



Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Policies – Further Options

East Bridg Comm
Plan Group
1073987

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)
East Bridgford Community Plan Group	Name	Patsy Andrews (chair)
Click here to enter text.	Address	69 Kneeton Road, East Bridgford NG13 8 PH
Click here to enter text.	E-mail	

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.

Click here to enter text.

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.

Click here to enter text.

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
Site COT1 – Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park (potential capacity around 240 homes)			
Site COT2 – Land at Main Road (potential capacity around 50 homes)			
Site COT3 – Land rear of and to the west of Main Road (potential capacity around 125 homes)			
Site COT4 Land off Woodgate Lane (potential capacity around 80 homes)			
Site COT5 – Bakers Hollow (potential capacity around 60 homes)			
Site COT6 – The Brickyard, Owthorpe Road (potential capacity around 100 homes)			
Site COT7– Land behind Firdale (2) (potential capacity around 65 homes)			
Site COT8 – Land behind Firdale (potential capacity around 95 homes)			

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<i>Site COT9 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (1) (potential capacity around 140 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site COT10 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (2) (potential capacity around 40 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site COT11 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (3) (potential capacity around 250 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site COT12 – Land south of Plumtree Lane (potential capacity around 250 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Any other location (please specify which)</i>	<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.

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
<i>Site EL9 – Land south of West Leake Road (potential capacity around 50 homes)</i>			
<i>Site EL10 – Land north of West Leake Road (potential capacity around 75 homes)</i>			
<i>Site EL11 – Brook Furlong Farm (potential capacity around 70 homes)</i>			
<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>			
<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>			

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site KEY13 – Hillside Farm (potential capacity around 60 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site KEY14 – Land south of Bunny Lane (potential capacity around 410 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.](#)

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)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
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)			

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<i>Site RUD13 – Land opposite Mere Way (potential capacity around 170 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site RUD14 – Croft House (potential capacity around 25 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Any other location (please specify which)</i>	<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.

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
Cropwell Bishop			✓
East Bridgford		✓	
Gotham			✓
Sutton Bonington			✓
Tollerton			✓
Any other settlement (please specify which)			✓

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

For comments based on the 2016 East Bridgford Community Plan Appraisal please see detailed comments under Questions 20 & 21

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)			
Site CBI4 – Land north of Fern Road (2) (potential capacity around 30 homes)			
Site CBI5 – Land north of Fern Road (1) (potential capacity around 250 homes)			
Site CBI6 – Land to the north of Fern Road (3) (potential capacity around 70 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.

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.

NO. The Community Plan Group has not had access to the East Bridgford Housing Needs Survey 2016 – its publication is strangely delayed until after the consultation period ends. The Appraisal findings is that the overwhelming majority do not support developments of even “carefully designed” developments larger than 10 homes

Question 21: Do you support housing development at:

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site EBR1 – Land behind Kirk Hill (east) (potential capacity around 15 homes)		✓	
Site EBR2 – Land behind Kirk Hill (west) (potential capacity around 70 homes)			✓
Site EBR3 – Land north of Kneeton Road (1) (potential capacity around 95 homes)			✓
Site EBR4 – Land north of Kneeton Road (2) (potential capacity around 150 homes)			✓
Site EBR5 – Land at Lammas Lane (potential capacity around 40 homes)			✓
Site EBR6 – Closes Side Lane (west) (potential capacity around 20 homes)			✓
Site EBR7 – Closes Side Lane (east) (potential capacity around 20 homes)		✓	
Site EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane (potential capacity around 20 homes)		✓	
Site EBR9 – Land to the south of Springdale Lane (potential capacity around 30 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.



RBC - East Bridgford Consultation EB COMMUNITY PLAN GROUP Submission

The Community Plan Appraisal questionnaire was recently completed by 354 households in East Bridgford, representing 798 people, 44% of the 2011 census. Many findings relate directly to the RBC consultation on developments into the Green Belt and housing need. We summarise only the relevant findings, for further details see attached report which addresses in particular the Green Belt Review (see Question 28).

