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1. **Introduction**

1.1 The ‘Statement of Consultation for the Rushcliffe Core Strategy Development Plan Document’ was published in March 2012 in accordance with the requirements, at the time, of regulation 30(1)(d) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008. The statement described the consultation undertaken in previous stages of the Core Strategy. It outlined who was consulted and how these consultations were undertaken. It provided a summary of issues raised and explained how these issues were addressed by the Borough Council.

1.2 This document is an addendum to the statement of consultation. It outlines details of the consultation undertaken by the Council during 2013 on further development proposals. It should be noted that the regulations under which this statement is produced are Regulation 22(1)(c)(i-iv) of the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

1.3 In accordance with the above regulations, this statement sets out

- which bodies and persons the local planning authority invited to make representations;
- how those bodies and persons were invited to make representations;
- a summary of the main issues raised by the representations; and
- how any representations made have been taken into account.

2. **‘Further proposals for housing development’ consultation**

2.1 The Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1 – Core Strategy is at an advanced stage of preparation. It was submitted for examination in October 2013. However, the Planning Inspector undertaking the examination identified that the plan as submitted was unlikely to be found sound, principally because it did not make sufficient provision for housing development in the period to 2028, nor take any account of longer term requirements beyond then. At the point of submission, the draft Core Strategy included provision for around 9,600 homes to be built between 2011 and 2026.

2.2 The Inspector agreed to suspend the examination until October 2013, and then to December 2013, in order to allow the Council to carry out additional work and public consultation on how best to meet the shortfall of proposed housing.
2.3 To address the shortfall and meet the identified housing needs, the Council’s Cabinet took the decision in May 2013 to consult on proposals that would provide for at least a further 3,550 homes up to 2028 (to take total planned provision to a minimum of 13,150 homes between 2011 and 2028). To meet this additional requirement, a new strategic housing and mixed use development of 2,500 homes is proposed to the east of Gamston (north of Tollerton). Additional homes are also proposed at Edwalton and at land south of Clifton, which are existing strategic allocations put forward in the previous Core Strategy.

When was consultation undertaken?

2.4 The ‘Further proposals for housing development’ consultation was undertaken between Monday 17 June and Friday 9 August 2013. At the same time, the Council also consulted on the draft Rushcliffe Green Belt Review (Parts 1 and 2a). The consultation comments received in relation to that document are reported separately.

Who was consulted?

2.5 The Council directly contacted and consulted the Specific and General consultees as required in the 2012 Regulations, which included the public, businesses and other organisations within the Greater Nottingham area. The full list is set out in Annex A. The methods and techniques of engagement were undertaken in general accordance with the Council’s adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). The Council also engaged with others as a consequence through, for example, their attendance at the various consultation events held.

How was consultation undertaken?

2.6 The methods and techniques of engagement were undertaken in general accordance with the Council’s adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

2.7 At the beginning of the consultation period, the ‘Further proposals for housing development’ and its accompanying Sustainability Appraisal and Equality Impact Assessment were deposited at Rushcliffe Borough Council’s Community Contact Centre (Rectory Road, West Bridgford), on the Council’s website and in the libraries within Rushcliffe and Clifton (within Nottingham City). All those on the Council’s planning policy consultation database were informed of the consultation by letter or email.
2.8 The Council invited comments, which could be made in a number of forms – either by letter, email or through the Council’s ‘Objective’ consultation system. It was also possible to make views known at the events that the Council held during the consultation period. The consultation sought feedback on the Council’s preferred approach to further housing development and invited suggestions for alternative options.

2.9 A detailed summary of the main issues raised from those representations made in relation to the ‘Further proposals for housing development’ is provided at Annex B.

2.10 The Council also distributed leaflets to households and businesses in the areas close to the locations where further housing development is proposed. The leaflets advertised the consultation and the provided details of the relevant consultation event(s).

2.11 The consultation events undertaken as part of the consultation consisted of:

- Workshops (by invite) involving 15-20 people – local Councillors, parish councillors and other interested members of the community. The aim of the workshops was to facilitate a better understanding of the proposals and consider matters including where exactly development might take place and what it might include. There were separate workshops for each of the three main locations proposed for further housing development.

- Community consultation events (open to all) – ‘drop-in’ style events to provide the opportunity for the wider community to understand the proposals and give their views and comments. The outcomes of the workshops were, where possible, used to inform presentation material at these events. The workshops undertaken were specific to each of the three main locations proposed for further housing development.

2.12 A list of consultation events is outlined in the following table:
Table 1 – Consultation Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing growth location</th>
<th>Event location</th>
<th>Event type</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land South of Clifton</td>
<td>Thrumpton</td>
<td>Workshop (invite only)</td>
<td>18/06/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gotham</td>
<td></td>
<td>04/07/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td></td>
<td>15/07/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larkhill retirement village</td>
<td></td>
<td>25/07/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwalton (Sharphill)</td>
<td>Edwalton</td>
<td>Workshop (invite only)</td>
<td>20/06/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public event</td>
<td>01/07/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Gamston/ north of Tollerton</td>
<td>Gamston</td>
<td>Workshop (invite only)</td>
<td>28/06/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tollerton</td>
<td></td>
<td>08/07/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tollerton Mobile Home Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>09/07/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.13 A detailed summary of the events undertaken, their format and the feedback received from them is provided at Annex C.

What were the main issues the consultation raised?

2.14 A detailed summary of the main issues raised from those representations made in relation to the ‘Further proposals for housing development’ is provided at Annex B. The feedback and views from the consultation events held is provided at Annex C.

2.15 Overall, in the Council’s view, the main issues arising were:

- Considerable opposition from residents to each of the three major development proposals.
- Increase in housing numbers considered unnecessary given the effects of the recession and reduction in expected migration.
- Concerns over deliverability of 3,550 dwellings within plan period on three major sites. Consider development should be more evenly distributed across the Borough.
- English Heritage raised concerns over the potential adverse impact on listed pill boxes on Tollerton airfield (within the proposed east of Gamston/north of Tollerton strategic allocation).
• Concerns about the impacts from any development to the west of Sharphill wood

How have these issues been addressed by the Borough Council?

Comments received have fed into the revision of a number of plan policies – chiefly, to Policy 2 Spatial Strategy, Policy 19 Strategic Allocation at Melton Road, Edwalton, Policy 23 Strategic Allocation South of Clifton and the new Policy B Strategic Allocation East of Gamston/North of Tollerton. In particular the proposed housing number for Melton Road, Edwalton has been reduced as a result of comments received during the consultation period. In addition, comments received from English Heritage have influenced the indicative site plan for the development East of Gamston/North of Tollerton.
Annex A

List of those bodies and persons invited to make representations

List of adjacent parish councils:

List of RBC parish councils:
General Public
A comprehensive list of consultees, of which there are 1500+ is available from the Borough Council
Annex B

Summary of representations to the ‘Further proposals for housing development’

B1.1 This is a summary of the key points arising from all the consultation comments received in respect of the ‘Further proposal for housing development’. A more detailed summary of all the comments received is set out in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2.

B1.2 At Appendix 1 is a summary of those comments received which used the questions set by the Council as a basis for responding.

B1.3 At Appendix 2 is a summary of all the letters or email received which did not specifically use the questions as a basis for responding.

Main matters arising from consultation comments

B1.4 A total of 914 individuals or bodies submitted comments. It is the Council’s view that the main matters arising from these comments are as follows:

- The large majority of representations are from residents opposing the proposals for further growth. Of the three sites, south of Clifton has attracted the most representations.

- The view of most attending the consultation events was clearly negative towards the three major development proposals.

- Objections have been made to the further proposed development from all the most affected parishes.

- Barton in Fabis, Gotham and Tollerton Parish Councils and others do not believe there is a need for the housing proposed. They believe that needs are less because of, for example, the effects of the recession and reductions in expected migration levels.

- Support from all Greater Nottingham local authorities and Derbyshire County Council. The proposals taken forward would enable them to withdraw their objections and confirm duty to cooperate between all authorities.

- Nottinghamshire County Council is generally supportive of the proposals.
A number of landowners/developers (mainly those with rural site interests) do not believe that all 3,550 are deliverable by 2028 on the three major urban extensions. Their view is that development needs to be more distributed across the Borough.

The Highways Agency and Nottinghamshire County Council (Highways) are awaiting further information before making their final comments.

Land south of Clifton specific

Barton in Fabis and Gotham Parish Councils reiterate their view that the B2 (general industry) and B8 (storage and distribution) employment uses proposed next to the A453 would have a major negative visual impact.

Land at Melton Road, Edwalton specific

Natural England, Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT) and the Friends of Sharphill Wood have significant concerns as to the impacts on Sharphill Wood (which is a designated Nature Reserve) and its wildlife. NWT is especially concerned about the impacts from any development to the west of the wood.

Land east of Gamston (north of Tollerton) specific

A developer/landowner consortium covering most of the main land holdings to the east of Gamston (north of Tollerton) has made the case that 4,000 homes cannot be satisfactorily accommodated (without compromising design quality and open space provision) unless land to the north of the Grantham Canal in the vicinity of the County Council depot is also included.

A number of landowners immediately surrounding Bassingfield have made the case for inclusion of their land within the proposed urban extension, based in part on the view that this is appropriate in Green Belt terms and there is no merit in keeping a gap between any development and Bassingfield.

Persimmon Homes is promoting land further towards Tollerton for major development on the basis of two approaches, the second a larger, longer term approach which it believes would be a logical addition to the area of proposed development.
• English Heritage has raised concerns over the potential adverse impact on the 18 listed pill boxes in and around Tollerton airfield. It has asked for further work to assess the impact.

Elsewhere

• Individual landowners (including the County Council) in the area east of Lady Bay and out towards Radcliffe on Trent have argued that land should be removed from the Green Belt in this area to better allow for educational and/or recreational development.

Key points relating to specific consultation questions

Q1 Do you think that we are right to increase the level of proposed housing by at least 3,550 homes, which in total will mean the delivery of a minimum of 13,150 new homes in Rushcliffe between 2011 and 2028?

Yes: 30 No: 613

Positive comments:
• The increased level of housing provision for Rushcliffe is necessary for the Borough to contribute to meeting housing needs across the Greater Nottingham Housing Market Area (Nottinghamshire CC, Derbyshire CC, HMA Authorities, Ben Bailey Homes, LHW Properties Ltd, Bloor Homes, Clifton Landowners)
• If RBC amend Core Strategy in line with current proposals then the collectively agreed level of objectively assessed housing needs will be met across the HMA between all five councils. No substantive grounds for the HMA authorities to maintain objections on this basis, will also result in duty to cooperate being fully met.

Negative comments:
• Housing figure too high/not justified. (including CPRE, Gotham PC, Barton PC, Tollerton PC, Cropwell Butler PC)
• Housing figure too low/not justified. (including IDC & Associates, Gladman Developments, Bloor Homes)
• Does the housing figure take into account the recession, lower student numbers, past rate of housing completions and a slow-down of the housing market? How are future figures predicted? (Gotham PC, Barton in Fabis (BiF) PC)
• Approach of housing dispersal should be followed (BiF PC)
- Existing infrastructure totally inadequate
- Routes to the city already overcrowded
- Do not believe RBC has demonstrated the ‘exceptional circumstances’ required to justify building on the Green Belt (CPRE, BiF PC)

Other:
- Delivery of large scale schemes takes longer than predicted, even this level of provision will barely meet the needs with this timescale over reliance on large sites. Consider that the LAPP document should be advanced in parallel with the Core Strategy to identify a portfolio of small and medium sized housing sites for delivery in the short term. (Langridge Homes)

Q2 Do you think that the identified shortfall in proposed new housing in Rushcliffe should be met in part by increasing the number planned at land south of Clifton by around 500 homes and that this should be achieved without increasing the amount of land already proposed for development? Please tick yes or no.

Yes: 119  No: 511

Positive comments:
- Already a busier area and the A453 widening could accommodate more traffic.
- Sustainable location adjacent to the PUA in line with strategy (Clifton Landowners, John A Wells & Nottingham Airport PLC)
- Similar spatial strategy of sustainable urban extensions is being applied within the Greater Nottingham area. (Nottinghamshire County Council, Erewash BC, Nottingham City Council, Gedling BC)
- Clifton has better amenities for the community already i.e. shopping and leisure facilities

Negative comments:
- Increasing the area of the development would encroach towards Gotham and provide even less of a defensible boundary for further development after 2028. (Gotham PC)
- Area of land south of Clifton includes land graded as 2 and 3a in the Agricultural Land Classification. (Natural England)
Other:
- Cannot be assumed that the density of development can be increased within the same developable area to deliver an additional 500 dwellings. This needs to be clearly evidenced, and contingency plans put in place to address any shortfall by allocating additional development allocations in other sustainable locations. (Linden Homes, Persimmon Homes, Gladman Developments)
- Deliverability of the site is a concern within the current plan period. No planning applications in place and major infrastructure work required. (Linden Homes)

Q3 Do you have any views on how development of land south of Clifton should look, in terms of, for example, the mix and layout of different land uses on the site, the types and level of new services and facilities on the site and their location?

- The employment proposals will have a major impact on landscape and are not justified given the availability of employment land elsewhere in Rushcliffe/ G Nottm, particularly B2 and B8 uses.
- The requirement for a development brief should be reinstated to control the quality of build
- Needs sufficient capacity for affordable housing

Q4. Do you think that the identified shortfall in proposed new housing in Rushcliffe should be met in part by increasing the number planned at land at Melton Road, Edwalton by around 550 homes?

Yes: 95  No: 74

Positive comments:
- Edwalton is already a suburb joining West Bridgford and Gamston-character will not be destroyed by adding the extra homes, good amenity provision.
- Land is well contained by the A52 and development will relate to the consented urban extension at Sharphill Wood.
- Removal of this land from the Green Belt will have a low impact on Green Belt objectives and will allow for development to be maximised in this sustainable location, where facilities and the transport network are to be improved. (Ben Bailey Homes)
• Supportive that a spatial strategy of urban concentration has been followed as a basis for identifying this particular strategic development site given that it would represent an extension to the main built up area of Nottingham (Erewash BC, Nottingham City Council, Gedling BC)

Negative comments:
• Insufficient transport infrastructure to cope with substantial additional development. Traffic congestion is already an issue from Nottingham to the South East of West Bridgford, the road would not cope.
• It seems sensible to focus increased development in an area where development would already be taking place, although it is not clear why this cannot be achieved by increasing housing density as at land south of Clifton (Nottinghamshire County Council)
• Sharphill is an iconic local landmark and the skyline must be protected. Against any road skirting the wood, effectively surrounding it, and any building on the fields to the West. If there is no green buffer zone and if it is surrounded by housing, much of the flora and fauna dependent on the wood would be lost. (Friends of Sharphill Wood)
• There is no justification for the overall housing numbers that have led to this proposal.

Other:
• Continue to safeguard Sharphill Wood and surrounding area for the much valued wildlife; highly visible and attractive landmark for miles. (Friends of Sharphill Wood)

Q5 Do you have any views on how development of land at Melton Road, Edwalton should look, in terms of, for example, the mix and layout of different land uses on the site, the types and level of new services and facilities on the site and their location?

• No strong views provided the extra traffic will be accounted for in providing safe road junctions at Melton Road and around the ring road
• Identified deficit in housing for the elderly should be tackled. (Plumtree Parish Council)
• Concerned that housing will be built over an area allocated for a Country Park. We would wish to see other solutions considered before the erosion into this country park allocation. Any future proposals will also need to ensure that strong green infrastructure and ecological links are maintained to the Sharphill Woods Local Wildlife site. (Natural England)
• Proposed residential area to the west of Sharphill Wood is totally unacceptable in ecological terms as with its proposed connecting roads will totally encircle the wood which has a healthy population of badgers amongst other species. Proposed increase in development to the east of the wood, this area (to the west) should be incorporated into the community park. (Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust)

Q6 Do you think other land within (to the north) of the A52 should be removed from the Green Belt and at the present time ‘safeguarded’ from development? If possible, please give reasons for your answer

Generally positive: 19 Generally negative: 12

• Golf course an obvious location for housing and would not affect the character of Edwalton which would provide considerable land for housing and still be within the ring road.
• Land is unlikely to come forward during the plan period, as the Green Belt Review identifies it as a longer-term development option, so it would not positively contribute to meeting the Plan’s overall housing target (Notts County Council)
• As a general principle Nottingham City would strongly support the designation of safeguarded land to meet longer term development needs post 2028. (Nottingham City Council, Gedling BC)

Q7 Do you think that the identified shortfall in proposed new housing in Rushcliffe should be met in part by a major mixed use development on land to the east of Gamston (north of Tollerton), which would include the delivery of around 2,500 homes by 2028, and with capacity to provide around a further 1,500 homes post 2028?

Yes: 25 No: 127

Positive comments:
• Yes but development at Clifton and Edwalton should be prioritised.
• HMA Authorities: supportive that a spatial strategy of urban concentration has been followed as a basis for identifying this particular strategic development site given that it would represent an extension to the main built up area of Nottingham
• The Gamston site appears to be of generally low nature conservation value, although useful if (preliminary) site surveys were available to support this (Notts County Council)
- This site has the potential for significant areas of archaeological interest where preservation in situ is required (Nottinghamshire County Council)

Negative comments:
- The area is already heavily congested, particularly in the morning and evenings, and the impact on transport conditions will be totally unacceptable.
- There is no justification for the overall housing numbers that have led to this proposal.
- Poor links with Gamston.
- Grantham Canal is an important well used amenity, development will risk disturbance of its wildlife.
- Concerns re deliverability of site – currently still an operational airport. No consortium at present with which to secure provision of infrastructure and necessary facilities. Unlikely to start to deliver before 2020. Better solution to distribution reasonable portion of dwellings around sustainable towns and villages. (Linden Homes)
- Development will suffocate the Green Belt around Tollerton Mobile Home Park and ruin this quiet residential area for elderly people.
- Urban boundary to east of Gamston well established by A52, any new development to east of the A52 will have a greater impact in terms of urban sprawl and encroachment into countryside than that to the west of Clifton.
- No consideration given to impact on local settlements i.e. Edwalton, Tollerton, Gamston, West Bridgford.
- 4,000 homes cannot be satisfactorily accommodated (without compromising design quality and open space provision) unless land to the north of the Grantham Canal in the vicinity of the County Council depot is also included (Gamston Developer Consortium). There is no merit in keeping a gap between any development and Bassingfield (various landowners around Bassingfield). Land around the village should be identified for development.

Other:
- Historical features should be preserved i.e. the pill boxes. (English Heritage)
- 4000 homes will require a massive investment in transport infrastructure.
Q8. Do you have any views on how development of land to the east of Gamston (north of Tollerton) should look, in terms of, for example, the mix and layout of different land uses on the site, the types and level of new services and facilities on the site and their location?

- Significant investment needed into A52 and A606 to cope with increase in traffic generated i.e. extra junctions on A52.
- Any development should be north of the canal – direct access to ring road and better links to Gamston.
- Integrity of Bassingfield and Tollerton should be protected
- Airfield is more suitable site than greenfield sites.
- Disagree that east of Gamston should have less land allocated for employment than Clifton as it is slightly less accessible to M1 corridor. If anything, more land is needed for employment use so that those living in the new development can more easily access employment without driving.

(Tollerton PC)
Appendix 1
Summary of responses using the response form

Question 1
Do you think that we are right to increase the level of proposed housing by at least 3,550 homes, which in total will mean the delivery of a minimum of 13,150 new homes in Rushcliffe between 2011 and 2028? Please tick yes or no.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If possible, please give reasons for your answer.

