaken on behalf of Keyworth Parish Council. That document formed part of the evidence base to be used by the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group to select the preferred housing and employment sites. Appraisal of the Green Belt Assessment Areas revealed all areas fell within a range which identifies them as being of ‘medium importance’ in fulfilling the stated purpose of the greenbelt as set out in the NPPF. Sites were assessed in clusters of which Land at Nicker Hill appeared in cluster 1 (Site D).
- 2.16 An assessment of the broad area clusters concluded that Cluster 1 had an average score midway between the respective cluster scores. The assessment acknowledged that; *‘The rail line to the north provides a strong defensible boundary which would ultimately restrict or prevent physical coalescence and limit merging of Keyworth with Plumtree and Normanton-on-the-Wolds.*
- 2.17 A stage 1(b) green belt review carried out by Rushcliffe Council 2015 that identified that, along with other settlements in the district, Keyworth was suitable for a detailed Green Belt review based upon broad Green Belt purposes and other sustainability standards. A detailed review of the Nottingham Derby Green Belt within Rushcliffe has now been carried out for these settlements and is being consulted on alongside the Local Plan Part 2.
- 2.18 Against the five greenbelt purposes outlined in the NPPF, KEY 4 (Land off Barnfield Farm, Nicker Hill) scores ‘low- medium’ Green Belt importance. It is apparent that as part of the ‘strategic review’ Keyworth north-east and Keyworth west both scored very similarly gaining a strategic greenbelt score of ‘low-medium’. Land to the north and the south of the village were deemed to perform better when assessed against the objectives and purpose of the

Green Belt, meaning that they are less suitable for development and should be retained in the Green Belt.

3.0 Summary

- 3.1 It is clear that the evidence underpinning both the Neighbourhood Plan and the Local Plan Part 2 relating to Green Belt is broadly consistent i.e. land to the east and west of the village is most appropriate for Green Belt release.
- 3.2 When considering the above, there is compelling technical Green Belt justification for adhering to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan proposals of growth to the east and west of Keyworth village. Within this broad spatial strategy, site specific site allocations should be locally derived within the spirit of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.
- 3.2 The Borough Council would therefore be fully justified in identifying those sites allocated and safeguarded for Green Belt release in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. To identify an alternative strategy would conflict significantly with local decision making and the principles of Localism.

1. <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/neighbourhood-planning-powers-boosting-plans-for-housebuilding-by-more-than-10>

Appendix One: Representations to the draft Keyworth NP (January 2015)

Land off Nicker Hill, Keyworth

Representations to the Keyworth Neighbourhood Development Plan

on behalf of Commercial Estates Group

January 2015

Land off Nicker Hill, Keyworth
Representations to the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan
on behalf of Commercial Estates Group
January 2015

London

Riverside House
Southwark Bridge Road
London SE1 9HA

t: +44 (0)20 7261 4240
w: nexusplanning.co.uk
[@nexusplanninguk](https://twitter.com/nexusplanninguk)

Manchester

Eastgate
2 Castle Street, Castlefield
Manchester M3 4LZ

t: +44 (0)161 819 6570
w: nexusplanning.co.uk
[@nexusplanninguk](https://twitter.com/nexusplanninguk)

Weybridge

Suite A, 3 Weybridge
Business Park, Addlestone Road,
Weybridge, Surrey KT15 2BW

t: +44 (0)1932 837 850
w: nexusplanning.co.uk
[@nexusplanninguk](https://twitter.com/nexusplanninguk)

Nexus
Planning

Contents

1.0	Introduction.....	5
2.0	Do you agree with where the housing sites have been located?.....	6
3.0	Conclusion.....	10

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 These representations are submitted on behalf of Commercial Estates Group (CEG) who are promoting land off Nicker Hill, Keyworth as identified in the draft Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan.
- 1.2 The consultation quite rightly focuses on obtaining the views of local residents. Accordingly we do not feel that it is appropriate to make any major submissions at this point in time. However we do feel that it is appropriate to confirm CEG's support for the draft Neighbourhood Plan, which includes the allocation of land off Nicker Hill as part of the strategy for Keyworth; and to confirm that we look forward to working closely with the Parish Council and the residents of Keyworth to support the Neighbourhood Plan process and to the subsequent delivery of high quality, locally-responsive development that is a credit to the village.
- 1.3 Against this background, these representations principally relate to the following question in the consultation summary document:
 - Do you agree with where the housing sites have been located?

2.0 Do you agree with where the housing sites have been located?

2.1 Yes.

2.2 The Government's intention for neighbourhood planning is for communities to come together to choose where they want new houses, shops and job opportunities to be built. Accordingly we support the proposed strategy which proposes the allocation of three sites to meet the adopted Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (December 2014) Policy 3 housing requirement for Keyworth.

2.3 As the promoters of the land off Nicker Hill site has undertaken comprehensive technical assessment work we summarise below some of the issues which we consider support the Parish Council's proposal to allocate this site as part of the strategy for the village.

Capacity / Deliverability

2.4 We can confirm that the land off Nicker Hill site (Site Reference: H1.1) can accommodate the level of development proposed within the draft Neighbourhood Plan (200 dwellings including 80 dwellings for Extra Care).

2.5 CEG is actively promoting the site and we can confirm that the site is deliverable and developable. There are no known viability or legal restrictions associated with the site.

