

Response Form

Please return by **5pm on Friday 31 March 2017** to:
 Planning Policy, Rushcliffe Borough Council
 Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road
 Nottingham. NG2 7YG
 Or to: localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk

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

Your Details		Agent details (where applicable)
Bev Angell Clerk Barton in Fabis Parish Council	Name	Click here to enter text.
Click here to enter text.	Address	Click here to enter text.
	E-mail	Click here to enter text.

Housing Development

Housing Land Supply

Question 1: Do you agree with the Council's assessment of the present housing supply situation and that enough land will need to be identified by Local Plan Part 2 to accommodate around 2,000 new homes?

Yes

No

Don't know

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

Before any decision is made on the allocation of additional sites, we urge the Borough Council to commission a thorough independent review of the reasons why the sites adjacent to the Main Urban Area have not been developed to the expected schedule. The reasons may be:

- Lack of demand. We have consistently held the view that the projected housing needs across the Greater Nottingham Area (and in particular the 13,000+ allocated in Rushcliffe) have been driven by wildly optimistic / exaggerated estimates of housing demand and growth in employment numbers from Nottingham City
- Lack of skilled labour to build houses
- Inability to bring a developer on to the schemes, potentially because their resources are fully deployed elsewhere in more profitable areas of the country
- Site viability issues given contributions to infrastructure
- Land banking in the hope of further releases of green belt land

Until the Borough Council has a clear idea of the reasons for the Main Urban Area developments not coming forward, it would be entirely wrong to release significant additional sites for development especially in the Green Belt.

It is clear that a few council areas are over delivering on their targets and opportunities exist to co-operate in terms of netting off against RBC's target as well as to understand 'best practice' in bringing housing schemes to fruition.

Housing Sites adjacent to the Main Urban Area

Question 2: Do you agree with the Council's view that none of the three strategic allocations (Melton Road, Edwalton; South of Clifton; and East of Gamston/North of Tollerton) should be expanded as part of resolving the current shortfall in the amount of land that is available for housing development over the next few years?

Yes



No

Don't know

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

We have consistently argued against the focus on a few very large sites such as the above, particularly given the fact that, across the country, very few such sites have been delivered due to their complexity and need for additional infrastructure. The

Borough Council has chosen to persist with their strategy and is now reaping the results of its failure with a major shortfall in housing starts. This has left the Council (and more importantly local communities) wide open to speculative development while it fails to provide the required housing supply. Given the failure to deliver housing on the main sites with some such as Clifton South being at least 3 years behind schedule even at this early stage, it would make no sense to allocate further housing numbers to these major sites.

Question 3: Do you support housing development at:

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site HOL1 – Simkins Farm, Adbolton Lane, West Bridgford (potential capacity around 40 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Any other location (please specify which)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Click here to enter text.

Housing Development at the 'Key Settlements'

Bingham

Question 4: Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should not allocate further greenfield land for housing development at Bingham in the plan period (up to 2028)?

Yes

No

Don't
know

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

Click here to enter text.

Cotgrave

Question 5: *Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for housing development at Cotgrave in the plan period (up to 2028)?*

Yes

No

Don't
know

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

Click here to enter text.

Question 6: *Do you have a view on the total number of new homes that should be accommodated on greenfield sites at Cotgrave up to 2028? If possible, please give reasons for your answer.*

Click here to enter text.

Question 7: *Do you support housing development at:*

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<i>Site COT1 – Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park (potential capacity around 240 homes)</i>			
<i>Site COT2 – Land at Main Road (potential capacity around 50 homes)</i>			
<i>Site COT3 – Land rear of and to the west of Main Road (potential capacity around 125 homes)</i>			
<i>Site COT4 Land off Woodgate Lane (potential capacity around 80 homes)</i>			
<i>Site COT5 – Bakers Hollow (potential capacity around 60 homes)</i>			
<i>Site COT6 – The Brickyard, Owthorpe Road (potential capacity around 100 homes)</i>			
<i>Site COT7 – Land behind Firdale (2) (potential capacity around 65 homes)</i>			
<i>Site COT8 – Land behind Firdale (potential capacity around 95 homes)</i>			
<i>Site COT9 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (1) (potential capacity around 140 homes)</i>			
<i>Site COT10 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (2) (potential capacity around 40 homes)</i>			
<i>Site COT11 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (3) (potential capacity around 250 homes)</i>			
<i>Site COT12 – Land south of Plumtree Lane (potential capacity around 250 homes)</i>			
<i>Any other location (please specify which)</i>			

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

Click here to enter text.

East Leake

Question 8: Do you agree that, apart from those eight sites that already have planning permission for housing development (sites EL1 to EL8 as shown at Figure 5), further greenfield land should not be allocated for housing development at East Leake?

Yes

No

Don't know

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

Click here to enter text.