Yes
- The local plan won’t otherwise be approved so there is no choice
- More housing for a growing population
- Use of improved infrastructure and public transport links
- Better quality housing for future generations, more sustainable and energy efficient
- Delivery of large scale schemes always takes longer than predicted, even this level of provision will barely meet the needs with this timescale
- The increased level of housing provision for Rushcliffe is necessary for the Borough to contribute to meeting housing needs across the Greater Nottingham Housing Market Area
- Increasing UK population and people are requiring homes of different sizes
- The ageing housing stock needs to be replaced with appropriate provision for families, young and elderly
- Rushcliffe needs to plan positively to avoid ad-hoc planning outcomes. Strategic sites represent an opportunity to develop key sites capable of handling future traffic flows, service / retail / and employment uses. This consultation is a vital component that done correctly will deliver a sound core strategy for all concerned (Persimmon Homes)
- Rushcliffe should meet the identified housing need for the Borough (Linden Homes – Landmark Planning)
- Essential to provide new housing with the benefit of better infrastructure
- If RBC amend Core Strategy in line with current proposals then the collectively agreed level of objectively assessed housing needs will be met across the HMA between all five councils. No substantive grounds for the HMA authorities to maintain objections on this basis, will also result in duty to cooperate being fully met. (HMA Authorities, Nottingham City Council)
- Failure to allocate adequate housing land could leave the Council open to the possibility of housing development by appeal. (Cranford Developments Limited)
- Consider that the LAPP document should be advanced in parallel with the Core
Strategy to identify a portfolio of small and medium sized housing sites for delivery in the short term. Response goes on to suggest a SHLAA site within Cotgrave (ref 364) (Langridge Homes)

- Cabinet resolved to express support for proposed increase in housing provision and extension of plan period – consistent with housing provision in Aligned CS’s. Council’s objection could be withdrawn if the proposed modifications are the same as the current consultation proposals. (Broxtowe BC)

- The final figure needs to clearly reflect the evidence base required by the NPPF (para. 159) notably an up-to-date SHMA. As the Inspector has already highlighted there needs to be a “clear audit trail of evidence to indicate how the housing policy and numbers have been derived.” This will be required to support the Major Modifications to the Core Strategy. (William Davis Ltd)

- Whilst the strategy to focus this additional growth on the PUA is acknowledged, and no specific objection is made to the identified sites, William Davis Ltd do question whether there is the capacity to accommodate all of the additional growth as indicated in an appropriate form of development within the required timescale. A more considered assessment of the capacity of the strategic sites is required, and that may indicate that additional growth in other sustainable settlements is necessary to meet the identified housing needs. (William Davis Ltd)

- The additional growth now proposed is welcomed and the proposal is understood to have been arrived at in consultation with the other HMA authorities, taking into account the latest household projections and information from the 2011 Census. As such the proposal is supported. (Ben Bailey Homes, and LHW Properties Ltd.)

- IDC & Associates promote land at Gotham Lane, Bunny for residential development in their response. (IDC & Associates)

- Support the increase in the level of proposed housing by at least 3550 (Clifton Landowners) (John A Wells & Nottingham Airport PLC)

- Proposed housing target of 13,150 and revised plan period welcomed and supported and would adequately address the concerns previously expressed by DCC. (Derbyshire County Council)

- Would help to ensure that alongside the other Nottingham Core Housing Market Area councils, Rushcliffe is planning positively in contributing towards meeting the assessed housing need for 49,950 new homes within Greater Nottingham up to 2028, supporting economic growth. The borough would benefit from a more holistic picture of when sites would likely be started and completed. Traffic consultations (MVA) have been tasked by Rushcliffe Borough Council to prepare an update of Stage 1 of the Greater Nottingham Transport Model (i.e. without mitigation) to provide a benchmark of the potential impacts. Until such time as the findings of the study are known it is not possible for the local highway authority to determine the suitability or otherwise of the proposed new housing allocations. (Nottinghamshire County Council)

- Should Rushcliffe Borough Council increase its housing requirement to a minimum of 13,150 new homes, Erewash Borough and Gedling Borough would wish to formally withdraw its objection made in response to the Publication version of the Rushcliffe Core Strategy (Erewash BC, Gedling BC)
• Over reliance on large housing sites which could jeopardise core strategy if one is not delivered. Question whether housing can be delivered during the time period

• Would not wish to raise any issues with regard to the proposed housing sites as there does not appear to be any existing playing fields impacted by the proposals. Imperative that robust and up to date evidence base is in place having regard to paras 70, 73 and 74 of the NPPF. Would include a Built Sports Facilities Strategy (is the 2006/2016 leisure facilities strategy sufficiently robust given the update in 2011) and a detailed Playing Pitch Strategy. The NPPF also requires up to date evidence with regard to open space (formerly PPG17) (Sport England)

• DO not wish to comment on the broader debate about the scale of housing proposed; concern relates to ways in which cycling might best be promoted at each of the sites, and how such provision, on-road and off-road, might best be linked with the wider cycle network. Suggestions are provided in consultation response. (Pedals)

• Council is relying heavily on strategic housing allocations. These sites are unlikely to maximise housing completions until the mid phase of the plan period (at the earliest) due to the significant infrastructure requirements. Therefore these sites will not help to address the significant existing shortfall in housing land supply. The Council has therefore chosen to ignore the capacity of other settlements such as Keyworth to absorb more homes. The proposed increase in housing numbers on these sites, with no satisfactory consideration of alternatives is not a justified approach. The fact that the proposed major development sites are explicitly linked to significant infrastructure to facilitate their development highlights our concern over housing delivery, when any delays with the major sites could lead to negative effects on year on year housing delivery. (Heaton Planning for Mr Metcalfe)

• A major concern is a lack of certainty, if the Core Strategy is to rely only on 3 strategic sites to deliver the majority of the housing, it will need to be based on evidence that those sites will deliver the expected number of homes in the whole plan period and have regard to the potential for sites within Key Settlements to deliver some of the additional 3,550 homes. (Heaton Planning for Mr Metcalfe)

• Para 3.1.2.18 Core Strategy identifies that where sites in Policy 2 are not capable of delivery within identified timescales, the Council will look to make up the shortfall on other sites identified through the SHLAA. Where this is not possible, a review of the Core Strategy would be undertaken. We consider that all housing/land use sites should be shown on a Proposals Map, in line with the policy advice now contained within the NPPF and not brought forward through subsequent DPDs or Neighbourhood Plans (Heaton Planning for Mr Metcalfe)

• If sites within Key Settlements are identified, there are deliverable sites (such as that promoted by our client) which do not have such large reliance on infrastructure delivery, and, which can be brought forward earlier in the plan period offering some security to housing supply as well as offering other local benefits (Heaton Planning for Mr Metcalfe)

• WPD [may have] [has] a number of strategic electricity distribution circuits (which can operate at 132,000 Volts, 66,000 Volts and 33,000 Volts) in some of the area’s being considered for development. These circuits may run both underground and as overhead lines (on either towers/ pylons or wood poles). WPD may also have
electricity substations in these areas. Generally, WPD would expect developers of a site to pay to divert less strategic electricity circuits operating at 11,000 Volts (11kV) or below. This may include undergrounding some 11kV and low voltage overhead lines. (Western Power Distribution)

- WPD would normally seek to retain the position of electricity circuits operating at 132,000 Volts (132kV) and 66,000 Volts (66kV) and in some cases 33,000 Volts (33kV), particularly if the diversion of such circuits placed a financial obligation on WPD to either divert or underground them as WPD would not be party to any planning application and any such obligation would also go against the statutory and regulatory requirement on WPD to operate an economic and efficient electricity distribution system. Assuming the required minimum statutory clearances can be maintained and WPD can access its pylons/poles, WPD does not generally have any restriction on the type of development possible in proximity to its strategic overhead lines but it would be sensible to consider uses compatible with the retention of strategic overhead lines, for example such as parking, estate roads, commercial uses or open space, within their immediate proximity. (Western Power Distribution)

- It is welcomed that the pattern of distribution does not detract from the numbers allocated to the rural centres in the submission Core Strategy as these settlements are able to accommodate sustainable development and need new housing to meet local needs and support services. (Miller Homes)

- The extensive housing development has the potential to impact upon the SRN. In this respect, the HA’s specific interest relates to the A52 and A453 routes in the Rushcliffe area. The HA is aware that investigations of the impacts of the further proposed development in Rushcliffe is being undertaken using the Greater Nottingham Transport Model (GNTM). The HA has previously accepted that the GNTM provides a suitable basis for assessing the network wide impacts of development proposals coming forward in Core Strategies in the Nottingham area. The HA also considers that the GNTM can assist in understanding the potential impacts of individual development proposals subject to the model undergoing local area validation and the outputs being subject to detailed logic checks. The outcome from the additional assessments and results of further GNTM scenario testing will assist the HA to identify, the SRN infrastructure required to support the Core Strategy. Given the assessments already undertaken, the HA anticipates that the growth proposed in the A453 and A52 corridors will require significant improvements to the SRN in the form of junction improvements to help mitigate the cumulative impacts that could adversely impact on the future operation of the route. No current proposals to provide significant junction improvements on the A52 - improvement measures need to be brought forward in conjunction with development - may best be addressed through an overarching route management strategy funded from a range of sources, including developer contributions. (Highways Agency)

- Core Strategy should not only outline the nature of the infrastructure improvements required along the A52 to support development, but also identify the mechanism for their delivery. RBC should consider proposing that measures required to address the cumulative impacts of development on the A52 should be funded through a pooled
contribution strategy and/or the proposed Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) for the area, to provide a defined level of funding towards delivery of required A52 improvements. (Highways Agency)

- I object to the wording "at least" - this implies no upper limit and can potentially set a dangerous precedent. The original proposal gave an exact number, why is the new one deliberately vague?
- Support the increase in housing by at least 3550 homes and extension of plan period to 2028. Given the findings of the housing needs assessment undertaken by the HMA authorities it is appropriate that Rushcliffe increase the level of housing to ensure needs are met in full and the majority of the increase should be met on sites either within or close to the PUA. (Bloor Homes) (Clifton Landowners)
- People will always need places to live, and a greater number of houses would (in theory) result in a reduction of house prices.

No

- Impact on the green areas and turn this beautiful area into an extension of the city
- Loss of village character, do not want to be attached to a new estate
- Why not regenerate areas that have empty homes/utilise empty properties throughout Nottingham/Nottinghamshire/Boots/East side before building new homes
- The housing figure is too high/ not justified. There is insufficient evidence to justify this
- There still seems to be many empty properties- does the housing figure take into account the recession, lower student numbers, past rate of housing completions and a slow-down of the housing market? How are future figures predicted?
- More political than real need
- Housing figure too high/not justified. (including CPRE, Gotham PC, Barton PC, Tollerton PC, Cropwell Butler PC)
- The housing figure is not justified by the evidence available. The figure of ‘at least’ 3550 homes means that the figure may be open-ended and undetermined
- Built up area large enough already, it is relatively easy to get out to the countryside at present
- Rushcliffe has some of the most sensitive areas of open countryside – unreasonable that it has to absorb the growth of Greater Nottingham - other districts to the north and east that could better accommodate the growth. (Plumtree Parish Council)
- No developer found yet for Sharphill Wood, build current allocation and only after those houses are sold consider building more
- CO2 emissions are already above WHO recommendations
- Clear need for more housing across the HMA but increasing Rushcliffe’s share seems unjustified and excessive
- Figures may prove unrealistic – development at Sharphill for example has not begun as a result of the current economic climate, time scale unrealistic
- Consequences of increasing targets are extremely serious and retrograde i.e. breaching Green Belt boundaries and increasing housing densities
- Where will people get mortgages to buy these houses when the recession looks set
to continue for several years

- Rushcliffe should fight the government on this and respect the Green Belt
- People in Whitehall do not consider the misery these schemes will inflict on local communities
- Existing infrastructure totally inadequate
- Routes to the city already overcrowded
- No planned major traffic developments to east of the city thus any substantial increase in population will generate significant car traffic on already congested roads
- Localised flooding exists in multiple places including parts of Tollerton and on Green Belt land north of the village; not just on the Trent Flood Plain.
- Role of Green Belt as an absorber of water and mitigating effect on flooding is under estimated.
- No general demand for houses. Demand is likely to be for 3rd generation (older) population e.g. Bungalows
- Figures for housing out of date and from the regional plan, changes in housing market due to recession. The rate of building over the last ten years or so are a better guide to what developers will deliver in the longer term
- Need confidence that existing services will not be adversely affected
- Other areas of Nottinghamshire more suited to taking housing
- Rushcliffe Borough Council have refused any attempt to discuss housing numbers since the Technical Review in February. This is an attempt to avoid discussion on the key weakness in the whole set of plans for Greater Nottingham, simply that the housing targets have no basis that stand up to a rational argument. To base targets on projections, not forecasts, of trends up to 2008 and not beyond ignores; five years of recession, reduced migration that has resulted in recent data of negative net migration, reduced demand from students, their own analysis from Edge Analytics of various scenarios which all reduce demand (Gotham PC)
- I am 20 and hope one day to own my own house, but not at the expense of the Green Belt
- The proposed increase imposed on Rushcliffe shows complete disregard for local elected representatives and the views of the electorate
- If additional housing is needed it could be managed with small development being added to existing housing areas instead
- Increases/decreases in numbers should only be decided when all the evidence has been heard in public at the Examination
- Do not believe RBC has demonstrated the ‘exceptional circumstances’ required to justify building on the Green Belt (NPPF para 82)
- Comparisons with Manchester and Leeds show capacity for high rise apartments, Nottingham City is hampered because inner city Meadows and St Anns have been lost to low density social housing.
- The most acute need is for affordable housing and this will not be solved by Green Belt release. Need for direct initiatives by social providers, Local Authorities, and Government.
- It is unlikely the figure would be achieved by 2028.
- The consultation process does not allow respondents to consider other areas other than those proposed by the council
- Tollerton will be a building site for 15 years
- Where will food be grown once the land is lost? Demand for more land to produce food
- Unlikely 13,000 people would be able to buy a home which is expensive by Notts standards, most people now do not have the job security now
- Agree that it is appropriate to use evidence from Regional Plan preparation where it is still relevant, but dispute that housing numbers ARE still relevant – relied on data from before the recession’s impact was felt. Evidence not available which would capture recent trends in household formation.
- Downward trend of university applications which means the student part of the housing figure for Greater Nottingham will be lower in a few years and we don’t know how this will develop longer term.
- Question whether the increased figure is justified or deliverable – calculations do not take past build rates into account. (CPRE)
- No attempt was made at the technical meeting to answer the technical questions raised in the Housing Background Paper (BiF PC)
- No economic strategy as required by the NPPF to accompany ambitious housing plans (BiF PC)
- Housing trajectory that relies on recovery of housing construction is totally unrealistic (BiF PC)
- No consideration of implications for household formation and dwelling need or failure of mechanisms for provision of affordable housing (BiF PC)
- Suggest approach similar to Inspector in Milton Keynes CS hearing – accept a lower figure with early review and increase in numbers if warranted by market conditions, should be accompanied by a strong brownfield priority policy. RBC should lead the way by including such policies in the proposed modifications (BiF PC)
- Consider alternative strategies to accommodate the extra houses than GB release i.e. dispersal among a large number of settlements – this is no longer precluded now the RSS has been revoked. Gedling have provided less housing in/adjacent to the PUA than required by the RSS so RBC could do similar. Inspector has not raised it as a key issue of soundness with them. (BiF PC)
- Solely concerned with the protection of Sharphill Wood - any future building beyond the footprint for the original 1200 houses adjacent to the wood, any building which would effectively surround the wood, i.e. on the fields to the West, and the increased footfall in the wood would totally undermine the barely adequate mitigating measures put in place in 2009 to protect the wood. (Friends of Sharphill Wood)
- There is a significant number of brownfield sites in the Greater Nottingham area, also vacant buildings which should be brought back into use. The overprovision of housing land - particularly through releasing more Green Belt sites, or allowing higher densities on existing ones - will damage efforts to attract developers to brownfield land or to refurbishing vacant buildings. This will weaken efforts to encourage urban regeneration within Nottingham, which remains a primary objective of planning in Greater Nottingham as a whole. (CPRE)
• No amended housing trajectory provided – concern that when one is produced it will show that sites delivered later in the plan period will need to deliver 100% affordable housing due to lower % of affordable housing on larger greenfield sites (BiF PC)
• Gotham should be allocated as a principle settlement which would have no issue supporting some growth, supports major businesses, boasts local services such as schools, shops and health centre, infrastructure is good and achieves a good score in 2010 Tribal Study. (Freeth Cartwright for BPB UK Ltd)
• RBC will need to demonstrate that the proposed increase in housing is compatible with policies contained within the plan; in particular Policy 1, 2, 7, 9, 19 and 23. Any proposed changes must be tested by SA and viability assessments. Essential that each site is viable and deliverable in line with para 173 and 174 of NPPF. (HBF)
• Council appears to be planning for the minimum amount of land to accommodate the 3550 new homes rather than an amount of residential land to significantly boost the supply of housing as per para 47 NPPF (HBF)
• Council should consider complementing these strategic sites with more non-strategic sites to add flexibility and responsiveness to changing circumstances as per para 14 NPPF. (HBF)
• Development around existing villages- this may help to maintain services and buses
• Nottingham City Council do not appear to have had regard to duty to cooperate with neighbouring local authorities e.g. Rushcliffe
• Concerns remain regarding the assessment of housing needs in the HMA – not objective and has not identified the full needs of the area (Bloor Homes)
• The Office of National Statistics 2008 projections indicate a need for 71,000 additional houses over the Plan period, there is a considerable gap between this and the 49,950 currently proposed for the HMA. (IDC & Associates)
• No assessment as to whether increasing densities on Melton Road and South of Clifton site will aid delivery, this presumption should be tested through a SA and assessment of viability and deliverability. (IDC & Associates)
• Other options other than using land adjacent to the PUA have not been considered. Considered that the Council should proceed with the second part of the Green Belt Review urgently as this would successfully add to the current suite of housing sites. (IDC & Associates)
• Notwithstanding the proposed changes to the housing numbers, Bloor Homes remain concerned that the assessment of housing needs across the HMA has not been objective. (Bloor Homes)
• Level of growth is not sustainable in the Rushcliffe borough. The direct land take for two of the development areas is substantial and involves a permanent loss of productive agricultural land. Two of the increases in numbers of housing will involve a significant direct loss of habitat which on-site green infrastructure provision never satisfactorily mitigates. The additional housing will also entail a significant increase in disturbance and damage to extant habitats such as the Fairham Brook, Sharphill Wood, the Grantham Canal and the Polser brook, which are currently relatively undisturbed. (NWT)
• We would encourage you to require a high level of sustainability from the developments, whatever their size – suggested measures outlined in response.
Priority should be to provide for affordable social housing to meet the needs of those who are unlikely to be able to meet their needs through private sector house building. Simply releasing more land in Rushcliffe will not achieve this. (CPRE)

The Council are proposing to distribute these additional housing numbers between two already proposed SUE’s and a new SUE - not robustly evidenced and unclear whether the Council have considered this approach along with other reasonable alternatives. Significant changes such as these should be subject to a further Sustainability Appraisal and Viability testing. Reconsider the plan as a whole, by rushing into the Examination the Council would be likely to experience further issues and potentially face the Core Strategy being found unsound and subsequently have to start the process from the beginning again. (Gladman Developments)

The Council should produce a final document in its entirety (to include any changes made since submission). This document, due to the significant increase in housing numbers and additional SUE will be materially different from the submission version of the Core Strategy and subsequently should be subject to a further stage of consultation. (Gladman Developments)

Gladman commissioned Development Economics Ltd to undertake an assessment of the future requirement for housing in Rushcliffe (full report provided in consultation response). This concluded that the original housing target of 9,600 was unsound. Concerns in relation to the housing proposals remain in relation to the increased target of 13,150. Based on a triangulation of the three drivers of housing demand – demographic change, economic growth and the need to provide affordable housing, the report outlines that an appropriate housing target for Rushcliffe would lie within the range 1,205 dpa and 1,262 dpa (equating to 20,485-21,454 over the plan period 2011-2028).

It is unclear how the overall phasing of the proposed revised target would operate. Gladman request clarity over the Council’s intentions regarding housing delivery.

Council need to ensure the Core Strategy includes a degree of flexibility or contingency to ensure the delivery of the plan even if an SUE does not deliver as planned. With the reliance that is being placed on these large strategic sites and the Green Belt Review (Part 2b) not being undertaken until the site allocations document is being prepared Gladman query what housing sites will actually be delivering housing in the short to medium term. The Council need to ensure they are planning for a range of housing sites, to increase the prospects of delivering housing throughout the plan period.

The houses that would be built would NOT reflect accurately the type of property that is needed now ie more affordable housing is required for first time buyers, single occupancy homes are needed for singletons and also housing should be in areas that are more conveniently located closer to industrial areas/leisure facilities to cut down on traffic on present road systems. Why not use all the sites that building companies / supermarkets are sitting on at the present time ie land that is not on the green belt.