Sustainable Development

2.6 When the draft Neighbourhood Plan as a whole, and the proposed allocation of the land off Nicker Hill specifically, are considered against the fundamental principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the recently adopted Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (December 2014) it is clear that they would:

- accord with the NPPF objective to achieve sustainable development;
- accord with the strategic policies of the adopted Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy.

Green Belt

2.7 The Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy has confirmed that in accordance with national planning policy exceptional circumstances exist to review the Green Belt in Rushcliffe, including that around Keyworth, to meet future housing needs. It is noted that

Parish Council's evidence base includes a Green Belt Review document which confirms the conclusions of Rushcliffe Borough Council's 2013 Green Belt Review assessment.

- 2.8 In late 2013 Nexus Planning undertook a Green Belt Alternative Site Assessment of sites with development potential surrounding Keyworth. A copy of this Assessment was submitted to the Parish Council and Rushcliffe Borough Council in December 2013. The Alternative Site Assessment demonstrated that against the five NPPF purposes of the Green Belt criteria (paragraph 80) the land off Nicker Hill site was the best performing site surrounding Keyworth.

Flood Risk

- 2.9 The Parish Council's evidence base confirms that no site allocated within the Neighbourhood Plan is at risk from river or brook/ stream flooding. Specifically in relation to the land of Nicker Hill site, CEG commissioned drainage consultants Weetwood to undertake a Flood Risk Assessment and a Foul Drainage and Water Supply Assessment. These technical assessments concluded that the site lies wholly within Flood Zone 1 – the Environment Agency's lowest category of flood risk, and that residential-led development on the site would be able to utilise surface water drainage to ensure that storm water run-off is restricted to a level no worse than existing greenfield rates.

Landscape

- 2.10 The topography of the land off Nicker Hill site lies between two ridges with its lower western slopes contained from the wider landscape by the outer ridge at Normonton Wolds. On behalf of CEG, landscape architects from Broadway Malyan have undertaken a landscape assessment of the site. This concluded that the site has the ability to absorb the level development envisaged without adverse impact on the wider landscape. Development on the site would also maintain the key views towards Normonton-on-the-Wolds as identified on the Neighbourhood Plan Key Diagram.

Ecology

- 2.11 The land off Nicker Hill site comprises agricultural land field compartments divided by managed hedgerows. As active agricultural land the site has negligible existing ecological or biodiversity value. This has been confirmed by an Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey of the site undertaken by Baker Consultants. This Habitat Survey concluded that development on the site would provide opportunities to secure net ecological / biodiversity gains through the provision of new managed open spaces and the long term protection of an adjoining British Geological Society meadow Local Wildlife Site/ Site of Important Nature Conservation.

Pedestrian / Cycle Connectivity

- 2.12 The land off Nicker Hill site is well connected to Keyworth's existing network of cycle and pedestrian routes. The site therefore has good accessibility to a full range of local amenities. All of the facilities in Keyworth are within 1.9km of the site, with the majority being under 1.2km, and accordingly, are considered to be within a distance where walking and cycling are meaningful and genuine alternatives to the private car. Nicker Hill is on the Keyworth Connection bus service route and Wolds Drive (less than 400 metres to the north west) is on the Keyworth Connection bus service.
- 2.13 The site is also connected to two existing Public Rights of Way that would be maintained and potentially enhanced through development on the site. These Public Rights of Way would provide opportunities for walking and cycling for both functional and leisure travel.

Vehicular Access / Traffic Generation

- 2.14 On behalf of CEG, transport consultants Bryan G Hall have discussed and agreed in principle with Nottinghamshire County Council (the Highway Authority) an appropriate format and design of a vehicular site access that could appropriately and safely accommodate the level of development identified. This would take the form of a new priority T-junction with Nicker Hill.
- 2.15 Bryan G Hall has also undertaken a Transport Assessment which considers the likely impact arising from residential-led development on the site on the existing highway network. The scope of this Assessment was first agreed with Nottinghamshire County Council and concluded that development on the site can be safely and efficiently accommodated within the highway network.

Historic Environment

- 2.16 An Archaeology Desk Base Assessment of the land of Nicker Road site has been undertaken by CgMs Consulting for CEG. This Assessment confirms there are no designated archaeological or heritage assets within or immediately surrounding the site. The Assessment concluded that there would be no residual environmental effects on cultural heritage as a result of residential-led development on the site.

Development Quality

- 2.17 CEG's development philosophy is based upon understanding what is important to a locality and then interpreting this within future development options. We are committed to working with communities and to the creation of high quality, locally-responsive developments. We

fully endorse the Parish Council's objective that new development should help create a sensitively designed and sustainable community.

- 2.18 CEG would therefore welcome the opportunity to work with the Parish Council and the residents of Keyworth to work-up masterplan concepts for the site that would deliver the level of development identified, in a way which secures high quality and therefore adds to rather than detracts from the quality and character of Keyworth.

3.0 Conclusion

- 3.1 CEG is wholly supportive of neighbourhood planning as a concept and the approach to the production of the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan being advanced by the Parish Council.
- 3.2 The land off Nicker Hill site is available for development; is a suitable location for housing (including Extra Care); and could deliver the levels of housing envisaged. CEG is committed to working with the Parish Council and local residents to ensure that development on the site is of a high quality which reflects the needs and character of Keyworth and is, accordingly, something that Keyworth can be proud of.