RBC Question “Do you agree that the Local Plan should identify East Bridgford as a suitable village for a limited level of housing growth on greenfield sites”?

NO. EB is not a suitable village for a limited level of housing growth, other than infill.

RBC Question “Do you have a view on the total number of new homes that should be accommodated on greenfield sites to 2028?”

NO. The Appraisal provides no estimate of numbers to 2028.

However, many questions record EB households’ rejection of development into the Green Belt. Building in the Green Belt is considered a 'problem' (71% of replies). two thirds (67%) opposed any development into the Green Belt.

Among the most important aspect of East Bridgford worthy of retention were the fields separating the village from the main roads. Among other facilities Butt Close playing field, the Green Belt surrounding the village, trees on the Trent escarpment and in Springdale wood were all highly prized.

A majority (53%) believed that the village was already 'over developed' although more (73%) considered single dwelling infill acceptable, while almost half (42%) consider infill of small groups of homes unacceptable infill.

Small developments of 10 or fewer homes on the edge of the village in the Green belt were acceptable to only 25% of households and larger “carefully designed” developments even less so. There was minority support for developments east towards the new A46 (40%), north towards Kneeton (39%), south towards the A6097 (22%) and little support for development west, direction river Trent (9%). A great majority wanted to preserve the belt of fields separating the village from the A6097 and new A46 (93%).

RBC Question “Do you support housing development:” and Site Comments

Negative aspects in italics

- Site EBR1 Kirk Hill (c. 15 homes) PART
in reality (if not technically) village infill; *development direction A6097; larger than 10 homes*
- Site EBR2 Kirk Hill (c. 70 homes) NO
Removes belt of fields separating village from A6097; development direction A6097; larger than 10 homes
- Site EBR3 North of Kneeton Rd (c. 95 homes) NO
Development direction river Trent; larger than 10 homes
- Site EBR4 North of Kneeton Rd (150 homes) NO
Development direction river Trent; larger than 10 homes
- Site EBR5 Lammas Lane (c. 40 homes) NO
Development direction Kneeton, larger than 10 homes
- Site EBR6 Closes Side Lane west (c. 20 homes) PART
in reality (if not technically) village infill, *but larger than 10 homes.*
- Site EBR7 Closes Side Lane east (c. 20 homes) NO
Development direction Kneeton / A46, larger than 10 homes
- Site EBR8 Butt Lane (c. 20 homes) PART
In realty (if not technically) village infill, *but larger than 10 homes.*

- Site EBR9 Springdale Lane (c. 30 homes) NO
Development dDirection A6097 and A46; larger than 10 homes, ridge and furrow field (very rare in EB)

Other Issues raised in the Appraisal

Infrastructure aspects commented on adversely in the Appraisal:
flooding problems after more frequent heavy rainfall over loading old and crumbling undersized sewers; poor state of roads and footpaths; existing traffic & parking problems; over-crowding in St Peter's Academy

.....
 Patsy Andrews, Chair of EB Community Plan Group
 East Bridgford March 2017

For further relevant info from EB Community Plan Appraisal (2016) see Q.28

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>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site GOT2 – Land north of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (west) (potential capacity around 50 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site GOT3 – Land north of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (east) (potential capacity around 20 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site GOT4 – The Orchards, Leake Road (potential capacity around 50 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<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.

Click here to enter text.

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

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

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<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.*

East Bridgford- further data from 2017 Community Plan Appraisal

The Green Belt Review & the Household Appraisal **Findings**

Introduction

Rushcliffe BC faces an additional demand from central government to provide more housing. As a result it is conducting a Green Belt Review of the potential for housing in the Green Belt surrounding East Bridgford and four other medium-sized villages with a basic level of facilities capable of potentially accommodating some housing.

Seven Green Belt sites in EB have been proposed by landowners and RBC has evaluated them against the following Green Belt Criteria:

1. Check unrestricted sprawl of settlements
2. Prevent merging of settlements
3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic settlement
5. Assist in urban regeneration

The 7 sites have been given Green Belt Scores out a maximum of 25 (5 x 5). The RBC documentation is readily available through the web address given on the EB village web site.