Lack of emergency services cover, proposals to reduce engines at West Bridgford Fire Station etc.
If the green belt is to be grubbed up and concreted over then advanced techniques in energy efficiency and dealing with water runoff should be mandated by the Council, consideration given to novel housing approaches such as the German estates of self-build homes. Apply such standards to all new build in the borough.

New businesses do not need to be located in cities any more, as they are more likely to be IT-based. They can be placed in rural business parks such as the one in Ruddington. Therefore housing developments do not need to be joined to major cities.

Planning policy is changing to allow more buildings to be converted to homes which will increase the stock.

The need for extra housing has not been convincingly proven, more equitable sharing around Greater Nottingham needed (Cropwell Butler Parish Council).

Gladman Developments conclude that the appropriate housing target for Rushcliffe lies within the range of between 1,205 dpa and 1,262 dpa over the 2011-2028 period. A detailed report can be found under rep number 778449 in the email responses.

### Proposed development of land south of Clifton

**Question 2**

Do you think that the identified shortfall in proposed new housing in Rushcliffe should be met in part by increasing the number planned at land south of Clifton by around 500 homes and that this should be achieved without increasing the amount of land already proposed for development? Please tick yes or no.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>119</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>511</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If possible, please give reasons for your answer.

**Yes**

- Increase the residential land by reducing the employment land area at the SW corner or ‘gateway’ area/ it may be to extend residential into this area
- Already a busier area and the A453 widening could accommodate more traffic.
- Clifton has better amenities for the community already i.e. shopping and leisure facilities
- Larger place – a suburb, not a small village like Tollerton – less detrimental
- The extra 500 homes would have little impact, large suburb and adequate facilities
- Bridges needed for access to Nottingham city, Clifton already has a dual carriageway bridge, can support more traffic
- Could take far more than 500 homes – this seems a small allocation given the money
being spent on improvements to infrastructure in this area; also good links to City Centre

- The actual number Clifton could accommodate should be determined by local need and capacity that community infrastructure could support
- The plan should allow for an increase in the amount of land proposed and a significant increase in the number of homes to be built south of Clifton. Extension of tram and dualling of A453 will make the site the most suitable in Rushcliffe for development
- Would be better to situate as many dwellings as possible in the space, but how will transport be adequate?
- William Davis Ltd do not object to the proposed allocation but it cannot be assumed that the density of development can be increased within the same developable area to deliver an additional 500 dwellings. This needs to be clearly evidenced, and contingency plans put in place to address any shortfall by allocating additional development allocations in other sustainable locations.
- Easier motorway access
- Would not destroy character of the area
- Expand housing area south of Barton Lane towards the parkway
- Will bring economic growth to the area
- If a new hub is built at Castle Donnington, it would be within a better commute for people
- The homes will be cheaper so presumably more affordable
- Amenities already in place for development, train at East Midlands parkway and tram.
- Transport provision will be attractive to home buyers
- The Green Belt here has already been breached
- Proposed housing numbers at Clifton inadequate given the significant infrastructure investment underway in this area
- Highly sustainable location given relationship with built up area, will be directly served by tram, area of land identified can accommodate the additional development. No need to amend boundary, but precise boundary should be determined at detailed design stage, this should be reflected in the policy wording and details shown on site allocation plan (Clifton Landowners) (John A Wells & Nottingham Airport PLC)
- Similar spatial strategy of sustainable urban extensions is being applied within the Greater Nottingham area. (Nottinghamshire County Council, Erewash BC, Nottingham City Council, Gedling BC)
- Previous proposals for this area as part of the ‘Nottingham Gateway’ project involved a larger development area, but also involved proposals for significant (and potentially very valuable) areas of habitat creation, which were a major potential benefit of an enlarged development area. The creation of equivalent areas may not be deliverable on such a scale through development at other locations (e.g. Gamston). The site has archaeological potential. Works associated with the NET and A453 uncovered significant archaeology, in particular one site of a probable Neolithic Causewayed enclosure which had to be considered for preservation in situ, on the advice of English Heritage. (Nottinghamshire County Council)
- Further transport modelling required
- No objections subject to any additional surface water drainage being attenuated; giving priority to the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (Environment Agency)
- This location cannot be supported for an urban extension of 3,000 dwellings unless the following provisos are met:- The necessary infrastructure (especially green and environmental infrastructure) being in place, the development fully integrating with, and supporting existing Clifton facilities, in particular the development should support and enhance the vitality and viability of Clifton District Centre, the development being a mixed development including significant employment opportunities which are appropriate and accessible to Clifton residents, the development being built to the highest environmental standards. In the context of the above comments, Option 1 is considered to be the most appropriate option at the present time. (Nottingham City Council)
- Welcome intention to incorporate the additional dwellings within the existing development footprint. We would expect the provision of GI to increase to cope with additional pressures through use by an additional c.1000 people and increases in provision of SUDS to cope with water run-off from 500 additional dwellings. (NWT)
- We highlighted a number of implications of this allocation in relation to the historic environment in our reps to the Core Strategy in 2012 and considered that the absence of reference to such considerations within Policy 23 was unsound. We considered that the policy could be made sound and we suggested wording to this effect. In relation to the additional housing proposed for this site, we have no overall objection, may be increased pressures on the historic environment attributes, over and above the original allocation. The addition of 500 houses serves to reinforce our view that policy reference here is necessary to ensure soundness. Setting of heritage assets should be taken into account during masterplanning work which may impact on layout, mix and density. (English Heritage)
- TABU does not believe that the number of houses planned for the District of Rushcliffe is appropriate or realistic (see Question 1) above. If nevertheless, RBC does propose to increase the housing provision in the plan, Clifton is one of the more appropriate locations.
- We query why you say a maximum of 500 extra homes can be provided by 2028. We suggest it would be sensible to develop the area more quickly as additional residents will support the earlier provision of social facilities, shops and other amenities. These are essential for a true community but are difficult to make viable if development proceeds slowly
- Question the need/desirability of providing such a large area of employment land. Large oversupply of employment land in the City and South Notts area already. The Clifton allocation is clearly aimed at motorway business park type development which is inevitably unsustainable and will undermine the viability of developments in the city centre. Arguments about local employment are virtuous but not reflected by the reality of the labour market. Removal of some or all of this employment allocation would provide land for extra housing in this sustainable location instead of spreading it around Sharphill/Edwalton and Gamston/Tollerton on the pretext that there is nowhere else better.
I worry that further runoff into the Trent will increase flood risks for us all, and hope that the Council will mandate developers to act to ensure that the development does not substantially impact surface water runoff. The houses should be built with high eco standards to ensure their running costs are low.

Greenbelt has already been breached in this area and there is no existing clear barrier that may limit further expansion of the conurbation. However the loss of prime agricultural land is a concern and I believe one that has not been considered.

Additional allowance should be made up by increasing density (Cropwell Butler PC).

**No**

- Do not believe the increase of 500 additional homes is necessary
- Increasing the area of the development would encroach towards Gotham and provide even less of a defensible boundary for further development after 2028.
- Green space between Gotham and Clifton serves to distance East Leake from Nottingham, the smaller site would be helpful in this regard
- Concern that increasing the number of homes on the site could impact adversely on quality of life in East Leake i.e. increases in traffic and adverse effects on the bus service
- Development would destroy the best and most attractive landscape of any approach to the City. The sweep of land down from the A453 into the vale, provides an open and culturally significant landscape that defines and contextualises the rural area to the south of the city. Development in this location would represent a massive and harmful incursion into the Green Belt, unconstrained by natural or man-made boundaries.
- Effect of building/not building a secondary school as part of the development on East Leake should be considered; likewise impact on other facilities i.e. leisure centre
- East Leake needs a new health centre and various health services need to be provided locally, would not wish to see an adjacent facility denying the opportunity for East Leake’s health centre to develop in this way
- LHW Properties Ltd has seen no evidence of how an increased development of up to 3,000 homes can be accommodated within the land identified for development – some calculations are set out in their repsonse. Fail to see how 500 more dwellings could be accommodated on the site by an increase in density; much less how this would be deliverable in a manner that would be commercially acceptable to a residential developer.
- We should keep building on farm land to a minimum. The government is always banging on about the need to produce more of our own food and reduce imports but the way we are eating up farm land will make this impossible in the future.
- An alternative to increasing the density of development at Clifton would be to allocate additional growth to other settlements. Ruddington, in particular, ranks with Bingham as the most accessible settlements in the borough. It is scored as having medium-high suitability for growth in the Tribal Appraisal of Urban Extensions (2008). It is therefore suggested that the Council consider apportioning some of the additional growth required to Ruddington. (LHW Properties)
- Further technical supporting information is needed particularly relating to transport to
determine whether Clifton can accommodate these additional dwellings. (Linden Homes)

- Deliverability of the site is a concern within the current plan period. No planning applications in place and major infrastructure work required. Response sets out their calculations on delivery rates and time scales. (Linden Homes)

- I fear that levering in an additional 500 units without increasing the amount of available land at Clifton will only sever to reduce the available green open space and result in urban cramming. (Persimmon Homes)

- Increasing density rather than developable area goes against trend across the country where density levels are reducing, better approach to spread the additional dwellings between the SUEs and smaller development sites – require less infrastructure investment, greater choice from purchasers and reduced risk for council, developers and landowners. (Linden Homes)

- Smaller villages were not assessed in the Tribal study as ‘the transport is inadequate for expansion’. With a half hourly bus service this assertion is challenged. A small amount of building in some of the smaller villages may keep them more viable e.g. improving trade in local shops. The whole approach of just adding to existing large centres is wrong. (Ruddington PC)

- Developments from all 3 areas being consulted on will have an impact on traffic in Ruddington and on Ruddington residents as they travel to and from the village. Measures are needed to alleviate the impact of extra traffic (these are set out in the consultation response) (Ruddington Parish Council)

- Sewage system in the area is seriously under capacity

- Development in recent years have been biased towards large detached family homes, a mix of homes to meet needs should be encouraged i.e. housing for older people wanting to downsize

- Do not believe Nottingham as a whole can sustain these large numbers, it is already falling apart at the seams.

- Should use brownfield land first

- No need to locate employment land here as people do not generally work close to where they live, cutting out employment would reduce need for land further

- This should be decided by the residents of Clifton

- Massive urban extension will not solve existing housing needs in villages and small communities in Rushcliffe. Affordable housing is required everywhere, not just in a massive development.

- Option of increasing land is unacceptable, would not provide any sort of defensible boundary against future development of Green Belt.

- Development should move towards Ratcliffe on Soar power station – link to opportunities provided by dualled a453

- The development would intrude and detract from a distinctive and attractive landscape, encroaching on Green Belt

- Rising slope of the land makes it far too prominent

- Pylons not an acceptable boundary, encroachment towards Gotham

- Object to increasing density, should build positive areas such as parks, green areas, cycle lanes, wide pedestrian pavements
• Will destroy historic open plan area with small woodlands. Loss of Grade 2 agricultural land
• Does not comply with NPPF para 79 and 80.
• Site can waterlog
• The additional 3000 dwellings should be considered in this location rather than at Gamston/Tollerton where the traffic impacts would be catastrophic (Plumtree Parish Council)
• Our main concern with proposal to add 500 houses is impact on Green Infrastructure (GI) provision. Local GI sites and links are vital to a functioning GI network and often make a big difference to the quality of life. We would not want to see the increased housing density use land that would have provided GI. Revised development proposal should provide evidence that GI can be provided at appropriate levels that will be able to deliver positive benefits to the community in terms of recreational provision and biodiversity enhancement. (Natural England)
• Area of land south of Clifton includes land graded as 2 and 3a in the Agricultural Land Classification. The plan should safeguard the long term capability of Best and Most Versatile agricultural Land and make clear that areas of lower quality agricultural land should be used for development in preference to the BMV land. The plan should recognise that development (soil sealing) has an irreversible adverse (cumulative) impact on the finite national and local stock of BMV land. Avoiding loss of BMV land is the priority as mitigation is rarely possible. Retaining BMV land enhances future options for sustainable food production and helps secure other important ecosystem services. (Natural England)
• We wish to ensure the protection of Fairham Brook Nature Reserve to east of the proposed site and suggest that there could be green infrastructure and ecological links to this site. (Natural England)
• Considered to be a strategy that is inflexible and overly reliant on three urban extensions. There is nothing in the plan that indicates if any of the extensions are viable using the criteria in the Harman Report on Viability Testing of Local Plans of June 2012. More emphasis should be placed, especially in the early years of the plan, to delivery of sites in alternative locations such as East Leake where there are developer led applications on new sites that can support the housing land supply in the short term. The plan should reflect a more balanced approach to the location of growth and increase the allocation to East Leake to a minimum of 800 dwellings. (Redrow Homes)
• Not persuaded that, IF land were to be developed here it would best be done by increasing housing density. Would welcome minimizing land take, but density proposed would lead to crammed housing unless higher rise houses were built. Higher rise houses would impair views across to the villages to the South of Clifton and would therefore not be welcome, even leaving aside the reluctance of people in England to consider living in high-rise housing due to its historic association with deprivation. (CPRE)
• Any development towards Gotham across the land south of Clifton does not have a natural boundary that would prevent future encroachment and the absorption at some point of Gotham within Nottingham. Gotham residents are proud of their
significant rural heritage and wish the city boundary to be kept as far away as possible, preferably where it is now. (Gotham PC)

- Gladman are concerned that significantly increasing the density on this site as proposed through the additional 500 dwellings may impact on the deliverability of this site, and result in increased risks of non-delivery.
- Gladman note that if this increased density and housing numbers on the land south of Clifton SUE was appropriate when initially considered by the Council, surely this scale of development would have been included within the original proposals for this site. The approach the Council are taking appears to be to artificially manipulate the site to try and ‘squeeze’ on additional housing numbers.

### Question 3

Do you have any views on how development of land south of Clifton should look, in terms of, for example, the mix and layout of different land uses on the site, the types and level of new services and facilities on the site and their location?

- 30% affordable homes should be insisted on
- Provision of critical infrastructure should be ensured
- The area should develop into a new suburb for 12,000-15,000 people
- A local centre, health and leisure facilities etc should be appropriate for the population. Without a local centre, there would be added congestion
- School provision needed as there are already not enough school places
- Orientation of housing to benefit from the south facing aspect and the use of solar panels for heating/electricity generation.
- Good open space provision, green parkland
- Extend tram line to link into employment land and East Midlands Parkway
- Potential for hotel/bar/restaurant as well as local retail provision
- The requirement for a development brief should be reinstated to control the quality of build
- The employment proposals will have a major impact on landscape and are not justified given the availability of employment land elsewhere in Rushcliffe/ G Nottn, particularly B2 and B8 uses
- ‘Gateway’ proposals not appropriate. Retail and warehouse sheds not an appropriate ‘gateway’
- Additional allocation of 3000 dwellings in this location would create sufficient critical mass to support a new district centre with retail, education, health and employment facilities
- Rigorous application of the Building for Life standards
- Welcome the proposal for land for employment purposes, would not wish to see this removed to accommodate more housing
• It would help if we knew how it was proposed to go ahead already
• New development should be sympathetic to current housing stock and population
• Needs sufficient capacity for affordable housing – suggest 25%
• Should be developed for first time buyers
• Against any high rise developments
• Let us not have an identikit estate of bland boxes that seem to be favoured by planners nationally. The industrial Units, well screened from residential areas, should be adjacent to the new transport hubs whilst leisure facilities, especially for the young, should be well planned and comprehensive.
• Needs of Gypsies and Travellers should be borne in mind. If provision is not to be made within new housing allocations, and it is accepted that this may prove difficult to achieve, then specific allocations elsewhere must be made and this may require further adjustment to the Green Belt (National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups)
• Development must have links to Clifton and no be separate
• Allotment areas should be located aside existing allotments along the boundary
• Housing should reflect the increased need for single occupancy households, housing associations, council housing alongside private housing.
• Concerns over crime if a gypsy traveller site were to be allowed
• Add to the character that exists already – create new areas that can tap into existing facilities but also create new space for recreation, shopping, a range of houses etc.
• Landscape character of the area south of Clifton is so significant that erection of B2 and B8 warehousing would cause enormous planning harm visually. Industry should be limited
• Western site boundary must be new A453, not old A453
• A hub and spoke network of housing and local amenities
• Possible supermarket to service the community
• Housing, low rise apartments, shops and park land
• Traveller site not required, would degrade the area
• Development of the land could cause Clifton Estate to degrade or become a rundown estate (slum)
• Should carefully consider employment land take-up, B1 would be more appropriate at Boots employment zone.
• B8 needs to be carefully considered aesthetically and may be contrary to the ‘gateway’ image
• Existing facilities available e.g. shops, medical centre and swimming pool. Enhancement of existing
• Vehicle access close to Fairham Field would harm the landscape
• Detailed assessment and site masterplanning work being undertaken to inform the decisions in relation to the scale, form and layout of development on land south of Clifton. This will support the preparation of a planning application (Clifton Landowners)
• ELA should have the capacity to accommodate in the region of 300 students from the Clifton Pastures development without requiring further physical development. If required (after 2020) ELA has space to increase capacity through a modest build to
accommodate the further 260 places required by 2028. There is no requirement therefore for a new institution for secondary education at Clifton Pastures. (East Leake Academy)

- Details have been provided to the Council by the Clifton landowners who are promoting the site, the broad approach proposed is supported. (John A Wells & Nottingham Airport PLC)

- Land to the south-east of the development area (marked as ‘area for surface water balancing’) should be designed to maximise its nature conservation value, as should other areas of Green Infrastructure through the site. (Nottinghamshire County Council)

- Should the employment element be necessary, the buildings should be located in the southernmost area of the site away from housing, where they will be topographically lower than the A453 and most of the residential development. We recommend incorporation of green roofs and walls to camouflage the exterior. This will also make a contribution towards the biodiversity of the development. Alternatively they could be sited away from the development towards the Parkway station and therefore closer to the M1 (NWT)

- Cycling provision should include safe and coherent links to and from the cycling provision being included in the A453 dualling plans (both in terms of shared paths and the use, along with general local traffic) of the old A453 between Barton Fabis and Thrumpton, on the one hand, and the new NET Clifton route extension terminal park and ride site southwest of Clifton, with a safe crossing for non-motorised users at the Mill Hill roundabout between the old A453 and the shared path to and from the NET Park and Ride site. The A453 new cycling provision will form part of Sustrans National Cycle Network Route 15 across the south of the county. (Pedals)

- Upgrade path by Fairham Brook between the River Trent and Rushcliffe Country Park with good links to and from this new development as well as Ruddington and Clifton. Links should all be designed as safe shared links for cyclists and pedestrians. (Pedals)

- Traffic modelling has already shown that Gotham will be subject to unacceptable traffic levels due to rat running as the A453 capacity will be exceeded by the South of Clifton development. While we await the further traffic studies that are being carried out, the traffic will clearly be even worse with extra housing. (Gotham PC)

- Reduction of non-housing land, services and facilities to meet requirements but industrial/ employment allocation may have to be reduced (Cropwell Butler PC).
Proposed development of land at Melton Road, Edwalton

Question 4

Do you think that the identified shortfall in proposed new housing in Rushcliffe should be met in part by increasing the number planned at land at Melton Road, Edwalton by around 550 homes? Please tick yes or no.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If possible, please give reasons for your answer.

