

Gotham responses

1. In relation to identifying Gotham as a suitable village for a limited level of growth, more responses supported rather than opposed new development at Gotham, although answers were often qualified in relation to matters such as the number and type of new dwellings, the infrastructure required to enable development to take place, and the sites that are considered suitable. A minority of responses did not know whether new residential development should take place on greenfield sites at Gotham. In total, having regard to responses to the document together with responses to leaflets given out at the exhibition undertaken in the village, 74 responses supported development on greenfield sites around Gotham, 59 did not support development on greenfield sites around Gotham and 24 responses did not know.
2. In terms of the actual number of dwellings that Gotham could provide, there was no overall consensus on the number of homes that Gotham could accommodate. The numbers of new homes suggested were spread from 0 to 200, with the most common response being up to 50 homes.
3. In terms of general issues raised relating to new development at Gotham raised by statutory consultees, specific consultees and developers and landowners, **Historic England** consider that it is not clear how heritage assets (designated and non-designated) have been assessed within Gotham and all of the other settlements. They also state that some of the additional sites have a high survival of field patterns which need to be considered appropriately as part of the plan. They recommend that site assessments for additional sites are undertaken in line with the methodology and advice set out in Historic England.
4. A **neighbouring Parish Council** is not satisfied with how sites have been selected for consultation. They suggest that there is a possible site at the end of Hill Road, which they believe does not have wildlife value and is a brownfield site.
5. **CPRE** state that Gotham has a better bus service and easier access to facilities in East Leake, but development could have adverse landscape impact on Gotham Moor and hills west of Gotham.
6. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust do not support** any of the developments, consider **GOT1** particularly vulnerable as it supports good quality grassland/scrub habitat and is part of a well-defined green corridor, linking to Gotham Sandbanks SSSI. They state that **GOT 5 and 7** are also undesirable as they are adjacent to Local Wildlife Site and represent a major intrusion into the landscape, with the loss of valuable grasslands, scrub, in-field and hedgerow

trees and a loss of a dense network of hedges. All of the above comments are reiterated by the **Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group**, however they also state that other sites do not appear to have significant wildlife value.

7. **Nottinghamshire County Council** state that **GOT1** is an area of grassland and scrub which may have ecological value, and suggest its omission unless it can be demonstrated that the site is of low ecological value. Nottinghamshire County Council as Minerals Planning Authority also state the British Gypsum should be consulted in relation to mining legacy of the area and any future potential.
8. **East Leake Parish Council** state that with the sites to the south of Gotham would close the gap between it and East Leake, and suggest that the Green Belt be extended to prevent merging. They also state that development at Sutton Bonington would impact on East Leake medical practice, and that both settlements would feed into East Leake academy, and that this impact needs consideration..
9. **Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board** state that the site options Gotham lies outside of the Boards District, the Boards consent would be required prior to increases in surface water discharge into any watercourse, other than a designated main river.
10. **Nottingham City Transport** support development in general at Gotham. They do comment that sites GOT4 and GOT5 appear to split through the existing bus depot on Gotham Road. It would be impractical for NCT to sell only part of this site, and that this should be reflected if any site in this location was to be formally allocated for housing.
11. In terms of responses from the general public, the following general issues were raised in relation to new development:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate infrastructure or facilities (more than 15 times) • None on greenfield sites (more than 10 times) • Build on brownfield sites (more than 10 times) • Should be affordable housing for young or elderly (more than 7 times) • Pressure on facilities (7 times) • Flood risk (more than 5 times) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No 3 storey houses (2 times) • Sewerage/drainage issues • Delay on larger sites should not mean more sites • Shouldn't build on church land • Don't build on green belt • High proportion of affordable housing should be provided • Sewerage an issue
--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use brownfield sites instead (more than 5 times). • Impact on wildlife (more than 5 times) • Traffic issues (more than 5 times) • Priority should be for affordable houses for the young and elderly with local connection (more than 5 times) • Parking an issue (4 times) • Should not build on agricultural land (more than 3 times) • Drainage an issue (more than 3 times) • Use empty properties (more than 2 times) • Renegotiate with Nottingham City (more than 2 times) • Roads are poorly maintained (2 times) • No three storey houses (more than 2 times) • Would lose village character (more than 2 times) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites to the west and south of the village if taken together together would turn a linear village into a nucleated village. • Loss of views • Use infill • Poor quality roads • New build homes not selling in village • Devalue properties • 25% should be affordable housing for local people • Houses of higher value would benefit the village • No executive homes
--	---

12. In terms of support for specific sites contained within the further options consultation document. The responses received were mostly negative about most of the sites. The only site that that gained more support than those that objected was GOT1:

	YES-all of the site	YES-part of the site	No
GOT1-Land to the rear of former British Legion	55	13	37
GOT2-Land North of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (West)	18	10	70
GOT3-Land North of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (East)	29	8	59
GOT4-The Orchards Leake Road	22	13	70
GOT5-Land East of Gypsum Way	17	14	73
GOT6-East of Leake Road	18	15	70
GOT7-Land East of Hill Road	16	14	56
GOT8- Land South of Moor Lane	29	4	59
Any other location	2	1	44

13. General comments received in relation to where development could be located are as follows:
- Suggestion that there is another possible site suitable for development at the end of Hill Road.
 - If all eight sites identified were developed it will change the whole nature of the village.
 - Not happy with houses being built on greenfield sites, however GOT1, 2, 3 and 4 are more centrally located.
 - GOT1, 2 and 3 can be better incorporated into the village.