Question 9: Do you support housing development at:

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site EL9 – Land south of West Leake Road (potential capacity around 50 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site EL10 – Land north of West Leake Road (potential capacity around 75 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site EL11 – Brook Furlong Farm (potential capacity around 70 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<i>Site EL12 – Land off Rempstone Road (north) (potential capacity around 235 homes)</i>			
<i>Site EL13 – Land off Rempstone Road (south) (potential capacity around 120 homes)</i>			
<i>Site EL14 – Land north of Lantern Lane (2) (potential capacity around 360 homes)</i>			
<i>Any other location (please specify which)</i>			

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

Click here to enter text.

Keyworth

Question 10: *Do you have a view on the total number of new homes that should be built on greenfield sites at Keyworth up to 2028? If possible, please give reasons for your answer.*

Click here to enter text.

Question 11: *Do you support housing development at:*

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<i>Site KEY1 – Land east of Willow Brook (potential capacity around 40 homes)</i>			

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<i>Site KEY2 – Land off Selby Lane and Willowbrook (potential capacity around 15 homes)</i>			
<i>Site KEY3 – Land south of Selby Lane (potential capacity around 60 homes)</i>			
<i>Site KEY4 – Land off Nicker Hill (potential capacity around 450 homes)</i>			
<i>Site KEY5 – Hill Top Farm, Platt Lane (1) (potential capacity around 50 homes)</i>			
<i>Site KEY6 – Hill Top Farm, Platt Lane (2) (potential capacity around 80 homes)</i>			
<i>Site KEY7 – Shelton Farm, Platt Lane (potential capacity around 160 homes)</i>			
<i>Site KEY8 – Land between Platt Lane and Station Road (potential capacity around 180 homes)</i>			
<i>Site KEY9 – Land north of Debdale Lane (1) (potential capacity around 110 homes)</i>			
<i>Site KEY10 – Land south of Debdale Lane (1) (potential capacity around 230 homes)</i>			
<i>Site KEY11 – Land south of Debdale Lane (2) (potential capacity around 200 homes)</i>			
<i>Site KEY12 – Land north of Debdale Lane (2) (potential capacity around 160 homes)</i>			
<i>Site KEY13 – Hillside Farm (potential capacity around 60 homes)</i>			
<i>Site KEY14 – Land south of Bunny Lane (potential capacity around 410 homes)</i>			
<i>Any other location (please specify which)</i>			

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

Click here to enter text.

Radcliffe on Trent

Question 12: Do you have a view on the total number of new homes that should be built on greenfield sites at Radcliffe on Trent up to 2028? If possible, please give reasons for your answer.

Click here to enter text.

Question 13: Do you support housing development at:

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site RAD11 – North of Holme Lane (potential capacity around 115 homes)			
Site RAD12 – Land to the north of Shelford Road (potential capacity around 180 homes)			
Any other location (please specify which)			

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

Click here to enter text.

Ruddington

Question 14: Do you have a view on the total number of new homes that should be accommodated on greenfield sites at Ruddington up to 2028? If possible, please give reasons for your answer.

Click here to enter text.

Question 15: Do you support housing development at:

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site RUD11 – Old Loughborough Road (potential capacity around 40 homes)			
Site RUD12 – Land to the east side of Loughborough Road (potential capacity around 60 homes)			
Site RUD13 – Land opposite Mere Way (potential capacity around 170 homes)			
Site RUD14 – Croft House (potential capacity around 25 homes)			
Any other location (please specify which)			

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

Click here to enter text.

Housing development at ‘other villages’

Question 16: Do you agree that, apart from the site to the south of Abbey Road, Aslockton with planning permission for up to 75 new homes, Local Plan Part 2 should not allocate greenfield land for housing development at Aslockton and Whatton in the plan period (up to 2028)?

Yes

No

Don't know

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

Click here to enter text.

Question 17: Should Local Plan Part 2 identify the following ‘other’ villages as suitable for a limited level of housing growth on greenfield sites?

	Yes	No	Don't know
<i>Cropwell Bishop</i>		✓	
<i>East Bridgford</i>		✓	
<i>Gotham</i>		✓	
<i>Sutton Bonington</i>		✓	
<i>Tollerton</i>		✓	

	Yes	No	Don't know
Any other settlement (please specify which)			

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

Click here to enter text.

Cropwell Bishop

Question 18: If greenfield land is allocated for housing development at Cropwell Bishop, do you have a view on the total number of new homes that should be built up to 2028? If possible, please give reasons for your answer.

Click here to enter text.