Yes

- There should not be a significant increase in density, however affordable housing/first time homes could be increased, resulting in an increase in units/ha
- May be a better option than Tollerton as land is within ring road
- Edwalton is already a suburb joining West Bridgford and Gamston- character will not be destroyed by adding the extra homes, good amenity provision
- Plenty of land along the A52 e.g. between Wheatcroft Island and Edwalton Golf Club island
- The proposal is supported. This land is well contained by the A52 and development will relate to the consented urban extension at Sharphill Wood. Removal of this land from the Green Belt will have a low impact on Green Belt objectives and will allow for development to be maximised in this sustainable location, where facilities and the transport network are to be improved. Ben Bailey Homes is promoting 2.5ha of land in this location and confirms that development is deliverable in the next 5 years.
- The site at Sharphill wood has already received permission for circa 1200 units. Topographical restrictions limit the scope of housing at this location. Also the future of Edwalton golf course may come under increasing development pressure should this site be developed (Persimmon Homes)
- William Davis Ltd do not object to the proposed allocation, or indeed its extension. Must ensure that the significant increase in the density level would not result in unsuitable design for the site/inappropriate accommodation. Whilst predicting the likely timing, phasing and delivery rates of developments is difficult, given the infrastructure burden and lead in times required, the number of dwellings that can be delivered within the plan period will ultimately be limited. The capacity of the site needs to be clearly evidenced, and contingency plans put in place to address any shortfall by allocating additional development allocations in other sustainable locations.
- Existing land granted planning permission along with further land east of Melton Road adjoining the (urban) edge of Edwalton ie up to the former railway should be
utilised in this regard. (Barratt Homes)
- Continue to safeguard Sharphill Wood and surrounding area for the much valued wildlife; highly visible and attractive landmark for miles.
- Land is still within the ring road- a strong boundary for the Green Belt
- Possibly – if Edwalton Golf Course were to be used – Green Belt would not be breached, golf course could be re-sited in the Green Belt, character of Edwalton would not be ruined.
- TABU does not believe that the number of houses planned for the District of Rushcliffe is appropriate or realistic (see Question 1) above. If nevertheless, RBC does propose to increase the housing provision in the plan, Edwalton is one of the more appropriate locations.
- Actual number allocated would need to fit in with context of present housing stock, community infrastructure capacity and local need.
- Edwalton’s character could be enhanced by some quality housing construction, within the ring road and not impacting on Green Belt
- Close to good facilities and transport links, well connected
- Should take place within the ring road, sustainable boundary
- Little impact on the character of Edwalton, already part of urban area
- You have already agreed to destroy the area with original housing quota
- Would not support a mandatory minimum density across the site
- Some scope for small-scale development of the northern end of the site between Hill Farm Court and 229 Melton Road
- Would like to see the release of the entire ‘Melton Triangle’ from Green Belt
- Do not increase density but allow for more land to satisfy provision within the plan period
- Increasing dwelling numbers will improve the viability of the overall development and maximise development potential thereby diminishing the need to release other green belt sites. Local centre retail component would be better located towards the existing retail uses to the south of the site, would encourage linked trips to the existing retail uses. (Cranford Developments)
- Response sets out the key constraints at land at Melton Road, Edwalton and also suggests other areas not already proposed for built development within the existing permission which the consortium considers suitable for development. Suggestions to revise the location of certain features within the existing planning permission are also made. (Edwalton Consortium) (John A Wells & Nottingham Airport PLC)
- The report produced by the District Valuer regarding viability issues on the Edwalton site should inform Core Strategy preparation including specific policies allocating land. The work should be used to ensure the infrastructure/sct106 burdens do not unduly constrain development. (Edwalton Consortium)
- It is not considered Policy 19 is sufficiently flexible nor does it appropriately reflect the District Valuers report. Amend the policy to reflect the need for flexibility and address issues of phasing and delivery of the scheme. (Edwalton Consortium)
- It seems sensible to focus increased development in an area where development would already be taking place, although it is not clear why this cannot be achieved by increasing housing density as at land south of Clifton (Nottinghamshire County
- The evidence base relating to the transport impacts of Rushcliffe’s strategy will require review. (Nottinghamshire County Council)
- No objections subject to any additional surface water drainage being attenuated; giving priority to the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (Environment Agency)
- Assumption for 49,950 homes yet to be tested, if found to be too low then figure in Rushcliffe may need to be revised upwards. The Council need to also be able to clearly demonstrate the evidence base that the housing proposals are derived from, providing the justification for the scale of growth proposed. (Gladman Developments).
- Supportive that a spatial strategy of urban concentration has been followed as a basis for identifying this particular strategic development site given that it would represent an extension to the main built up area of Nottingham (Erewash BC, Nottingham City Council, Gedling BC)
- No overall objection to this increase, we are concerned that no reference is made within Policy 19 to the setting of heritage assets. The increase in the allocation by a further 550 houses heightens the need for reference to be made in this policy in taking this revised allocation forward. This will ensure soundness in terms of historic environment considerations. (English Heritage)
- By increasing the density of housing and using land previously earmarked for commercial development - the need for which, again, is not demonstrated given the under-occupation at the Wheatcroft estate - more housing could be accommodated

No
- Increasing numbers south of Clifton reduces the need for homes at Sharphill
- Insufficient transport infrastructure to cope with substantial additional development. Traffic congestion is already an issue from Nottingham to the South East of West Bridgford, the road would not cope
- Ruddington Parish Council has a major concern about the conurbation coalescing with Ruddington. It is important that Ruddington retains and protects a separate identity.
- Extra housing could be provided here provided all supporting technical information indicates it is feasible. Need more information re proposed new density and additional areas to be developed in order to appropriately assess the impact on the area of these additional dwellings. (Linden Homes)
- Concern re deliverability realistic implementation plan needs to be prepared to demonstrate development will occur by 2028. More secure route to ensure delivery would be to identify a number of smaller sites within sustainable locations as well as the SUEs (Linden Homes)
- No further development until a there is a new tram line crossing the A52 in the Gamston area
- Sharphill is a prominent local landmark visible from many directions
- Impact on footpaths and amenity value of the woods
- There is a large area of unused land off Wilford Lane between Nottingham forest Academy and Roko, what is planned for this site along with the Becket site?
• The current multiple traffic light proposal looks set to significantly increase congestion. With housing values in this area and the additional housing numbers, the council should renegotiate a much better traffic solution.

• Experiences of Lower Earley nr Reading demonstrate compromises of increasing housing density with 4 bed detached homes in 700sqft houses.

• Without the protection of a large country park, playing fields, and a substantial buffer zone all around the wood the fauna will be subject to much increased predation by pets. (The Mammal Society estimates that the UK’s cats catch up to 275 million prey items a year.) Add the increased footfall from local residents (and the greater risk of vandalism) these pressures would result in a downward decline in the biodiversity, quality, and social value of the wood.

• If additional housing must be built, increase the density of housing on the original footprint and build where there were previous proposals for a college and commercial development. Not convinced of the need for more commercial properties - much of the existing provision on the Wheatcroft site is under-utilised. Providing more starter homes would more likely meet any perceived need and would help reduce the age demographic in West Bridgford. The iconic views of Sharphill from the Trent and the skyline must be protected, light pollution minimised and any land to the west of the wood left clear to provide wildlife with a corridor to Old Road and foraging space for badgers as recommended by the original Planning Inspector’s report. (Friends of Sharphill Wood)

• Rushcliffe’s reputation as a good place to live is jeopardised by the proposal.

• Major traffic issues at Wheatcroft roundabout. Development here will add further congestion to A52 penalising those living in the East of the district.

• Use space to create a proper community wood and nature reserve.

• Development should be spread over more sites, including smaller villages.

• Concern for pupils crossing Melton Rd from Machin’s Lane to Village Street – proposal to modify an already suggested change regarding a cycle way and a dedicated crossing has already been made by this council (Edwalton Neighbourhood Council).

• Concern that parkland set aside in the original plan will be built over in the future.

• Urban area but shouldn’t ruin character.

• Travellers site should be included to prevent unauthorised sites being used.

• Original plan for development was more than enough.

• Would highlight some of the comments made for the 2009 public enquiry: “the proposed Sharphill development would result in significant adverse residual impacts to a designated nature conservation site, a legally protected species and to Priority Habitats and Species under the UK and Nottinghamshire Biodiversity Action Plans. The proposals are therefore contrary to specific planning policies at national, regional and local levels. We support the principle of creation of a Community Park and of establishment and management of appropriate habitats within it. However, in their current form, the mitigation and habitat creation proposals are inadequate to fully address the key impacts of the scheme. These include long-term loss of habitat value within Sharphill Woodland SINC, loss and degradation of hedgerows and loss of habitat and indirect effects to farmland birds and badgers.” “To fully mitigate these
impacts, further measures would be required, including securing the long-term future of the area to the west of Sharphill Wood (Spinney Hill) by its inclusion within the Community Park. This area could then be managed to provide suitable habitat for species that would otherwise be lost from the site”. (NWT)

- Increasing the number of houses by 45% totally undermines the barely adequate, mitigating measures previously proposed by encroaching on the proposed community park and the further proposal to build to the south west of the wood will severely jeopardise the ability of wildlife to sustain itself if surrounded by housing at such close proximity. They would result in the inevitable long term loss of habitat and therefore of threatened species due to the activities of domestic pets and general disturbance. (Friends of Sharphill Wood)

- Sharphill is an iconic local landmark and the skyline must be protected. Against any road skirting the wood, effectively surrounding it, and any building on the fields to the West. If there is no green buffer zone and if it is surrounded by housing, much of the flora and fauna dependent on the wood would be lost. (Friends of Sharphill Wood)

- As owners of Sharphill Wood, Rushcliffe Borough Council has a duty to protect this Site of Importance for Nature Conservation for the benefit of the community and meet the Local Biodiversity Action Plan sustainable development targets. (Friends of Sharphill Wood)

- Council are proposing a combination of increasing the density on the land already proposed, whilst also including some additional land, Gladman raise concerns with this approach and question whether the Council is basing these changes on realistic density assumptions.

- Area to the south-west of Sharphill wood and Edwalton Golf course should be left undeveloped (Cropwell Butler PC).

| Question 5 |
| Do you have any views on how development of land at Melton Road, Edwalton should look, in terms of, for example, the mix and layout of different land uses on the site, the types and level of new services and facilities on the site and their location? |
| An additional food supermarket may be needed as the existing may be insufficient. |
| No strong views provided the extra traffic will be accounted for in providing safe road junctions at Melton Road and around the ring road |
| Identified deficit in housing for the elderly should be tackled – would have added benefit of being a low traffic generating use. (Plumtree Parish Council) |
| No high density development along Melton Road |
| Should be sympathetic to existing housing stock and population. |
| Offer sufficient green space and meet needs for schooling and health care. |
| Possibly another Park and Ride, certainly not a mixed industrial development |
• Schools needed, shops and additional services,
• Play grounds and public facilities to enhance the existing ones.
• Well-designed screening with trees and greenery would make the development more acceptable
• The area is desirable and housing would fetch a premium, therefore provision should be made for affordable homes; starter homes and local services.
• Mixed development of 2-5bed houses with open green spaces.
• If the Waitrose goes ahead then no need for other shops as they won’t be able to compete
• Development without proven demand will only further depress capital values and rents, leading to enforced sales as mortgage rates rise
• Broad location of the various land uses is sensible
• Potential for a wider range of commercial uses and large retail uses
• Low density, lots of green space
• Increased bus service
• High eco standards should be mandated to ensure the houses are cheap to run and energy efficient (avoiding the problem in the future of powering all these extra homes). There should be attention paid to groundwater runoff and developers should be made to ensure that they act to minimise increases in runoff. Self builders should be given the opportunity to build so that these initiatives do not just pour cash into developers pockets.
• More expensive houses to match the current homes in the area
• New and exclusive bike paths leading into the city would be welcome, along with better pedestrian paths.
• Additional supermarket use should be in the plan- existing near capacity
• Land near to the Wheatcroft roundabout could be used for a retirement site similar to the one near the Clifton development. Land to the East of Melton Road could take more housing without causing any problems.
• High density housing
• Increasing the density of housing would mean changing the look of the development, but the increased use of town houses and apartments, such as at Ludlow Hill, could achieve that and remain sympathetic to the locality.
• The ranger and ranger building could be provided to maintain the community park and wood
• Sports, medical facilities, shops and good transport links
• The original plan was carefully thought out for its needs and that plan should stay and not be tampered with
• Reasonable that land within the Green Belt is no longer Green Belt, golf course could be relocated
• Additional development at Edwalton can take place and this should be in the general form on the attached framework plan (John A Wells & Nottingham Airport PLC) some further revisions are also suggested. NB No framework plan attached to paper response (GD)
• Medical Centre – existing provision is only just adequate (Edwalton Neighbourhood
- Public buildings, shops and services should be positioned near the entrance(s) to the development, this would also limit their visual impact. (Edwalton Neighbourhood Council)
- The reduction in the area of land currently proposed as country park, and the establishment of a new development area to the south-west of Sharphill could increase pressure on the wood. Careful consideration required of development design and open space configuration to minimise impacts. Addition of landscaping buffer and green space likely to be needed (Notts County Council)
- This site has the potential for significant areas of archaeological interest where preservation in situ is required (Nottinghamshire County Council)
- Impact of a retail store on vitality and viability of West Bridgford's centre should be considered (Nottinghamshire County Council)
- Proposed residential area to the west of Sharphill Wood is totally unacceptable in ecological terms as with its proposed connecting roads will totally encircle the wood which has a healthy population of badgers amongst other species. We feel that with the proposed increase in development to the east of the wood, this area (to the west) should be incorporated into the community park. (NWT)
- Concerned that building dwellings in such close proximity to setts will mean that badgers will in time access gardens - likely ultimately to lead to the badgers being excluded from their setts.
- Sports pitches in this area will reduce the potential foraging for badgers and will attract more footfall from the proposed development to the east of the wood through the wood to the pitches. We therefore recommend that they are removed from the site altogether and the existing pitches at Rushcliffe Leisure Centre are utilised more effectively. (NWT)
- Increase in housing numbers required could come from an increase in housing density including the use of flats and apartments, changing the proposed employment development on the far south of the site to residential and extending the residential areas to the North of Sharphill Wood and close to the existing settlement off Peveril Drive. This will allow the area around Spinney Hill and the west of the wood to be incorporated into a community park. We also recommend that a woodland buffer could be planted between the far North Western edge of Sharphill Wood and Wilford Hill Wood to the West in order the create a substantial ecological linkage between the two woods. (NWT)
- We welcomed plans for cycling provision in the existing plans for 1200 new dwellings and these should form the basis of provision in any revised plans to accommodate an extra 750 people in this area – specific suggestions are set out in response. (Pedals)
- Proposals map for extra housing at Melton Road - Sharp Hill - subway shown only as 'for emergency use only', no ref to existing status as public footpath let alone proposed status as legally and physically upgraded shared use facility for both cyclists and pedestrians and also connecting to the proposed spine cycleway-footway across the new housing developments towards Boundary Road and the Green Line etc. (Pedals)
• This proposal also involves increasing the density of housing, we would wish to see evidence that the proposal for this area would be able to provide appropriate levels of GI. (Natural England)

• Concerned that housing will be built over an area allocated for a Country Park. We would wish to see other solutions considered before the erosion into this country park allocation. Any future proposals will also need to ensure that strong green infrastructure and ecological links are maintained to the Sharphill Woods Local Wildlife site. (Natural England)

• Part of the area allocated for additional housing falls within grade 2 and 3a in the Agricultural Land Classification. The Plan should recognise that development (soil sealing) has an irreversible adverse impact on the finite national and local stock of BMV and make clear that areas of lower quality agricultural land should be used for development in preference to the BMV land. Avoiding loss of BMV land is the priority as mitigation is rarely possible. Retaining higher quality land enhances future options for sustainable food production and helps secure other important ecosystem services. (Natural England)

• Concerned as to how all the additional facilities be funded?

• Increasing the density would mean changing the look of the development, increased use of town houses and apartments, could achieve that and remain sympathetic to the locality. The proposed BMX track and allotments should remain as should a ranger and ranger building be provided to maintain the community park and wood. (Friends of Sharphill Wood)

• A mix of land uses including residential should be considered at the location depicted on Figure 4. The area should be planned comprehensively – in terms of infrastructure, facilities and services and released from the statutory Green Belt through the Local Plan/Core Strategy accordingly. A full mix of housing can be provided against the scale of provision envisaged with several developers operating across the entire site, thereby ensuring delivery and continuity of housing land supply. (Barratt Homes)

• It is assumed that 40 dwellings could be delivered on additional land to the east of Melton Road. However Ben Bailey Homes is aware of other land to the east of Melton Road, adjacent to Hill House Farm, which falls within this area being identified by the Council for additional development. Therefore it is suggested that the estimate of 40 dwellings as set out on page 31 of the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum might be a little reserved. (Ben Bailey Homes)

• I understand that the land-owner has proposed a new road to be built from the Rushcliffe School area, round the north of the wood, and on to the new housing near the ring road. Additionally, he proposes that football pitches etc should be constructed along the skyline. This is unacceptable:-
  a) proposed new road would mean that the wood is completely surrounded by development and without any open link to the Country Park area, increased pressure for the road network to be fully open to Musters Road for all road users rather than limited to buses.
  b) proposed football pitches on the skyline would inevitably have some features that would be visible from the north, and provision would have to be made for changing
rooms, car parking, etc. All of this would completely spoil what is currently the finest footpath in the Country Park area as it runs along the ridge-line.

c) both the road and the playing fields would make the provision of the "wildlife corridor" difficult or impossible.

- The current proposal is that the build to the east would be 25 metres from the wood with a road round the south and building on the fields to the west of the wood. I am writing to ask you and local politicians to keep to your promise and uphold the safeguards and agreements which were part of the approved plan?

---

**Question 6**

Do you think other land within (to the north) of the A52 should be removed from the Green Belt and at the present time 'safeguarded' from development? If possible, please give reasons for your answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generally positive</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>Generally negative</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- No, this should be reserved for future leisure use
- Need to keep Green Belt
- Yes, specifically Edwalton golf course (which would provide considerable land for housing and still be within the ring road) as an immediate option, not a long term one.
- If development on the golf course occurred, a new course could be provided in a more rural setting outside the ring road - much more acceptable use of Green Belt than housing
- Yes, possible to design new development that can cope with floodplain location and A52 better placed to cope with additional traffic than Melton Road
- Do not believe that any land should be removed from the Green Belt
- Nottingham has a population of 300,000+ covering approximately 29 sq miles = population density of 10,550 person per sq mile. Imperative green belt and undeveloped land around it is retained for environmental benefits, wildlife habitat, control risk of flooding, off set pollution and provide land for recreation and farming.
- As a last resort only
- Development is again restricted due to steep topographical features (Persimmon Homes)
- Would retain the ring road a Green Belt boundary. The golf course could in the long term release more land for construction
- Should not be removed from the Green Belt as this would only offer scope for it to come forward for development potentially in a piecemeal fashion. Any development of this land should be co-ordinated, with this extra land released as appropriate post 2028. (Linden Homes)
• No point in safeguarding, should be kept as Green Belt
• At least the site can be served by existing shops etc.
• Congestion unless a grade separated interchange constructed
• Golf course could be built on. If a golf course is really needed, this could be sited within the remaining Green Belt,
• Perhaps the golf course could be sited on the flood plain.
• Golf course an obvious location for housing and would not affect the character of Edwalton
• Development would impact on character of Edwalton. Cumulative development of golf course and Sharphill would impact on character of Edwalton
• Far more possibilities exist which are not covered by the narrow options of this proposal – dualling the A52 or providing a new Trent crossing would provide greater opportunities
• All Green Belt should be safeguarded from development
• A more credible and sound option, with a strong Green Belt boundary
• Golf course suitable, but as this is owned by Rushcliffe, it would be a political decision to take
• There are a number of golfing alternatives
• Development of the golf course could start once the lease ends in 2017, potential for 700 homes. Land owned by Rushcliffe so residents would benefit from the capital of the sale
• Some villages and hamlets wrongly washed over by Green Belt
• Plenty of existing golf courses, some area underused and these could take the numbers from Edwalton, or new golf course on Hoe Hill.
• Keep as buffer and potential for leisure use
• Should not be taken out otherwise further development to the west will take place
• Wheatcroft house is visible from many areas and should not be swallowed up by other buildings
• The ring road should not be moved and should be remain as a boundary
• Long term view is needed to ensure amended Green Belt boundary will endure beyond the end of the plan period, if necessary safeguarded land should be identified which would only be made available for development after a Local Plan Review (Langridge Homes)
• Land which might be required for development in future should be removed from the Green Belt and protected in the short term through other means of land use control (John A Wells & Nottingham Airport PLC)
• Land is unlikely to come forward during the plan period, as the Green Belt Review identifies it as a longer-term development option, so it would not positively contribute to meeting the Plan’s overall housing target (Notts County Council)
• As a general principle Nottingham City would strongly support the designation of safeguarded land to meet longer term development needs post 2028. (Nottingham City Council, Gedling BC)
• The Parish Council is concerned about proposals to build on Edwalton Golf Course. This would mean a reduction of sports facilities. How would this be replaced?
The argument that the A52 should be the boundary of West Bridgford is undermined by the proposal to build to the east of Gamston. Need to retain green belt land close to urban development both for the protection of wildlife, but also to allow for well managed recreation by the local population. We believe Sharphill cannot withstand increased predation by pets, cyclists and walkers. (Friends of Sharphill Wood)

Assuming further land for housing is needed –safeguarding would be preferable to removal from Green Belt. Don’t follow reasoning here – why propose land North of the A52 for safeguarding but not any of the other areas proposed as candidates for housing land (South of Clifton or near Tollerton etc)? (CPRE)

Rushcliffe in its consultation says Edwalton Golf Course is a possible longer-term development option. TABU does not believe that the number of houses planned for the District of Rushcliffe is appropriate or realistic (see Question 1 above). Nevertheless if increased housing provision is made, we believe that Edwalton Golf Course would be suitable. If developments were staged, development of this area could be approved towards the end of the plan period.