GOT1: Land to the rear of the former British Legion

14. **British Gypsum** support the removal of all of their landholdings from the Green Belt, including GOT1. Furthermore they state that GOT1 should be allocated for affordable housing.
15. Other comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
- Should be developed in conjunction with the British Legion (5 comments).
 - Should be developed for first time buyers and the elderly.
 - Access poor, on dangerous bend and public footpath crosses the site.
 - Brick Lane narrow and not suitable access.
 - Easily incorporated into village
 - Ideal for limited number of homes
 - Development would be hidden
 - If developed access to the countryside should be preserved for dog walkers and hikers
 - Brownfield site
 - Good wildlife habitat and is part of a green corridor stretching up to Gotham Sandbanks SSSI

GOT2 Land North of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (West)

16. **Wheeldon Brothers** (promoting GOT2) supports the development of GOT2. They state that the site is screened from the wider countryside. Whilst the site is in the setting of the old Gotham School, there is the ability to provide mitigation through design and layout against these impacts. In addition, there is interest from a local house builder.
17. Other comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
- Only green site within the village that is protected by green belt (5 comments).
 - Impact on wildlife and wildlife corridor (3 comments).

- School traffic an issue (3 comments)
- Kegworth Road not suitable to accommodate more development. Issues with parking at school time (3 comments)
- Covenant on land.
- Ridge and Furrow
- Adverse visual impact if developed
- Ridge and Furrow

GOT3: Land North of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (East)

18. Comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
- School traffic an issue (2 comments)
 - Covenant on land
 - Site caused flooding to surrounding properties
 - Brick Lane narrow and not suitable access
 - Brownfield site
 - Ridge and furrow. Historic asset
 - Adverse visual impact if developed

GOT4: the Orchards, Leake Road

19. The **landowner** of part of GOT4 facing Hall Drive supports its development.
20. Comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
- Hall Drive is too narrow, overused and dangerous, particularly during the school run. (over 10 comments)
 - Ridge and furrow, heritage asset (5 comments)
 - Turned down over 50 years ago due to narrow access (3 comments)
 - Impact on wildlife (3 comments).
 - Devaluation of properties along boundary of site.
 - GOT4 could be bought and used as an extension to the graveyard or as a memorial park
 - Not brownfield
 - Site floods
 - Could be accessed from Gypsum Way
 - Devaluation of properties
 - Good access for school
 - Has limited agricultural use

GOT5: Land East of Gypsum Way/The Orchards

21. **Sinclair**, the landowner of the northern part of GOT5 support its development, and that there are a range of facilities in Gotham that would support growth, together with good public transport and connections to the M1.
22. The agents acting on behalf of **Woolley (Field House Nursery)** support in full or in part the development of **GOT5**, however they consider that it could be bought forward as a standalone allocation. They state that the site could be accessed from Leake Road or Gypsum Way, is close to facilities and the main bus route. It comes out well in the landscape assessment, has no notable constraints in terms of flood risk or heritage impact and could accommodate around 45 dwellings with on-going developer interest.
23. Comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
 - Adjacent to wildlife site/impact on wildlife and major intrusion into wider landscape (2 comments)
 - Access not suitable (2 comments)
 - Only if access is via Gypsum Way
 - Ideal for limited housing
 - Away from facilities
 - Too big
 - Site floods
 - Ridge and furrow

GOT6: East of Leake Road

24. **Southwell Diocese** support the development of **GOT6**, although they state that the extent of the site should run along the field boundary to the east of the extent of land identified in the further options consultation document.
25. Comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
 - GOT6 church land
 - Adjacent to wildlife site and major intrusion into wider landscape
 - Too big
 - Would transform approach to the village
 - Narrow road
 - No defensible boundary

GOT7: Land east of Hill Road

26. **British Gypsum** support the removal of GOT7 from the Green Belt. Furthermore they state that GOT7 should be allocated for employment and/or mixed use.

27. Comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
- Site floods (2 comments)
 - Floods and has electricity pylons across it
 - Good access without traffic having to pass through village
 - Ideal for limited housing
 - Too big
 - Issue with powerlines
 - Only if access is from Gypsum Way

GOT8: Land south of Moor Lane

28. The **prospective purchaser of GOT8** supports its allocation for housing for 15-20 dwellings that could deliver by 2019, **although no response was received from the present owner.**
29. Comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
- Ideal for limited housing
 - Easily incorporated into the village
 - Access problems, off blind bend
 - Would not have a major impact
 - There is a covenant on the land to prevent development
 - Would be a danger to horse-riders
 - Would cause conflict with heavy farm traffic

Other sites

30. **British Gypsum** have put forward two additional sites for development. They consider that their existing premises should be allocated for employment use, and that a further opportunity exists at the top of Hill Road which could be allocated for residential development.