Question 19: Do you support housing development at:

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site CBI1 – Land to the south of Nottingham Road and east of Kinoulton Road (potential capacity around 30 homes)			
Site CBI2 – Land north of Memorial Hall (1) (potential capacity around 75 homes)			
Site CBI3 – Land north of Memorial Hall (2) (potential capacity around 60 homes)			

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<i>Site CBI4 – Land north of Fern Road (2) (potential capacity around 30 homes)</i>			
<i>Site CBI5 – Land north of Fern Road (1) (potential capacity around 250 homes)</i>			
<i>Site CBI6 – Land to the north of Fern Road (3) (potential capacity around 70 homes)</i>			
<i>Any other location (please specify which)</i>			

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

Click here to enter text.

East Bridgford

Question 20: *If greenfield land is allocated for housing development at East Bridgford, do you have a view on the total number of new homes that should be built up to 2028? If possible, please give reasons for your answer.*

Click here to enter text.

Question 21: *Do you support housing development at:*

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<i>Site EBR1 – Land behind Kirk Hill (east) (potential capacity around 15 homes)</i>			

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<i>Site EBR2 – Land behind Kirk Hill (west) (potential capacity around 70 homes)</i>			
<i>Site EBR3 – Land north of Kneeton Road (1) (potential capacity around 95 homes)</i>			
<i>Site EBR4 – Land north of Kneeton Road (2) (potential capacity around 150 homes)</i>			
<i>Site EBR5 – Land at Lammas Lane (potential capacity around 40 homes)</i>			
<i>Site EBR6 – Closes Side Lane (west) (potential capacity around 20 homes)</i>			
<i>Site EBR7 – Closes Side Lane (east) (potential capacity around 20 homes)</i>			
<i>Site EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane (potential capacity around 20 homes)</i>			
<i>Site EBR9 – Land to the south of Springdale Lane (potential capacity around 30 homes)</i>			
<i>Any other location (please specify which)</i>			

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

Click here to enter text.

Gotham

Question 22: *If greenfield land is allocated for housing development at Gotham, do you have a view on the total number of new homes that should be built up to 2028? If possible, please give reasons for your answer.*

Click here to enter text.

Question 23: Do you support housing development at:

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<i>Site GOT1 – Land to the rear of former British Legion (potential capacity around 25 homes)</i>			✓
<i>Site GOT2 – Land north of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (west) (potential capacity around 50 homes)</i>			✓
<i>Site GOT3 – Land north of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (east) (potential capacity around 20 homes)</i>			✓
<i>Site GOT4 – The Orchards, Leake Road (potential capacity around 50 homes)</i>			✓
<i>Site GOT5 – Land east of Gypsum Way/The Orchards (potential capacity around 200 homes)</i>			✓
<i>Site GOT6 – East of Leake Road (potential capacity around 45 homes)</i>			✓
<i>Site GOT7 – Land east of Hill Road (potential capacity around 160 homes)</i>			✓
<i>Site GOT8 – Land south of Moor Lane (potential capacity around 15 homes)</i>			✓
<i>Any other location (please specify which)</i>			✓

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

We do not wish to make detailed comment on individual sites, but urge the Borough Council to engage seriously with the local experts of Gotham Parish Council. It is very clear that the process for identifying potential new sites is deeply flawed and based on out of date or erroneous information. We understand that

GOT5 has a covenant on it restricting development, GOT7 (and other sites) is prone to flooding and has pylons running across it. A potential site between GOT5 and GOT7 is a brownfield site, but the Borough Council have incorrectly identified this site as a wildlife site.

The process for identifying and evaluating sites could have been made robust IF the borough Council had engaged with and sought the intelligence of Gotham Parish Council ahead of commencing this process.

No sites should be progressed without engagement with the Parish Council and a full impact study on any sites' development on current facilities in the village (also extensively used by members of the Barton in Fabis community) and on the local transport infrastructure and traffic flows.

Sutton Bonington

Question 24: If greenfield land is allocated for housing development at Sutton Bonington, do you have a view on the total number of new homes that should be built up to 2028? If possible, please give reasons for your answer.

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Question 25: Do you support housing development at:

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site SUT1 – Land north of Park Lane (potential capacity around 140 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Any other location (please specify which)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Tollerton

Question 26: *If greenfield land is allocated for housing development at Tollerton, do you have a view on the total number of new homes that should be built up to 2028? If possible, please give reasons for your answer.*

Click here to enter text.

Question 27: *Do you support housing development at:*

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<i>Site TOL1 – Land at Burnside Grove (potential capacity around 180 homes)</i>			
<i>Site TOL2 – West of Tollerton Lane and North of Medina Drive (potential capacity around 360 homes)</i>			
<i>Site TOL3 – Land east of Tollerton Lane (potential capacity around 50 homes)</i>			
<i>Any other location (please specify which)</i>			

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

Click here to enter text.

Other issues

Question 28: *Please identify any matters related to housing development which are not covered here or elsewhere.*

Click here to enter text.

Please return by **5pm on Friday 31 March 2017** to:

Planning Policy
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Rushcliffe Arena
Rugby Road
Nottingham. NG2 7YG

Or to: localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk

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

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