Preferable if this land remained designated green belt. The alternative originally proposed to transfer it to a legally protected trust is an acceptable alternative.

Essential part of Green Belt, maintaining them is a better form of ‘safeguard’ (Cropwell Butler PC).

Proposed development of land east of Gamston (north of Tollerton)

**Question 7**

Do you think that the identified shortfall in proposed new housing in Rushcliffe should be met in part by a major mixed use development on land to the east of Gamston (north of Tollerton), which would include the delivery of around 2,500 homes by 2028, and with capacity to provide around a further 1,500 homes post 2028? Please tick yes or no.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If possible, please give reasons for your answer.

Yes

- Only after a significant proportion of Edwalton and Clifton have been taken up
- Sustainable location for urban extension of separate but linked urban villages, with hedgerows, woods and ridges separating
- Need to exclude sufficient land so that green belt boundary does not come under pressure for review
• Land between the canal and the A52 (including the highway depot) should be included and developed first.
• The site at East Gamston can be successfully utilised to deliver a major housing investment. The scope of this site including re-use of Nottingham Airport will continue to deliver housing for Rushcliffe far beyond the emerging Core Strategy plan period reducing pressure elsewhere in the borough and providing an opportunity for the council to improve existing road networks. Topographically, East Gamston lends itself to residential / employment / retail / service uses. Issues of coalescence between Tollerton and the proposed East Gamston extension can also be safely guarded by the use of green buffers. Please see report attached to consultation response for further detail and maps (Persimmon Homes).
• Use of a brownfield site
• William Davis Ltd do not object to the proposed allocation however, given the great reliance on large strategic sites within the Core Strategy, it is critical that the capacity of the site to accommodate the proposed scale of development is clearly evidenced, and contingency plans put in place to address any shortfall by allocating additional development sites in other sustainable locations.
• Worth considering development in part of this area, particularly on the Tollerton airfield site
• Disagree that the land East of Gamston should have less industry than South of Clifton
• Flat and least obtrusive area
• Yes but development at Clifton and Edwalton should be prioritised
• John A Wells & Nottingham Airport PLC do not object to the preferred approach identified by the Council but consider that a higher quality, landscape led scheme can be planned with the inclusion of other areas of land, some of this could be incorporated into the scheme but retained as Green Belt (John A Wells & Nottingham Airport PLC)
• The Consortium fully support the proposed development of a SUE and will work with the Council to develop a detailed proposal for the site which accords with the site allocation. The Consortium intends to prepare a planning application at the earliest opportunity. (Gamston Consortium) the response sets out further details relating to this site.
• 4,000 homes cannot be satisfactorily accommodated (without compromising design quality and open space provision) unless land to the north of the Grantham Canal in the vicinity of the County Council depot is also included (Gamston Developer Consortium).
• There is no merit in keeping a gap between any development and Bassingfield (various landowners around Bassingfield). Land around the village should be identified for development.
• The Gamston site appears to be of generally low nature conservation value, although useful if (preliminary) site surveys were available to support this (Notts County Council)
• This site has the potential for significant areas of archaeological interest where
preservation in situ is required (Nottinghamshire County Council)

- There are a number of small watercourses that run through the area of search and pose a localised risk of flooding. Considered to be sufficient land within the area to ensure that built development is directed away from areas at risk of flooding, in accordance with the sequential approach (Environment Agency)
- Supportive that a spatial strategy of urban concentration has been followed as a basis for identifying this particular strategic development site given that it would represent an extension to the main built up area of Nottingham (Erewash BC, Nottingham City Council, Gedling BC)
- This would be a fairly natural extension of the existing development. Proviso should be the upgrading of supporting infrastructure
- Logic in building on brownfield land at the airfield if this is large enough to support adequate local facilities and if it can be built around efficient public transport and there are good pedestrian and cycle routes to West Bridgford (and the riverside) so it is not completely car dependent. Seems no reason to limit the development to 2,500 by 2028. With regard to employment land, re-use of parts of the airfield for industry may make sense but there is no case for further car dependent business parks.

No

- Why is industrial expansion required?
- Hard to comment without information on predicted population
- Much smaller area than Clifton, Ruddington, Edwalton. Impact on village and its character
- Land within the A52 could instead be removed from Green Belt without compromising its purpose
- There is no clear and sustainable boundary to the Green Belt east of the ring road at Tollerton
- Providing the remainder of housing required in a third SUE will increase potential for not delivering housing required in plan period. It will also exacerbate shortfall in completions for first part of plan period. (Linden Homes)
- Concerns re deliverability of site – currently still an operational airport. No consortium at present with which to secure provision of infrastructure and necessary facilities. Unlikely to start to deliver before 2020. Better solution to distribution reasonable portion of dwellings around sustainable towns and villages (Linden Homes)
- There are brown sites which should be built on first
- Due to previous mine tunnels running through this area it is questionable whether building in the area would be safe from undue subsidence.
- Entails building on good agricultural land used for arable crops
- Grantham Canal is important well used amenity, development will risk disturbance of its wildlife
- In 2012 18 pillboxes around the site were listed as Grade II structures. Whilst other surviving structures on the airfield itself are not designated, there is a clear inter-relationship between these which forms a key part of the setting and significance of the designated heritage assets and as part of a military landscape. As heritage assets
Substantial harm or loss to grade II listed buildings should be exceptional (paragraph 132 NPPF). We are concerned that the development of this site for housing requires the removal of the non-designated assets and building on this site in order to accommodate this level of growth. The loss of these may be harmful in itself, and furthermore this, and the development of the land between the pillboxes, is likely to affect the setting of the designated heritage assets. We consider that the allocation of this site for housing has the potential to be substantial harm in relation to the significance of these 18 grade II listed buildings, through development within their setting. Consider work is required to assess the significance of the site in heritage terms as a former military aviation site to fully understand the impact both on the designated and non-designated heritage assets. The impact of proposals on this significance should then be assessed. This should include assessment of the whole site, including both designated and non-designated heritage assets here. Should this site, on the basis of a proper understanding of the historic environment implications and level of harm to heritage assets, still be found to be, on balance, the preferred option, measures for mitigation should be properly explored (English Heritage)

- Poor links with Gamston- very difficult to access by foot (and car at times). Street layout does not allow for crossings easily
- 4000 homes needs a massive investment in transport infrastructure- currently single carriageway access along Radcliffe Road, constricted access into city
- Development will suffocate the Green Belt around Tollerton Mobile Home Park and ruin this quiet residential area for elderly people.
- Urban boundary to east of Gamston well established by A52, any new development to east of the A52 will have a greater impact in terms of urban sprawl and encroachment into countryside than that to the west of Clifton
- No consideration given to impact on local settlements i.e. Edwalton, Tollerton, Gamston, West Bridford
- Overcrowding, crime and traffic concerns
- Increases in traffic will have a negative impact on the environment and air quality
- Tollerton and Bassingfield’s village identities will be threatened
- Only safe exit from Tollerton via Tollerton Land and Melton Road traffic lights already difficult to access due to selfish parking at Tollerton School and nursery which obstructs the view of oncoming traffic on the lane.
- Frequent traffic tailbacks on A606 due to accidents at Wheatcroft Island and high vehicles getting stuck under the railway bridge
- Development should be in the vicinity of the recently duelled A46
- Support Tollerton residents alternative plan
- Experts are now linking car Co2 emissions to cancer, development will raise these emission levels further
- Maybe ‘yes’ to a much smaller development – 200 houses on land north of the Canal and west of Bassingfield. Should be separate and screened from Bassingfield, Tollerton and Green Belt.
- Cannot accept that the site has capacity for numbers proposed along with the private
hospital that already has permission and ensuring Tollerton Airport remains.

- Historical features should be preserved i.e. the pill boxes
- Any proposed industrial development should not encroach on the Green Belt, Council Highway Depot adjacent to Lings Bar could be redeveloped for this use.
- The Government clearly state that the wish to leave the Green Belt for farming and future generations
- Where are these future residents coming from and would they be able to afford the so-called affordable homes
- A52 and A606 would seize up twice a day with queues back to Bingham and possibly Stanton on the Wolds
- Area is prime farmland, grade 2 land
- Rich in wildlife
- Expansion over A52- would eventually lead to a creep consuming Bassingfield, Tollerton and Cotgrave
- How would roads cope unless a 4th Trent crossing was built?
- If the airport is lost to development, there is almost no possibility that a replacement could be provided, impact on an asset to Nottingham
- Out of proportion with existing surrounding villages, vast increase proportionally
- Flawed housing calculations.
- Would open door to filling between West Bridgford, Radcliffe and Ruddington
- Don’t believe only way to achieve sustainability is to build next to the urban area-trend towards home working and flexible office space
- Has Ruddington been considered in the plan?
- Construction of 250 homes a year will mean construction traffic over a long period
- The proposed Travellers site would be more suitably situated on the present Council site next to the A52 by the roundabout and should be well monitored
- The only possibility for the area is to build cheap flats/housing, which will affect the character of the area
- Increased housing figure is based on flawed/out of date calculations. Does not seem sensible to set aside land for a further 1500 homes post 2028. There will have been further iterations of the Local Plan by 2018 and ample opportunity to revise housing figures at a later date.
- Sharphill will already have an impact on Tollerton, cumulative impact of this and East of Gamston development on Tollerton. Why should this small village of 850 have the ‘lions share’ of development. Ratio of existing to new housing is completely out of proportion to elsewhere
- Need a firm commitment to a tram link to the city centre, dualing of Lings Bar and Melton Road
- Difficult to fully evaluate any potential impacts because this is a new site and no baseline ecological information is currently available to us we would expect any development to fall under the EIA Regulations as an “Urban Development” exceeding 0.5 ha under Schedule 2, paragraph 10b of The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011. (NWT)
- Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust set out in their response the GI and Biodiversity Action
Plan Habitats they would expect to see as part of any development on the site (NWT)

- Prefer developed area not to north of Grantham Canal - concern about increased recreational pressures on the suite of wetland habitats, including our own recent new acquisition in Holme Pierrepont (area known as “Blotts Pit”) which forms an extension to our existing Skylarks nature reserve creating the largest reserve in Rushcliffe. If Gamston is a focus for growth we would suggest a commuted sum is made available to manage and increase the area of land under conservation management in the HPP to Lady Bay area, to allow it to better cope with the pressure caused by the increase in residents. (NWT)

- Gladman raise serious concerns in relation to the inclusion of this site. The Council need to demonstrate in a clear and transparent manner how they have come to the decision that this location is appropriate to come forward as an SUE through the Core Strategy. Proposals should be subject to a Sustainability Appraisal and also viability testing.

- If a significant number of houses was built east of Gamston, it would be difficult to achieve any connectivity with that suburb. As the Tribal study noted, the layout of streets in Gamston does not lead to the Ring road, and there are no existing links. There is at present only one pedestrian crossing, and crossing the road at any other point is hazardous. We do not believe that either bridges or subways (were they to be provided) would overcome this problem.

Question 8

Do you have any views on how development of land to the east of Gamston (north of Tollerton) should look, in terms of, for example, the mix and layout of different land uses on the site, the types and level of new services and facilities on the site and their location?

- Development dependent on improved road access to the city and hospitals, new bridges, new school?
- How will the independence of Tollerton village be maintained? Need to retain green spaces around the village and retain village feel. Consideration must be given to wide buffers. Buffer should be wider than existing proposals and sustainable
- Increased traffic through the village- plans should be put in place to prevent this
- Extra junctions should be built on A52, taking traffic out without it using Tollerton Lane
- Should be developed on a much smaller scale and into a new town not Tollerton – would no longer be a village
- The only pedestrian crossing of the ring road is north of the canal
- Development should only be very small and only as a last resort if all other options have been developed
- Any development should be north of the canal – direct access to ring road and better links to Gamston.
• Traffic created by the development should be diverted away from Tollerton Lane – used by many cyclists and lots of bad bends; but this would be difficult to achieve as Tollerton residents need access to the A52 in the event of problems on the A606.
• NHS & Private hospital originally planned for the area should go ahead.
• Not a good location for social housing as poor links to city and employment opportunities.
• Please see plan DSK001 attached. (Tollerton Parish Council response)
• The proposal put forward by our local parish council seemed very sympathetic to the environment and our village.
• An alternative proposal has been circulated by TABU showing an expansion beginning west of Bassifield as it makes the best attempt at linking with the existing conurbation of Gamston and West Bridgford even though existing road patterns do not encourage linking to a new development. This assumes that the A52 notional boundary is breached. Answers given previously state that this is the least favoured option. (Bryan Cather)
• Significant investment needed into A52 and A606 to cope with increase in traffic generated.
• Listen to the public and those MPs who are trying to halt development of housing in the Green Belt – should only be used in exceptional circumstances.
• Should be limited development, sympathetic to local environment with significant provision of affordable housing.
• Tollerton residents alternative plan should be considered.
• No high rise development.
• The area should be bound by the Grantham Canal, Thurbeck Dyke and the bridleway adjacent to Homestead Farm, to maintain the individuality of Tollerton and Cotgrave and protect the more environmentally sensitive areas to the North of the Grantham Canal.
• No need to offer specific community development as it would afford easy access to facilities at Gamston.
• In order to maintain character of Tollerton, a wide green boundary between the village and new houses would be required.
• Village lands should not be used or must be rethought with bus, cycle and pedestrian access.
• May compromise existing services, yet volume may not support a new doctors/ dentist.
• Any development must be low rise.
• Any buffer with Tollerton would realistically be quickly eroded.
• There should be no additional development between the airport and Tollerton. The airport could be used for facilities such as office, business, health, education and recreation.
• Employment only on Tollerton airport.
• Speed restrictions or bus ramps on Tollerton Lane.
• Locate development alongside the A52 so access is onto A52.
• Land from Gamston island to Tollerton Lane may be an option but must shield Bassingfield, then it could run from Tollerton Lane down to Morrisons but only 100
metres back from the road to shield Tollerton.

- Any new development should not result in a ‘new town’ being established
- Prefer Tollerton residents alternative plan to the 3 Council suggestions
- Should not occur until A52 is dualled back to A46
- Access across the A52 is currently hazardous
- Should be a self-contained development
- Shops should be located close to Gamston, development should be part of Gamston not Tollerton
- Development should be in proportion with Tollerton so that it can be integrated into the community
- Would like to see canal protected
- Industrials units East of Gamston should be close to the A52, with roundabouts to ease access and slow down traffic
- Development to be constrained to Tollerton airport
- Get developers to build a lot of one-level accommodation for the elderly – they will be the only people able to afford Tollerton/Edwalton homes (because they don’t need mortgages
- Development if necessary should be in much smaller stages
- Airport could make a pleasant self-contained development
- The provision of a new supermarket should be made at Edwalton and then a later study made following the absorption of the housing and facilities built there before determining what should be built at Tollerton
- Integrity of Bassingfield and Tollerton should be protected – airfield is more suitable site than greenfield sites.
- Disagree that east of Gamston should have less land allocated for employment than Clifton as it is slightly less accessible to M1 corridor. If anything, more land is needed for employment use so that those living in the new development can more easily access employment without driving. (Tollerton PC)
- Plan attached to Tollerton Parish Council’s response.
- Comprehensive transport assessment required for this site considering specifically how to
  - Facilitate use of sustainable modes of transport
  - Deal with severance caused by Lings Bar Road between West Bridgford and new development
  - Solve road congestion problems caused by additional vehicles converging onto Trent Bridge from the new settlement
  - How Rushcliffe envisage well designed, attractive funded alternatives to driving becoming a reality (Tollerton PC)
- Part justifying a development because it could raise funds for road infrastructure conflicts with the principles of plan making. We would like to see the calculations RBC have used to arrive at the claim that their preferred option would be capable of raising funds for the infrastructure needed. Seems unlikely a developer would be prepared to contribute the sums needed. (Tollerton PC)
- Employment, recreational facilities, schools, community facilities are needed
- Should reopen the Cotgrave rail link to allow for a sustainable development there.
- Development should be staged over many years
- Softening the edge of existing Clifton estate is perfectly possible, therefore it should not be treated as a 'hard edge' for building new housing against.
- Detrimental pincer-movement on Ruddington, including Sharphill
- May be justification for building 400-500 homes north of the canal providing the residents of Bassingfield are in agreement
- Massive infrastructure for many years whilst the building and infrastructure is being put in place
- The development should be designed such that its nature conservation value is maximised. This should include enhancements to existing green corridors of the Grantham Canal (which is a SINC) and Polser Brook, and through careful design of surface water attenuation features. There may also be the scope for significant areas of woodland planting. (Notts County Council)
- Consideration should also be given to improved access into the countryside around the development area, including east towards Cotgrave Country Park and north to the Holme Pierrepont area. (Notts County Council)
- The transport and connectivity issues will be most challenging if a significant development is permitted to the east of the A52. Essential that this site can be linked to West Bridgford by public transport, and well integrated into Gamston with sustainable transport opportunities (Notts County Council)
- It has been suggested that the A52 would be diverted bypassing the A52 Gamston roundabout. This would provide a clear boundary and minimise segregation from the rest of the built up area. Further consideration of extent/ location would be needed, which may affect the position of the housing allocation (Notts County Council)
- Provision for cyclists should include a series of safe links across and alongside the A52 Gamston-Lings Bar Road (suggested works set out in response) (Pedals)
- We recommend that there should be a buffer area of undeveloped land adjacent to the Grantham Canal which is a Local Wildlife Site to allow for the protection of this site. (Natural England)
- Opposed to a travellers' site being included in the proposal. Would expect this would have a detrimental effect on the pricing of any new housing development and lead to builders being reluctant to offer their services. Local solicitors' searches will inevitably reveal the plan for such a site and that would be likely to put many would be residents off buying.
- Any development to the east of Gamston MUST include better access to Gamston/Morrisons from the A52, Tollerton side. At busy times it's a nightmare to either enter or exit from Gamston to go to/come from the Tollerton side of the road. A similar situation prevails at the junction of Tollerton Lane, but this is not nearly so busy.
**Appendix 2**

**Summary of general responses (letters/emails)**

**General comments:**

- Houses should be well designed and built to the highest ecological standards- high insulation standards and solar panels. These building standards do not necessarily mean an increased price
- The principle urban area has been developed too far already
- The Local Plan development should not be handed over to volume builders.
- The 2009 design guide was a huge step forward and hopefully this will mean that Gamston and Compton Acres are not repeated- too much priority given to the car rather than community and environment- open up to architectural competition
- Plan new build with variation, greenery, ecology and community in mind
- Need continual engagement between planners, designers and developers
- Impact on biodiversity, bat populations in particular under threat. We should be trying to increase biodiversity
- Money should be spend of modernizing existing housing, which have the worst standards in Europe
- Infrastructure crossing the river Trent would not be able to cope with extra cars
- Need to maintain village identity of Ruddington, development south of Clifton may impact on this
- There appeared to be little justification or objective analysis behind previous regional housing figures, yet these figures have been assumed by Rushcliffe
- Small numbers could be added to a number of surrounding villages without destroying the character of these
- People need somewhere to live, new developments should not be clock as it will provide employment and facilities at a time when these are diminishing elsewhere
- More housing on brownfield, including airfields, even if this increases commuting
- Wider consultation across West Bridgford to assess knock-on effects of development
- Should not have more car dependent developments when the elderly and under 30’s have less access to cars
- Impressed by the plans to build houses in between Gamston and Tollerton as I believe this will bring progressive changes to the area. An increasing population always brings in new opportunities, such as ideas and shops.
- Development of housing may lead to people moving out of West Bridgford to elsewhere
- The vast proportion of additional homes being proposed are within less than 1 mile of each other and on the edge of one of the most expensive areas in the region
- Gamston the worst of the three housing options due to proximity to Trent crossings and traffic impacts
- Could build houses to the East of Clifton Village
- Impact on traffic in Ruddington, improvements should include:
  - Junction improvements at the Nottingham Knight.
  - Junction improvements on the A60 at the junctions with Ashworth Avenue, Easthorpe...
Street and Kirk Lane.

- Improvements to the junction of Clifton Road and Wilford Road.
- Bus priority measures at the Nottingham Knight.
- Traffic calming measures (NOT humps) in the centre of Ruddington.
- Improvements to the ring road and the dualling of the A52 by Edwalton.
- A ‘Park and Ride’ on or near the Ruddington Business Park. This would reduce traffic from there to the City and reduce parking in Ruddington centre

(Nigel Boughton-Smith, Rushcliffe Borough Councillor Ruddington)

The Council should be considering these sites in a comprehensive manner, rather than the approach which they are taking through which they are proposing the housing provision on these sites without clarity on whether linked to the increased scale of housing these sites should be offering additional facilities and services. This will have an impact on land availability on these sites and needs to be adequately considered (Gladman)

- Need to have flexibility in delivering SUE’s and allowing for non-delivery, as these often take a long time to deliver (Gladman)
- The impact of 13,150 new homes in Rushcliffe generating a potential new population of over 30,000 should not be underestimated. This new population would represent an increase of 25% to our patient population which would undoubtedly require comprehensive planning of health service provision in both primary and secondary care (NHS Rushcliffe Clinical commissioning group).

Land at Melton Road, Edwalton related comments:

- Impact on leisure activities- walking, running and cycling, impact on enjoyment
- Greater traffic flow, air and noise pollution, air quality management area declared on parts of Loughborough and Radcliffe Road.
- Concerns over congestion
- Addition of traffic lights and extra vehicles will cause traffic issues.
- Concern for pupils crossing Melton Road from Machin’s Lane to Village Street
- Concern over safety implications of traffic, particularly on schools in the area
- Visual impact of housing
- Concern over safety of cyclists on Melton Road- what measures are being considered to preserve the safety of cyclists?
- Brownfield sites should be used first
- The country park should not be reduced, concern over significant reduction
- Failure of developers to start work by the agreed date
- The decision not to open up the Musters Road entrance should be reconsidered- direct access to West Bridgford facilities
- Medical centre needed
- The traffic and visual impact of public buildings, shops and services would be reduced if positioned near Wheatcroft
- An extra 550 homes will impact upon the amenity of the protected woodland/ area
proposed as undeveloped land

- Not clear that facility provision will be adequate
- The council should reinstate the distance between the nature reserve and housing
- Road measures such as the underpass should be reinstated, road infrastructure improved. Bus for residents idea should be retained
- Protect Green space around Sharphill, protect wildlife including badgers, skylarks, woodpeckers, buzzards
- Need to have parkland for the enjoyment of the public, good for physical and mental health
- Loss of landscape from building on the hillside
- No travellers site, impact on character of area
- Smaller development for elderly, no more than 300 homes
- Tollerton and Clifton better places to be included
- The tram needs a West Bridgford branch
- Buffer around the wood should be retained at 75m as in original plans, need to uphold safeguards and agreements which were part of the original plan
- Object to development of the west of the site
- Traffic impact of Musters Road being used as a direct route to the city
- During heavy rain, the down flow of water from Sharp Hill can lift the drains on Loughborough Road/ Eton Road. Flood risk with less area to soak away
- No building further up the slope or around the west side of the wood
- There could be additional homes here by having more affordable social housing instead of so many larger homes
- Can the level of social housing be reduced to help improve the viability of the site without increasing the number of houses?
- Can houses be developed on the industrial/college areas?
- Can one or more of the sport pitches be used for housing?
- Can the additional land at the top of the Melton Triangle that has been added to the plans accommodate a number of additional houses?
- Concern that plans for a bus gate may be compromised/ abandoned
- A new planning application should be assessed as there have been many changes since planning was originally passed
- Car parking issues in West Bridgford
- Development on the edge of the urban area and potential Waitrose may weaken the function of West Bridgford town centre
- The proposed new road linking to the West of the site would mean that the wood is completely surrounded by development and without any open link to the Country Park area. This would make a wildlife corridor impossible
- If the council decides to allocate further land near Sharphill Wood, this should be by the ring road and away from the wood
- Football pitches, parking and changing provision etc would impact on the ridgeline
- Impact on Edwalton conservation area
- The infrastructure provisions including the financial contribution of £60,000 are inadequate
• Would prefer at least half of it to be "council housing" because there are many people who simply cannot afford to purchase a property, even 'affordable' housing
• Currently poor cycle provision, this needs to be more than just painted lines
• What will be done for the safety of children with more traffic on the roads?
• Size of country park reduced already, what is to stop further proposal being submitted for more homes in the future being built on the proposed country park?
• Pressure on existing policy force
• No need for another supermarket with a Morrisons close by and new Sainsbury's
• Increased density housing will require more green space not less
• Major concern about the conurbation coalescing with Ruddington- with Sharphill there would be very little separation between Ruddington and Edwalton

Land south of Clifton related comments:

• Concerns over traffic impacts on Kegworth- more motorists using the village roads to bypass the traffic congestion at J24 of the M1. Need for traffic calming as a result. Pollution impacts on Derby Road and London Road in Kegworth, which are already Air Quality Management Areas
• The housing types proposed pay little regard to integration and may polarise communities
• Drainage is a significant issue, hard to see how a balancing pond would address this. The sloping nature of the site could result in considerable runoff. Concern over potential sewerage runoff
• Meeting House Close would be unable to cope with an increase in traffic as a result of the proposals
• Would be hard to achieve pedestrian and cycle access to the south of the site- The nature of access via Mill Lane does not link up to what is proposed. The site would encourage vehicle use
• Concerns over biodiversity impacts
• Development south of Clifton will inevitably create pressure for their absorption into the city
• A453 expansion and tram extension will not cope with increase in housing
• Major infrastructure required to make scheme work.
• Concern over power lines and the health implications of these
• Impact on swans which occupy both sides of Gotham Road, consideration should be given to protecting their environment
• Concerns:
  - The amenity of residents on the Clifton side needs to be preserved as much as possible – especially along Summerwood Lane, Manesty Crescent and Larkhill Village
  - Development needs to connect well and not be detrimental to Clifton
  - Employment in Clifton may be threatened by extra housing south of Clifton- need adequate proposals to guarantee employment levels in this area
  - Any proposals would need a fresh detailed transport study to see if they are
Land to the east of Gamston/ north of Tollerton related comments:

- Not the demand for housing
- Concerned about traffic- existing infrastructure (A52/A6011) does not support commuter traffic
- Tollerton Lane should be diverted to access the A52 north of the canal. Making a roundabout to Morrisons and Gamston would make Lings Bar safer
- Once the A52 is breached, where will it end? Risk of continuous urban sprawl
- Impact on the village of Tollerton
- Current infrastructure could not cope, building new roads and drains will cause environmental damage. Parking in West Bridgford for amenities is already difficult
- Housing should be built near to Clifton due to infrastructure provision, A452 widening.
- Around the recently improved A46 might be more suitable for housing
- Development should be north of the A52 near Holme Pierrepont
- Other areas such as Clifton, Edwalton and Ruddington have a far wider range of shopping, leisure and other facilities than Tollerton. Would be easier to integrate housing into these places without changing the character to the extent of Tollerton
- Virtually every facility would have to be created from scratch in this location
- Tribal Study recommended no development here due to transport and flooding
- Development would increase the need for another Trent crossing
- There are 5 footpaths and a canal which run through this area, which could complicate development. Insufficient public transport to the city
- Where is the demand for employment going to come from?
- Development may increase runoff and flood risk
- The airport wants to increase business traffic, helping Nottingham’s economy
- Impact on existing property values
- Residents of the mobile home park are elderly and would not be able to stand the noise, dirt and upheaval of building. There must be other fields available without surrounding the park
- Conflict of interest- Rushcliffe owning some of the land
- Why can’t the tram be built here?
- Tollerton Lane should be closed between Tollerton village and the new development- this road is currently used as a cut-through between the A606 and A52. Cotgrave Lane should be blocked off.
- Tollerton Parish Council put forward a proposal to take Rushcliffe’s option 2 for the site and push this forward. The proposals are unjust and will envelope Bassingfield.
- Airport should remain current size or be removed
- Would swamp Tollerton park and impact on character
- There should be several feeder roads/roundabouts on the A52 ring road with access not via Tollerton Lane
- Tollerton Lane should be restricted to 30mph with speed humps and cameras
- A single footpath should be installed to the East of Tollerton Lane (as currently included as part of previous plans for the airport redevelopment).
- Try developing the airport first with industrial units and see how many companies are interested in re-deploying their business to the area. Also how many jobs will be created to support further house building.
- Should not replace council depot with gypsy site
- Bypass land around Gamston would impact on the Water Sports Centre
- Main response- letter (TABU):
  Thousands of houses unoccupied in Rushcliffe and brownfield sites still available
  Would ruin integrity of Tollerton, Bassingfield and Gamston, linking the three areas
  No scope for alteration in roads at Gamston Bridge, Lady Bay bridge and Trent Bridge- traffic issues, pollution, increased commuting time. Wheatcroft and Nottingham Knight roundabouts at capacity.
  Tollerton Lane/ Cotgrave lane cannot be widened along their length to create alternative routes
  Insufficient bus services to the city at present.
  Any development should be a viable addition to the existing village
Annex C

Summary of and feedback from events

C1 Introduction

C1.1 In summary, the consultation events undertaken as part of the consultation consisted of:

- Workshops (by invite) involving 15-20 people – local Councillors, parish councillors and other interested members of the community. The aim of the workshops was to facilitate a better understanding of the proposals and consider matters including where exactly development might take place and what it might include. There were separate workshops for each of the three main locations proposed for further housing development.

- Community consultation events (open to all) – ‘drop-in’ style events to provide the opportunity for the wider community to understand the proposals and give their views and comments. The outcomes of the workshops were, where possible, used to inform presentation material at these events. The workshops undertaken were specific to each of the three main locations proposed for further housing development.

C2 Structure of events

Workshop structure

C2.1 Workshop events were held focusing on each of the proposed locations for further housing development. These consisted of three hour events attended by invited members of the local community, including parish councillors, local Borough and County councillors and other local community leaders. The attendees were split into groups and asked to consider the Council’s proposals, including where exactly development might take place and what it might include. A facilitator was on hand at the Gamston and Edwalton consultation events to encourage participation in the workshops by all attendees.

C2.2 To set the scene, the existing proposals (where relevant) and new proposals for each of the three proposed locations for further housing development were outlined in general terms. During the session, a summary of the key
facts/comments gathered by the Council for each area was presented to attendees. The information for these summaries had been gathered through previous consultation events and the Council’s own research covering the following themes:

- Your facilities/ economy
- Your housing
- Your transport
- Your economy

C2.3 Below is an example of the key comments presented to the workshop groups

C2.4 To focus discussions and comments, broad structured exercises were undertaken. These varied dependent on the area being considered, with the Land East of Gamston workshop presenting more of a blank canvas on which to consider different development options. More detail is provided on the structure of each workshop.

C2.5 Broadly, the workshops started by looking at local features, including potential constraints to development, to give a background to each site. The general aim was to consider how the proposed new housing could be accommodated. This was done in order to:

- Get views on possible plans already prepared for the site
- Identify whether it should be done differently
- Seek views on a possible new Green Belt boundary

C2.6 Attendees were presented with a series of maps showing existing local features, including potential constraints to development, to give a background to each site.

**Figure 1: Constraints to development adjacent to the Nottingham Primary Urban Area (example from workshop)**

C2.7 Once discussion had taken place on local features and issues, workshop attendees considered what development should occur and where. The format and detail of these discussions varied from workshop to workshop. A broad discussion of infrastructure requirements and priorities was also carried out. Where existing proposals had been previously put forward, attendees were encouraged to comment on the revised proposals for these sites. To assist with discussions, attendees were presented with a plan of the area including an aerial photo, a plan from the Green Belt Review and an extract from the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

C2.8 Finally, attendees were asked to comment on indicative masterplans/concept plans put forward by the council at this stage. Where attendees did not agree with the masterplan/concept plan approach, they were encouraged to give their opinion as to what development should occur and where.
Workshop outcomes

C2.9 At each workshop session, attendees were split into three groups, each group also had an officer from the Council acting as a facilitator and another officer of the Council taking notes and recording all of the comments made by attendees. These comments will be made available to the Inspector. In addition, a summary of key comments were taken from the sessions and presented at the public exhibition events. An example is shown below.

An example of comments collected from workshop sessions

| Priority to identify a defensible boundary to protect Tollerton. Airfield could be used as part of this boundary. |
| If north of canal area is included for development, could the buffer at Tollerton be larger? |
| Should look to incorporate environmental sustainability design measures |
| No strong view that development shouldn’t go north of the canal |
| Polser Brook not considered strong enough boundary by some, others disagreed. |
| Protect the meadow land – sky larks are often seen there |
| Where does surface water go when the area is concreted over? |
| Development should not breach the A52 – good defensible boundary |
| Canal is a good defensible boundary |
| Grantham Canal should be protected as an important asset |
| Considered important to include the airfield in the area for development – otherwise it will simply get added in at a later stage anyway – brownfield site, makes the most sense. |
| History of flooding in Tollerton |
| Contamination of airfield |

Public exhibitions structure

C2.10 The aim of the events was to provide a ‘drop-in’ opportunity for the wider community, presenting them with the feedback received from the workshop events and with Planning Policy Officers on hand to answer questions and provide information regarding the consultation and the process to date. Events were held in village halls local to proposed housing growth locations, with an additional event in Clifton (in Nottingham City); given the cross-
boundary implications arising from development south of Clifton. Events were advertised via leaflets posted to local residents in each area, along with posters/ signs for each event. The public consultation events are summarised on the following pages.

Public exhibition Exercise 1:

C2.11 Attendees were presented with background information on housing allocation and the reasoning behind proposals for an extra 3,550 homes. Key points and comments from the workshop events were presented, along with maps showing potential constraints to development. A large outline map of the proposed development area was displayed, along with post-it notes for people to leave comments on specific site issues.

Public exhibition Exercise 2:

C2.12 Attendees were presented with a number of potential development options for each of the three proposed housing growth areas, and were asked to express their preferred site option, using a sticker. An example preference table is shown below.

Table 1: Example of preference table for exercise 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible approach</th>
<th>Estimated Number of homes</th>
<th>Please use a sticker to mark your preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Council’s preferred approach)</td>
<td>4,000 (2,500 before 2028)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,500 (2,500 before 2028)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop suggestion A</td>
<td>4,000 (2,500 before 2028)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop suggestion B</td>
<td>4,000 (2,500 before 2028)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop suggestion C</td>
<td>At least 3,500 homes (2,500 before 2028)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public exhibition Exercise 3:

C2.13 Attendees were presented with a potential illustrative masterplan put forward by Rushcliffe Borough Council. Comments on the masterplan gathered at the workshop session were also presented. Information on potential infrastructure requirements and provision was also presented for comment.

Questions and Answers

C2.14 A number of commonly asked questions were presented, including information on the Green Belt review. A timeline was displayed, showing the development of the Core Strategy and the role of consultation events as part of this process.

Feedback

C2.15 Leaflets were provided for attendees to provide comments, with a box for leaving comments.
C3 Public Engagement for proposals for land south of Clifton

C3.1 This part summarises feedback from the following consultation events and specifically in relation to the proposed strategic allocation on land south of Clifton (in Barton in Fabis Parish)

Summary of the workshops and public exhibitions

Tuesday 18 June (5pm to 8pm) Workshop (Held in Thrumpton)

Workshop with parish councillors/community representatives from Barton in Fabis, Gotham, and Thrumpton.

Thursday 4 July (3pm to 8pm): Public Exhibition (Gotham Memorial Hall)
Monday 15 July (3pm to 8pm): Public Exhibition (Clifton Cornerstone)
Thursday 25 July (10am to 3pm): Public Exhibition (Larkhill Retirement Village)
Thursday 1 August (5pm to 8pm): Public Exhibition (Barton in Fabis Village Hall)

For this series of public exhibitions, the exercises from the workshop were presented along with feedback from this. Attendees were presented with information on the existing site and previous proposals, with maps showing key features, opportunities and site constraints. Different potential site options were presented, along with a preferred option, and there was the opportunity for respondents to record their preference.

At the Lark Hill public exhibition, a presentation was given to residents to outline the background to the proposals being put forward. A condensed version of the exhibition was displayed, and a Question & Answer session was undertaken. As with the other events, attendees were invited to leave comments.

Information was also presented on the Green Belt review and infrastructure, along with some frequently asked questions. Feedback was collected both through post-it notes and a response form. A sample of the response forms can be found in Appendix A.
Summary of group workshop- Land south of Clifton

Exercise 1: How should housing be accommodated?

C3.2 The session started with an introduction giving a background to the proposals, and why further housing was being considered on this site. Following a broad discussion where attendees raised thoughts and issues, the first exercise aimed to consider how the additional proposed 500 homes should be accommodated. Views were gathered on possible plans already prepared for the site, and whether the proposal should be done differently.

C3.3 In doing this, attendees were asked to consider in turn whether additional housing should be provided within the existing overall site area; or whether the site should be expanded further to the south.

Exercise 2: Where should housing go?

C3.4 The aim of the exercise was to review existing proposed development components (e.g. 30% affordable housing,) and the layout of housing, employment, open space, roads and services, and then:
Identify for the higher number of 3,000 new homes:

1. what infrastructure and services are needed – same as existing proposal or something different; and
2. where housing (incl. gypsy and traveller pitches), employment, open space, roads and services should broadly be located – similar to the existing proposal or something different?

C3.5 At the workshop event, attendees were provided with a large scale, blank map of the site. They considered infrastructure requirements; the location of employment, the local centre and housing as well as enhanced Green Infrastructure. Members of the groups were provided with other background information, such as constraints maps.

C3.6 In the table below is a summary of the group comments made in relation to the following questions:

- How should additional housing be accommodated?
- If development of 3,000 homes happens, what should be included in the development and where should it go?
C3.7 While these are the recorded general views of each group, the comments were not necessarily supported by each group member individually and some attendees reserved the right not to give a view at all.

Table 2: Summary of group comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>General summary of response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Green | • Defensible boundary needed, power lines not a strong boundary. Water feature could be used as a boundary.  
       | • Need to keep green areas adjacent to the A453 and north of the Trent  
       | • Question whether employment is actually needed on site  
       | • Science/ enterprise park more appropriate, B8 development would ruin ‘gateway’ and is a visible location  
       | • Allotments should be provided  
       | • History of flooding in the south west corner of site  
       | • concern about the removal of the requirement for a development brief. Need a cohesive design strategy, paying attention to local identity  
       | • Improved green space network, the area to the west of the new A453 should be better quality open space  
       | • Green space to the North of Gotham as a boundary  
       | • Improved cycle routes needed  
       | • There is no play area / playing pitches at Barton in Fabis, would be good if this could be 'gifted' to the Parish as part of the development  
       | • Concern increased runoff would impact on Gotham  
       | • Would prefer higher density |
| Blue  | • Objection to removal of design brief from Policy 23, essential to ensure local people have full involvement in shaping the development  
       | • Against big sheds, remove B2 and B8, limit to B1 uses. Build more housing on employment land.  
       | • Preserve agricultural land for food production  
       | • Light pollution is a consideration  
       | • Concerned about defensible boundary and encroachment upon Gotham  
       | • Preference for high density, low cost housing  
       | • Gypsies & Travellers- could be preferable to have a site, controlled by the local authority to reduce risk of unauthorised use |
| Red   | • Concern over warehouse development, should be knowledge based business, monopolising on Nottingham Trent Uni  
       | • Lack of a defensible boundary  
<pre><code>   | • Development should be distributed around smaller sites and villages rather than a large block |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>General summary of response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure a high quality design before the sale of land. The quality of design and living space should be considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concern over light/ noise impacts on Thrumpton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential flooding issues to the east of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Development should be staggered/ phased rather than the upfront allocation of a large site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The edges of the site should be ‘softened’, with green space instead of employment adjacent to the A452.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concerns about the ridgeline and raised relief of the area where warehousing/ business is proposed, visible from across the valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential traffic and congestion through Clifton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Land South of Clifton- Public Exhibitions Feedback

**C3.8** A series of three exercises were displayed at the public exhibition, for attendees to engage with and leave comments.

#### Exercise 1- Background and Issues

**C3.9** The aim of this exercise was to confirm and add to the Council’s understanding of the local area. At both the public exhibitions and the workshop, attendees were presented with comments from previous consultations and key facts across four key themes: housing, transport, facilities/ economy and environment. People were encouraged to record comments both on post-it notes, and through the consultation response form. Below are summaries of comments received under each theme across all events.

**Housing**

- Development should be distributed around villages, rather than being built in one large block.
- The quality of design and living space should be considered, there should be discussions with developers to improve the quality of design within the scheme, and this should be done before the sale/ purchase of land.
- Development should be staggered/ phased rather than the upfront allocation of a large site.
- Objection to the removal of the Design Brief from Policy 23 – It is considered essential by local people in order to ensure they have full involvement in shaping the development.
• If there is more than one developer on site this is needed to develop a cohesive design strategy, otherwise the development could be a mismatch.
• Suggestion to double the density of the existing site and reduce the site area
• Who would want to live next door to a traveller site? They should be on brownfield
• Higher density will mean more affordable housing which is what is needed for young families and older people downsizing
• Housing figure is too high
• Limited evidence of the need for the amount of housing proposed
• Affordable housing figure too low. Social housing is needed for the next generation
• With a variety of housing and thought being put into housing type, the area could be made welcoming
• Flats for couples, older people and single people, with a mix of 2-4 bed houses for families. A mix of homes to meet needs should be encouraged i.e. housing for older people wanting to downsize
• A development of 3000 houses does not meet the housing needs of many of the villages in Rushcliffe.
• Potential to effectively incorporate higher density development such as 3 storey apartments, similar to the David Wilson development at Wildford Place.
• The extra 500 homes would have little impact on Clifton compared to villages
• Could take far more than 500 extra homes, seems a small allocation given the money being spent on improvements to infrastructure in this area
• Green space between Gotham and Clifton serves to distance East Leake from Nottingham. Concern over impacts of development on East Leake e.g. bus service and school
• Allocate additional growth to other settlements, in particular Ruddington
• Higher rise houses would impair views across to the villages to the South of Clifton

Facilities/ Economy
• Concerns over employment proposals and the potential development of warehousing. Concern over noise and light pollution from operations at night, potential visual impacts of warehousing due to the ridgeline.
• Proposed business should be knowledge based/ office type development rather than sheds, monopolising on the presence of the nearby Nottingham Trent campus e.g. through a science park
• The site was seen as an important ‘gateway’ into Nottingham, and as such it should give a good impression of the city.
• Remove proposal for B2 and B8 and limit to B1 uses instead, could build more dwellings on some of the employment land. Other more attractive opportunities in the vicinity, i.e. opposite East Midlands Airport and near Parkway station.
• Can understand the logic of placing the industrial area by the A453 but there should be a band of native trees along the boundary and for some distance along the Barton Lane boundary
• Industrial areas need access to and from A453- industry should be clustered near to this roundabout i.e. not extending beyond Drift Lane plantation and Heart Lees
• Will bring economic growth to the area

Transport
• Difficulty of accessing Gotham from Thrumpton due to the closure of Barton Lane
• Potential traffic and congestion through Clifton.
• Need an improved cycling route - Nottingham Road very difficult for cycling.
• Extension of tram and dualling of A453 will make the site the most suitable in Rushcliffe for development
• If a new hub is built at Castle Donnington, it would be within a better commute for people
• Transport provision will be attractive to home buyers

Environment
• Lack of a strong, defensible Green Belt boundary. Concern that this could lead to encroachment towards Clifton.
• Power lines can be put underground and so may not present a fixed boundary.
• Reed beds/water feature could be developed as a potential defensible boundary.
• Expansion of development area could possibly have noise and light impacts on Thrumpton
• Potential flooding issues to the east of the site. History of flooding in the south west corner of site.
• Should protect agricultural land for food production
• Importance of keeping green areas adjacent to A453 and north to the Trent.
• Allotments should be provided
- Improved green space network - the area to the west of the newly aligned A453 should be developed into better quality open space, part of a wider green network wrapping round the site and creating a buffer with Gotham
- Concern that additional development would lead to more run off and impact on Gotham
- The allocated ‘wet areas’ to stop flooding/ runoff will not work
- Use brownfield land instead
- Minimise loss of Green Belt farmland in prominent position and leave a larger gap from Gotham
- Substantial buffer zone between Summerwood Lane and first line of development is needed
- Maximise retention of green space/ woods, plus green infrastructure on south eastern side
- Rising slope of the land makes it far too prominent
- Should build positive areas such as parks, green areas, cycle lanes, wide pedestrian pavements
- Increasing housing density will lead to a loss of green space.
- Would not want to see the increased housing density use land that would have provided GI Important to retain Green Infrastructure at a level which benefits residents and the environment. (Natural England)
- We wish to ensure the protection of Fairham Brook Nature Reserve to east of the proposed site and suggest that there could be green infrastructure and ecological links to this site. (Natural England)
- Concerns over biodiversity impacts

**Exercise 2: Sites**

C3.10 The public were presented with two potential site approaches for land south of Clifton. Approach 1 proposed the retention of the previously proposed site area, increasing the density of housing to accommodate the extra 500 homes. Approach 2 proposed increasing the development area to accommodate the extra houses. Respondents were asked to record their preference at the exhibitions, with the table below summarising responses from all exhibition events and associated feedback forms. A more detailed breakdown can be found in Appendix B.
Table 3: Respondent results from all consultation events and comment forms—preferred site approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible approach.</th>
<th>Number of homes.</th>
<th>Amount of people who preferred this approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Council’s preferred approach)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,000 larger area</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above.</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 – South of Clifton site possible approach

Exercise 3: Looking at the indicative new masterplan

C3.11 At the public event, attendees were given the opportunity to comment on proposals put forward by Rushcliffe Borough Council. Information was presented on potential infrastructure requirements and provision, and the public were encouraged to comment on this. A summary of comments on infrastructure is outlined below:

- More health care facilities will be needed
- Would not like to see any new facility impact on East Leake’s health centre
- No doctor at Lark Hill – difficulty accessing services as they are already at capacity
- Roads are already overloaded, development would lead to more congestion
- Ensure present bus service to Gotham remains
- A453 widening and tram will resolve existing traffic issues, but development will fill up the spare capacity those improvements create
- Present volume of traffic through Gotham is dangerous, particularly at school times. Gotham will be used as a rat run
- Vehicle access to east and west should be at one point only, excluding through traffic
- The A453 widening could accommodate more traffic
- Easy motorway access
- Transport concerns about Gotham Road being used instead of A453.
- Improvements to Secondary School in Clifton would remove need for new secondary school on site.
- Requirement for new secondary school – East Leake Academy is already at capacity.
- Swimming pool facility needed
- Central community facilities and a park with a wooded area (providing educational opportunities), outdoor facilities. A well-designed development could contribute to the area.
- Need to provide a new shopping centre and facilities
- Provision of new allotments adjacent to the existing ones, there should not be a road through the existing ones.
- Clifton has amenities for the community already i.e. shopping and leisure facilities
- Proposed drainage issues/remedies unlikely to be adequate
- Ensure sewerage arrangements do not impact/disrupt Farham Brook and nature reserve
C4 Public Engagement for proposals for land at Melton Road, Edwalton

C4.1 This part summarises feedback from the following consultation events and specifically in relation to the proposed strategic allocation on land at Edwalton (Sharphill Wood).

Summary of the workshops and public exhibitions

Thursday 20 June (2pm to 5pm) Workshop (Edwalton)

Workshop with parish councillors/community representatives from Edwalton.

Monday 1 July (3pm to 8pm) Public Consultation (Edwalton)

For this exhibition, the exercises from the workshop were presented along with feedback from this.

The public were presented with information on the existing site and previous proposals, with maps showing key features, opportunities and site constraints. Different potential site options were presented, along with a preferred option, and there was an opportunity for respondents to record their preference.

Information was also presented on the Green Belt review and infrastructure, along with some frequently asked questions. Feedback was collected both through post-it notes and a response form. A sample of the response forms can be found in Appendix A.

Summary of group workshop

C4.2 At the workshop event, attendees were provided with a large scale, blank map of the site. They considered need and potential location for infrastructure requirements such as employment, the local centre and housing as well as enhanced Green Infrastructure. Members of the groups were provided with other background information, such as constraints maps.

Exercise 1: Planning context and key challenges

C4.3 Attendees were given the background to the proposals for increasing housing at Edwalton, comparing existing and new proposals. A facilitator engaged with
each group of attendees, asking about any potential challenges facing the site.

**Exercise 2: Sites- Assessing site areas**

C4.4 Attendees were asked to look at how housing should be accommodated, assessing each of the following potential development areas:

- Area 1: Reconfigure existing site area
- Area 2: Area west of Rushcliffe School
- Area 3: Remainder of Melton Road Triangle (east of Melton Road)
- Area 4: Area to the south-west of Sharphill Wood
- Area 5: Area to the west of Sharphill Wood
- Area 6: Edwalton Golf Course (was discussed as a future consideration rather than a current option.)

Attendees commented on where development should and should not occur and what type of development this should be.

**Exercise 3: Looking at the indicative new masterplan**

C4.5 An indicative new masterplan for land at Melton Road was considered, and attendees were encouraged to discuss the layout of potential development.

C4.6 The council wanted to know where housing, employment, services and facilities, green infrastructure, etc should be located.

C4.7 At the workshop event, attendees were provided with a large scale, blank map of the site. They considered requirements and location for necessary infrastructure such as employment, the local centre and housing as well as enhanced Green Infrastructure. Members of the groups were provided with other background information, such as constraints maps.

C4.8 While these are the recorded general views of each group, the comments were not necessarily supported by each group member individually and some attendees reserved the right not to give a view at all.
### Table 4: Summary of group comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>General summary of response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | • Major impact on woods due to increased visitor numbers, loss of species, concern about cumulative impact of development  
       | • Maintain existing green buffer  
       | • If the housing numbers are increased then the mitigation plan as proposed under the existing permission would have to be scrapped  
       | • Could use golf course instead, less of an impact on wildlife sites  
       | • Protect footpaths and Rights of Way adjacent to woods  
       | • Green networks through residential areas need to be safeguarded  
       | • Potential for a retirement facility within area 1 to help increase density  
       | • Increase housing density  
       | • Bus gate would be difficult to enforce  
       | • Site 2 could become isolated, lack of connectivity  
       | • Site 4 needs to be part of the green buffer  
       | • Housing on site 4 needs to be as far away from the woods as possible  
       | • Site 5- could accommodate a replacement golf facility in another area  
       | • Opposed to the new housing to the west of the wood.  
       | • Retail use concentrated to the south could lead to increased car usage  
       | • Drainage issue – area off Loughborough Road currently floods  
       | • Access needed from A52  
       | • Need to keep the 30% affordable housing |
| 2     | • campus on original layout could be used to accommodate more housing  
       | • Sharphill wood significantly important, impact on wildlife  
       | • New hedgerow that was to be provided across the top of the ridge from Sharphill Wood to Old Road should be carried on into any proposals  
       | • Must provide school capacity  
       | • Ridgelines should be retained and kept free from development.  
       | • The underpass that goes under the A52 should be kept open for walking.  
       | • The proposed buffer around the wood needs to be retained.  
       | • Some support for moving the school adjacent to the wood with some of the buffer used for playing area/wildlife area  
       | • Some but not uniform support to use the area currently proposed as playing pitches for housing.  
       | • Development would be very visible  
<pre><code>   | • Would not like to see the loss of proposed allotments. |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>General summary of response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Retirement village concept considered least-worst option. Higher density would lessen pressure elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Potentially use part (but not all) of golf course instead of intensifying too far at Edwalton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gypsy accommodation best by Wheatcroft roundabout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Football pitches not acceptable to the west of the wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Buffer too small to the west of the wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>• Need to ensure sufficient school places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wildlife Mitigation Plan must be retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce employment provision at Wheatcroft, vacant units there already</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use field identified for academy for housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Important to maintain public transport into City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Extend protective strip/ extend width around Sharphill wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• BMX track not seen as relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Light protection a concern- must protect wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Need for wildlife corridors from the wood out to Green Line etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Avoid building new dwellings that back onto those on Boundary Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Must be careful not to alienate the new community from the old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Part/total removal of football pitches for housing, reduction of a small part of community park could allow for houses but green space elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reassess school catchments, there may not be a need for a new one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• soil in the area where the allotments are sited under the current application is clay and therefore not ideal, move to another part of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Retain area 2 as a community park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Retirement village concept considered best option for area 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Area 4 would be a separate and self-contained community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Remove area 5 from Green Belt, golf course can be protected in other ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Different types of affordable housing should be dotted around the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gypsies could be accommodated on Landmere Lane. Impact on new house values?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Grade separation essential on A52 to enable development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Scale back healthcare with new health centre on Wilford Lane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of public exhibition

C4.9 A series of three exercises were displayed at the public exhibition, for attendees to engage with and leave comments.

Exercise 1- Background and Issues

C4.10 The aim of this exercise was to confirm and add to the Council’s understanding of the local area. At both the public exhibitions and the workshop, attendees were presented with comments from previous consultations and key facts across four key themes: housing, transport, facilities/ economy and environment. People were encouraged to record comments both on post-it notes, and through the consultation response form. Below are summaries of comments received under each theme across all events.

Housing
- Density should be increased for more homes
- Use business park area for housing
- Development should not ‘surround’ Sharphill wood
- Oppose traveller site
- Need more social housing and less privately owned. Affordable housing desperately needed
- Development will make Edwalton a less attractive area in which to live
- The density should not be increased
- Ensure sufficient buffer between development and existing housing
- A travellers site will impact on the area
- Cotgrave/ Bingham ideal for further development
- Numerous sites in the city which could be developed

Facilities/ Economy
- More health facilities to serve the new homes
- More school spaces required
- Recreational provision is already nearby at Rushcliffe Leisure Centre, this should be enhanced to cope with greater usage
- Local centre should be in the middle, not to the edge where it could create traffic problems.
- Development of the golf course seems to be the only future option. If this amenity land is used for housing, then an alternative should be created—perhaps East of Gamston.
• The golf course should not be developed; people should be encouraged to get exercise and fresh air
• A community hall would be useful

**Transport**
• Huge traffic increase, roads already congested, increase traffic on a52 and through West Bridgford and at Wheatcroft/ Nottingham Knight roundabout.
• Development would result in having to cross the A52 to access open countryside, this would necessitate using a car instead of walking
• Having a road at the bottom of the hill to area 4 would mean crossing a wildlife corridor
• Not enough access points for cars and emergency vehicles
• Underpass needed
• Should allow for a tram route
• Need to consider good cycle routes

**Environment**
• With so many homes, the demand for community park space would be increased not decreased
• Impact of domestic pets on the wildlife
• Sharphill woods an important amenity and wildlife site and should be protected
• The proposed 50m buffer is not enough, should be increased.
• Plenty of footpaths and wildlife corridors should be provided
• Keep green buffer as in original plans
• Concern about increased runoff, drainage and potential flooding at Edwalton Lodge Close
• Still plenty of brownfield sites which can be developed first. Need a comprehensive assessment of ‘micro’ sites
• Light pollution needs to be considered
• Changed location of school in revised plans- higher site, close to Sharphill woods- visual impact and disturbance to wildlife
• Concern over noise, litter, damage to habitat. Development will bring people into the nature reserve which will threatened wildlife.
• Sharphill ridgeline will be spoilt with the existing quota, this will be viewed from many aspects
• Country park needed
Exercise 2: Sites

C4.11 The public were presented with five potential site options for Edwalton. The sixth potential option of the Golf Course redevelopment was not included as this would be a longer term option outside of the plan period. Respondents were asked to record their preference at the exhibitions, stating whether they agreed or disagreed with each location. The table below summarising responses from all exhibition events and associated feedback forms. A more detailed breakdown can be found in Appendix B.

Table 5: Preferred site options for Edwalton: Respondent results from all consultation events and comment forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of above</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Housing site options at Melton Road, Edwalton

C4.12 Summary of comments for each site

Site 1:
- Open hillside, impact on skyline and green views
- Housing figure too high
- More small units
• Use industrial area for housing instead
• Current houses overlooked, screen from Melton Road to maintain village appeal of Edwalton

Site 2:
• Develop -80 homes at the north end, alongside existing housing and joining musters road
• Traffic increase at Musters and Boundary Road, traffic issues also on minor roads
• Housing figure too high
• Sloping nature of land- what will the impact on drainage be?
• Best area for new houses as area already residential
• Area should not be developed- a community park should be created here for all to enjoy.
• Football pitches could go here, adjacent to Rushcliffe/ Musters Rd, flatter area adjacent to existing pitches
• The ridgeline means housing here will be intrusive and overlook existing properties. It would have a visual impact with the loss of a green hillside visible from the city centre.
• Site could be used for allotments or access to the park
• Could a small amount of land be given/ sold to existing owners?

Site 3:
• Part of site was originally reserved for a Park and Ride, this site may be required in the future and should not be used for housing
• Not suitable – access to A606 limited
• Compromise on football pitches and develop this site
• Local centre should be here
• Privacy and noise impacts on houses to the north

Site 4:
• Remote from vehicle access and a link to the A52 would be unacceptable due to traffic.
• Linking to rest of development will affect wildlife and nature, and impact upon Sharphill.
• Isolated site, away from main development already proposed.
• Elderly housing should be provided- less vehicles onto A52, no real infrastructure needed
• Site damaging to wood, should be moved away from the wood. Would surround the woods, impact on wildlife
• Consider making Old Road into an access road for area 4 with slip road from A52.
• Any new development should be to the left of Sharphill Wood
• Why put a retirement in such an isolated place? Access to this site would be difficult
• Development near A52 but not up the hill
• Views extend southward a long way to Gotham Hill, coalescing effect

Site 5:
• Golf a course should be retained to create a green oasis. Development would lead to a loss of leisure land
• Access to A52 would be impossible due to traffic as with Site 4.
• There are already two large golf courses in the area
• The density should be increased with some low/medium rise flats to better use the land
• Development near Musters Road would make the junction with Boundary Road impossible.
• In favour of any extra building to be placed on the golf course
• The provision of a golf course is a benefit only to those people who can afford the equipment and have time to use it (mostly weekdays), and is a drain on RBC resources.

Exercise 3: Looking at the indicative new masterplan

C4.13 At the public event, attendees were given the opportunity to comment on the proposals put forward by Rushcliffe Borough Council. Information was presented on potential infrastructure requirements and provision, and the public were encouraged to comment on this. A summary of comments on infrastructure is outlined below:

• Infrastructure insufficient to cope, traffic increase issues. Access to site and associated traffic lights will increase congestion
• Underpass should be put back into overall scheme, to maintain the flow of the A52
• Bus gate proposal should be retained at Musters Road, but hard to police this
• Keep the existing green space proposals
• More schools needed, at capacity
• Need to ensure a new bus service links the development
• Schools should be near the woods to give access to wildlife
• Allotments should be provided
• Cycle and pedestrian links are very important
• Primary school should be built in first phase of development so existing schools are not overcrowded
• School should be in the middle of the site not Melton Road
• Extra slip roads on to A52.
• Need a community park- vital for children and to protect the woods/wildlife
• A tram/ light railway would help and even if this is unaffordable in the short term, nothing should be done to make it more difficult to build in future.
• Need for long term financing and management of community services
• Single access to Melton Road no longer practicable, access to Musters Road needed
• Concerns about safety implications of traffic and the use of Landmere lane as a ‘rat run’
• Flood risk at low point, on Melton Road and Ring Road
• Previous section 106 agreements should be honoured
• There are already fine football pitches on Alford road and recreational pitches at Rushcliffe- are more really needed?
• Is there scope for a new (Super) Health Clinic on the site of the proposed Waitrose? This could deal with new development and the loss of service to Wilford from West Bridgford
• Health provision but only minimal if space allows- housing must be the priority if Green Belt is to be used. BMX track or football pitches not a priority.
Public Engagement for proposals for land east of Gamston/north of Tollerton, June 2013

This part summarises feedback from the following consultation events and specifically in relation to the proposed strategic allocation on land to the east of Gamston/north of Tollerton.

Summary of the workshops and public exhibitions

Friday 28 June (2pm to 5pm) Workshop (Gamston Community Hall)
Workshop with parish councillors/community representatives from Gamston and Tollerton.

Monday 8 July (3pm to 8pm) Public Exhibition (Tollerton)
Tuesday 9 July (12pm to 5pm) Public Exhibition (Tollerton Mobile Home Park)
Wednesday 10 July (3pm to 8pm) Public Exhibition (Gamston Community Hall)

For this series of exhibitions, the exercises from the workshop were presented along with feedback from this. At Tollerton Mobile Home Park, because of a constraint on space a abridged version of the material was presented.

The public were presented with information on the existing site and previous proposals, with maps showing key features, opportunities and site constraints. Different potential site options were presented, along with a preferred option, and there was an opportunity for respondents to record their preference.

Information was also presented on the Green Belt review and infrastructure, along with some frequently asked questions. Feedback was collected both through post-it notes and a response form. A sample of the response forms can be found in Appendix A.

Summary of group workshop

Exercise 1: What do we know about the local area?

The aim of this exercise was to add to the council’s understanding of issues affecting the local area. Information and comments from previous consultation events were presented, along with maps showing potential constraints to development. Groups were asked to discuss any thoughts or issues,
particularly relating to housing, facilities and the economy, transport and the environment.

Exercise 2: If development happens, what are the priorities for your area?

C5.3 The aim of exercise was to understand what attendees’ priorities for the area were, should development go ahead. For example, the council wanted to know what people wanted to protect in their area, what they wanted to get out of any potential development (e.g. infrastructure improvements, housing for the elderly, new facilities, enhanced green infrastructure, etc.) and how a development scheme could help deliver this.

Exercise 3: If development happens, what might go where?

C5.4 The aim of exercise was to understand how those attending considered the potential development should be laid out. The council wanted to know where housing, employment, services and facilities, green infrastructure, etc should be located. There was also discussion on how people thought the Green Belt should be amended. The aims of the exercise were to
- To get views on possible plans already prepared for the site.
- To identify whether it should be done differently?
- To seek views on a possible new Green Belt boundary

C5.5 At the workshop event, attendees were provided with a large scale, blank map of the site. They considered requirements and suitable locations for infrastructure such as employment, the local centre and housing as well as enhanced Green Infrastructure. Members of the groups were provided with other background information, such as constraints maps.

C5.6 In the table below is a summary of the group comments made in relation to the workshop questions

C5.7 While these are the recorded general views of each group, the comments were not necessarily supported by each group member individually and some chosen not to give a view at all.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>General summary of response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | - Gypsies- Could have a pitch sited adjacent to the depot?  
       | - Protect the allotments or provide an alternative  
       | - Employment should be sited near the A52  
       | - View the new settlement as a separate community from Gamston  
       | - Tollerton Lane not suitable for large increase in traffic, the development must avoid rat-running through the site to avoid the A52  
       | - Could there be a bus gate on Tollerton Lane?  
       | - Real concerns about connectivity with Gamston  
       | - Bring forward the golf course sooner to ‘soften the blow’ at Gamston  
       | - If north of canal area is included, could the buffer at Tollerton be larger?  
       | - Concerns over flooding and surface water runoff in Tollerton  
       | - Heritage assets around Tollerton  
       | - Plant trees to make a defensible Green Belt boundary for Tollerton  
       | - Create footpaths |
| 2     | - Priority to identify a defensible boundary to protect Tollerton. Airfield could be used as part of this boundary.  
       | - Accept that affordable housing is needed but 30% could be too high.  
       | - Housing layout/density/mix needs to be established up front as to protect area from greater land take. There should be a mix of densities.  
       | - Should look to incorporate environmental sustainability design measures.  
       | - Barrier of A52 – connectivity issues. It would be very difficult to integrate any new development because of this. New access over A52 needed  
       | - Bottlenecks already a problem along Tollerton Lane. Pressure needs to be taken off this congested route.  
       | - Grantham Canal should be protected as an important asset  
       | - The Airfield’s permission for employment and hospital should be protected for as long as possible.  
       | - Suggestion to include area to the north of the canal but move southern boundary further north to increasing buffer to Tollerton  
       | - Potential defensible boundary created by a new road/allotments/trees |
| 3     | - Query raised as to whether this should be a stand-alone settlement or integrated with the existing community  
       | - Edwalton Golf Course suggested for development. Move golf course to opposite side of A52.  
<pre><code>   | - Use highways depot for development |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>General summary of response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Use airport in development or it will simply get added at a later stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Important to consider the mobile home park as this will be in the middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A retirement village would be self-contained, helping to alleviate traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Development should not breach the A52 – good defensible boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Polser brook not considered strong enough boundary by some, others disagreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Canal is a good defensible boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High ridgeline to north of Tollerton could be a boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Protect the meadow land- sky larks seen here. Protect Polser Brook- water voles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bus service needed and must be retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Query as to whether Tollerton Lane could be widened as part of any development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cumulative impact of colliery traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Could access be restricted through to Tollerton from the new development?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Block off access from Bassingfield to the A52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Morrisons junction is awful at the moment, improve access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Schools needed to serve development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Public Exhibitions**

**C5.8** As part of the public consultation events, a series of three exercises were presented, which attendees could engage with and comment on.

**Exercise 1- Background and Issues**

**C5.9** The aim of this exercise was to confirm and add to the Council’s understanding of the local area. As with the workshop events, attendees at the exhibitions were presented with comments from previous consultations and key facts across four key themes: housing, transport, facilities/ economy and environment. People were encouraged to record comments both on post-it notes, and through the consultation response form. Below are summaries of comments received under each theme across all events.

**Housing**

- Housing should be distributed more evenly across the Borough, not focussed in a one place
• Protection should be given to the pill boxes
• Object to any development near the mobile home park due to impact on landscape, views, wildlife
• Should build on Cotgrave country park, all new housing on this site using Stragglethorpe Road and Hollygate Lane.
• Concern that development will spread further eastwards.
• Limit amount of affordable housing
• The 30% affordable housing limit should not be reduced. Sheltered housing needed
• Lower density housing and green spaces throughout
• Locate the traveller site on A52 near the Radcliffe junction or on the allotment near Tollerton Lane and relocate the allotments to the new development.
• Impact on character of Tollerton, not linked to Gamston and shouldn’t be
• Who is the housing for? Elderly– not appropriate. Young – wish to live close to city centre.
• Keep the Tollerton mobile home park, no building right up to it.

Facilities/ Economy
• Airport should be retained, important for economic and commercial development of city.
• Employment areas likely to have longer hours/ weekend work etc, so should be away from housing
• Industrial area needs to be far away from the current line of sight of Gamston houses
• Local centre to be in the heart of the new community.
• Local centre to be located west of canal.
• Local centre near employment and airport
• Site should be self-contained and separate with own facilities

Transport
• Keeping development north of canal would allow direct access to A52
• Dualling of the A453 will improve access to EM Airport which will compensate for the potential loss of Tollerton Airport.
• Tollerton Lane already used as cut through, safety issues
• Option one means new access could be made on to A52, less traffic on Tollerton Lane
• Access onto the A606 is already poor due to traffic issues
Environment

- Priority to maintain the Grantham Canal as a recreational area, keep area around the canal green space
- Restrict public access to the canal
- Need to retain agricultural land
- Green buffer zones around Tollerton and Bassingfield.
- Green buffer should be enhanced with large scale tree planting and natural ponds. Trees should also be considered along the canal.
- Polser Brook is a habitat for great crested newts
- There is a flooding issue south of Tollerton Airport. Development will make it worse.
- There is no clear and sustainable boundary to the Green Belt east of the ring road at Tollerton
- Relocate golf course to area north of medina. Use green belt for what it should be used for.

Exercise 2: Sites

C5.10 The public were presented with two potential site options for land south of Clifton. Option 1 proposed the retention of the previously proposed site area, increasing the density of housing to accommodate the extra 500 homes. Option 2 proposed increasing the development area to accommodate the extra houses. Respondents were asked to record their preference at the exhibitions, with the table below summarising responses from all exhibition events and associated feedback forms. A more detailed breakdown can be found in Appendix B.

Table 7: Preference for possible approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible approach</th>
<th>Number of preferences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Council’s preferred approach)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other approach</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Group A</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop group B</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop group C (plan followed workshop)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tollerton PC suggestion</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 4: Possible approaches 1 to 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach 1</th>
<th>Approach 2</th>
<th>Approach 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Figure 5: Possible approaches from workshop groups A and B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop A</th>
<th>Workshop B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

![Maps showing different approaches for each workshop group.](image-url)
C5.11 Other options suggested

North of canal
- First phase of development north of the canal. Bassingfield could still be protected from development. This has access to the A52 and Lings Bar Road.
- Development no further than southern airfield boundary. Airfield would not be viable due to proximity of new homes if this area is to be allocated.

Option 1 (plus part of airfield near Tollerton)
- Landscape surrounding the mobile home park should be protected (buffer zone to reduce impact). Expect that some development is inevitable.
- Adequate fencing required to reduce risk of theft.

Option 1 – but include greater area around Bassingfield.
- Existing homes in Bassingfield could be incorporated as part of any scheme.

Option 2- but reduce buffer with Tollerton
- Use flat airport land for employment, use canal as a boundary to the north. Housing close to Nottingham. Facilities could be provided to share with Tollerton village.
Option 3 but with phased development in North and less to south
- Development should be phased, with phase 1 north of the canal, and phase 2 north of the airfield. This should suffice without building closer to Tollerton. There should be a new road linking the A52 to the ring road. Road into Tollerton should be a no through road. Green buffers between housing phases, protecting mobile home park and canal.

Option 3 with Green buffer along Lings Bar
- New access to the South of the site linking with Lings Bar (forming southern boundary, new access to A52 to the north. Employment and new centre on airfield. Large green buffer between development and Tollerton. New access roads should not be opposite existing housing due to traffic congestion and noise impacts on housing.

Option 2 but include extra farmland (Ian Hoyland, land owner)
- Tollerton could share facilities. Old village needs protecting, with a need to stop rat-running. The current land use of the farm on Little Lane is for 2000 pigs, which would impact on any housing to the north. Would like this land to therefore be included in development.

Top section of option 1
- Develop north of the canal and to the south, not extending further south than the northern extent of the airport and not including the airport

Airport site only
- Allows separation from existing communities
- Around 1500 homes

Hybrid of option 1 and 2
- Utilises brownfield site, preserves more Green Belt west of Tollerton Lane, creates green belt buffer.

Part of airport site and southern portion of option 1
- Housing should be further south, adjoining Tollerton and running to the West of Tollerton Lane and the east of the A52/ Lings Bar. Use of airport for employment and green buffer to the north, protecting the canal.
Exercise 3: looking at the indicative new masterplan

C5.12 At the public event, attendees were given the opportunity to comment on the proposals put forward by Rushcliffe Borough Council. Information was presented on potential infrastructure requirements and provision, and the public were encouraged to comment on this. A summary of comments on infrastructure is outlined below

Transport

- Transport infrastructure improvements needed before development commences.
- Many residents of the mobile home park rely on public transport, if Tollerton Lane closed there could be an impact on this bus route.
- Tollerton Lane should be widened – include a spur to Cotgrave Road, taking traffic around the village to the west of A606.
- Need for footpaths, cycle paths including provision along Tollerton Lane. Any footpath development should include bridleways.
- Would lead to traffic impacts
- Tram extension should be considered. 4th Trent Crossing should be considered
- Tollerton Ln could not cope with additional traffic due to subsidence, not suitable for HGV’s
- Traffic flow should be restricted into Tollerton to avoid it becoming a rat run, potentially resident only access
- Close Tollerton Lane north of the Cotgrave Lane junction
- Planned flyover for Wheatcroft roundabout to be brought forward before building commences.
- Good bus services needed to Nottingham
- Underpass for A52 needed if development is to occur.
- Need for new access road to Melton Road
- Needs pedestrian access over the A52, bridges (Safety).
- Explore feasibility of a park and ride site at the colliery and use the old mineral line as a light railway.
- Utilize existing accesses off A52 rather than introduce new roads.
- Requirement of possible dualling of A52 and re-routing away from existing development.
- Dual A606
- New access should not be opposite existing housing due to traffic congestion and noise
- Improve junction at Goose pub and Lings Bar Road
• Impossible to get out of Tollerton Park due to traffic at Lings Bar/ Nottm Night
• Employment in the airfield with its own road to the A52
• Suggestion that Tollerton Lane could be linked to Lings Bar across the fields

Facilities
• New health centre, primary school, secondary school
• Provision of a wide range of shops and services
• Facilities (including community hall) should be concentrated on the airport site
• New schools should be sited off a main road to avoid congestion on smaller roads. Should be geographically distant from Tollerton and Gamston schools
• New development should join Tollerton, to give benefits of new doctors, leisure, school etc.
• Could share doctors with East Gamston

Airport
• Logistically difficult to remove the runways (weight).
• Airport unattractive and causes noise disturbance – housing would be preferred on this site.
• Airport is a brownfield site suitable for some employment commercial activity
• The airport would probably not be viable due to the proximity of new houses

Environment
• Green space between the development and Tollerton a priority. A band of trees on south side of development to reduce visual impact on existing residents at north end of Tollerton
• New development will lead to additional run-off, could lead to flooding in Tollerton
• Sufficient open/green space needed. Jubilee wood could be extended to form a green barrier with wooded walks
• Grantham Canal and Polser Brook form natural boundaries.
• Protect the canal, green space along the canal. Protect Polser Brook
• The hedgerows surrounding the grazing land provides shelter for wildlife, some of the fields are ancient
Appendix A: Consultation leaflets

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT LAND SOUTH OF CLIFTON: COMMENTS

Please use this form to provide any comments or feedback on the proposed development at land south of Clifton.

The site is already proposed for 2,500 homes. If there has to be an extra 500 homes by 2028, where should they go?

There are 2 options to consider:

1. Increase density and fit it into the area already proposed for allocation (the Council’s preferred approach); or

2. Increase the area to be developed (increasing the area could enable more than 500 extra homes to be built, with building continuing after 2028).

Which development option do you feel is preferable? (please tick)

Option 1 [ ] Option 2 [ ] None of above [ ]

Reason for preference:

(Please continue on another sheet if necessary)

Your Name
Email Address
Home Address
Postcode

EXISTING LAND USE MAP: CLIFTON AREA

SITE COMMENTS

COMMENTS ON INFRASTRUCTURE

Infrastructure provision
Health: Existing health facilities at Clifton Grange are nearing capacity. It is likely that a new small scale heathcare facility would be required on site. Do you have any comments on healthcare provision?

Drainage & Flood Risk: Sustainable drainage systems and above ground tanking areas proposed.

Education provision: Previous proposals were for 2 primary schools, one of 420 places and one of 310 places. A site is being considered for a new secondary school. What education provision do you feel should be considered as part of any revised proposals? Where do you think the school should be located?

Green spaces and natural habitats: Previous proposals were for the retention and enhancement of two existing woodland areas on the site, with development of underused green infrastructure areas along water catchment areas. What green space do you think would be liked to see and where?

Transit: Current infrastructure improvements in the area include the A63 Widening and the completion of NET Phase 2. What transport improvements are needed as part of any revised proposals?

Community services: Provision of a variety of community buildings and sports and recreation space have been considered. What community provision should be included as part of any revised proposals? What services would you like to see in a local centre? Where do you feel a local centre should be located?

Waste: No significant improvements expected.

Sewer: For previous proposals. It has identified the capacity at Clifton pumping station needed improvement.

Emergency services: A vehicle standby location may be required for ambulance services.

(Please continue on another sheet if necessary)
COMMENTS
Please tell us any comments you would like to make regarding the consultation proposals on this form:

FURTHER INFORMATION
Please direct your informal email and handovers to one of the Council Officers, today;
Alternatively email your comments to us at: mcsdevelopment@northllantris.com – you need to include your name and address with your comments, or send written comments to: mcs Planning Policy, Rhydychen Borough Council, Pantwn Road, West Bridgford, Nottingham NG2 3TE. We will also contact you about further opportunities.

Consultation on the Borough Council's proposals will run until the end of November. To view more details about the consultation and our proposals, please visit our website:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
<th>Home Address</th>
<th>Postcode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT EDWALTON: COMMENTS
Please use this form to provide any comments or feedback on the proposed development at Edwallow.

POTENTIAL SITE OPTIONS: EDWALTON
As part of proposals to accommodate extra homes at Edwallow, five potential site options for new housing are being considered. Please indicate in the table below which of these you think should or should not be developed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Estimated number of homes</th>
<th>Should this site be developed? YES/NO?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* As a long-term option

Infrastructure provision
Health
There is open space provision, an area of 0.7ha within the development area, which is reserved for healthcare provision. There are a number of health centres and facilities in the area.

Flooding & Flood risks
The Town Council has no proposals to build flood defences or increase the capacity of the flood defences at existing sites.

Education provision
A primary school was proposed as part of the existing scheme, but this was not included. The number of children attending the primary school is not given.

Transport
A transport proposal was included in the existing scheme.

Green Spaces and Natural habitats
The proposal for Greenacre Park, the wooded area at Chequers Wood and the area of nature reserve at Edwallow is not given.

Community Services
Community services include a community hall, an allotment, a BMX track, a football pitch and a children's play area.

Emergency Services
In previous proposals there were no known requirements.

Please feel free to write down any comments you have about the proposed development, and to annotate the map with any details about specific areas of the site where development should go:

EXISTING LAND USE MAP: EDWALTON

SITE COMMENTS

COMMENTS ON INFRASTRUCTURE
Appendix B: Consultation response figures

Land south of Clifton exhibitions- site options

Sticker exercise

At the consultation events, two potential housing options were put forward. The public were asked to put a sticker next to their preference, with the results shown below:

Gotham exhibition sticker exercise results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number of homes.</th>
<th>Amount of people who preferred this approach.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,000 larger area</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above.</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barton exhibition sticker exercise results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number of homes.</th>
<th>Amount of people who preferred this approach.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,000 larger area</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above.</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No results were received at the Clifton Cornerstone consultation event.

Leaflet responses

The same question was also asked in the consultation leaflets made available for attendees to complete. The following table shows the results from the consultation leaflets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number of homes.</th>
<th>Amount of people who preferred this option.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,000 larger area</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above.</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land at Melton Road, Edwalton preferred site choices

At the consultation events, several potential housing options were put forward. The public were asked to put a sticker next to their preference, with the results shown below:

Sticker exercise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Estimated number of homes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing</td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leaflet responses

The same question was also put forward in consultation leaflets available for attendees to complete. The following table shows the results from the consultation leaflets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Estimated number of homes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land east of Gamston/north of Tollerton exhibitions- site options

Sticker exercise

At the consultation events, several potential housing options were suggested, including new ideas from the workshop events. The public were asked to put a sticker next to their preference, the results are set out below:

### Gamston exhibition sticker exercise results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible approach</th>
<th>Number of homes.</th>
<th>Number of preferences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Council’s preferred approach)</td>
<td>4,000 (2,500 before 2028)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,500 (2,500 before 2028)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop A</td>
<td>4,000 (2,500 before 2028)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop B</td>
<td>4,000 (2,500 before 2028)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop C</td>
<td>At least 3,500 homes (2,500 before 2028)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above.</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tollerton exhibition sticker exercise results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible approach</th>
<th>Number of homes.</th>
<th>Number of preferences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Council’s preferred approach)</td>
<td>4,000 (2,500 before 2028)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,500 (2,500 before 2028)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop A</td>
<td>4,000 (2,500 before 2028)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop B</td>
<td>4,000 (2,500 before 2028)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop C</td>
<td>At least 3,500 homes (2,500 before 2028)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above.</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Leaflet responses

The same question was also set out in the consultation leaflets made available for attendees to complete. The following table shows the results from the consultation leaflets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible approach</th>
<th>Number of homes.</th>
<th>Number of preferences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Council’s preferred approach)</td>
<td>4,000 (2,500 before 2028)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,500 (2,500 before 2028)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other option</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tollerton PC suggestion</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>