These evaluations are subject to public consultation.

EB has recently completed a Community Appraisal in which 354 households (45% of total households) have given their opinion on a range topics including development, the Green Belt and housing. This note sets out the data relevant to the Green Belt Review.

Summary

The Appraisal does not directly address the 5 Green Belt Criteria, but does provide much indirect evidence with which to assess the Green Belt site locations.

- **There is a strong desire to keep EB as it is and a two thirds majority oppose more development, particularly into the Green Belt.**
- **Presciently the Appraisal did ask a series of questions about attitudes if the village was compelled to accept some development into the Green Belt. In particular, Q26 records information on the preferred direction of development.**

Site	Appraisal Assessment
South of Manor Farm Kneeton Rd	Development in direction Trent - only 9% agree
North of Manor Farm Kneeton Rd	Development in direction Trent - only 9% agree
East of Kirk Hill	Development in direction main road A6097 - 22% agree Removes belt of fields between EB and main road - 93% oppose
South of Springdale Lane	Development in direction main road A6097 - 22% agree (Development in direction main road A46 - 42% agree) Removes ridge & furrow heritage - 84% oppose
North of Closes Side Lane	Development in direction main road A46 - 42% agree
North of Butt Lane	Development in direction main road A46 - 42% agree
At Lammas Lane	Development in direction Kneeton – 39% agree (Development in direction main road A46 - 42% agree)

The Appraisal Findings in Detail

Except where stated the percentages are based on the 354 households who responded to the survey. The Appraisal represents the largest survey of residents' opinions for over 14 years.

There is a demand for continuity, to keep things as they are

Q 108. Have Your Say: What sort of village would you like to see in 5-10 year's time? What needs to be preserved

<i>Most of those responding resist change</i>	# write-ins	% write ins
Keep things as they are, etc.	70	32%
Preserve the Green Belt/green spaces/wildlife	29	13%
Resist expansion of village	27	12%

There is general agreement that EB has a special value as a village in the countryside

Q9. Thinking about East Bridgford as a place to live, what aspects do you as a household or family like most?

Being in the countryside not the town or suburbs is important	97%
---	-----

Q13. Which of the following features of East Bridgford Parish give it its special character and should be preserved?

The fields separating the village from the main roads	88% very important
The Green Belt surrounding EB	81% very important

The Green Belt is important

Q9 What aspect do you like most?

It's in the Green Belt	53% very important	32% important	85% Total
------------------------	-----------------------	------------------	--------------

Q10. What are the things you dislike about the village or you feel would benefit from improvement? Here are some ideas / statements that have come up in East Bridgford and other villages.

Development extending into the surrounding countryside (building in the Green Belt, wind turbines, etc)	47% significant problem	24% problem	71% Total
---	----------------------------	----------------	--------------

There is a mixed attitude to the current level of development

Q14. What do you feel about the current development of the village? Here are some views that have been expressed, do you agree?

The village is being over developed	21% strongly agree	32% agree	53% Total
-------------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------	--------------

There is majority opposition to development into the Green Belt

Q26. If the village has to be extended, in which direction would the development be acceptable and under what restrictions?

All development outside the village limits into the green belt should be <u>opposed</u> .	46% strongly agree	21% agree	67% Total
---	-----------------------	--------------	--------------

Villagers have views on where any development that is forced on village should be located and on what scale

Q25. If new homes are to be built what scale of development would be acceptable and where? The majority favours infill, but opposes extensions in to the Green Belt and particularly so for larger developments

Answer Options	Preferred	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Conversion/extension or replacement of existing buildings	44%	42%	6%
Infill inside the existing village-single dwellings	18%	55%	16%
Infill inside the existing village-small groups of less than 10 homes	11%	38%	42%
Edge of the village in the green belt-single dwellings	2%	28%	60%
Edge of the village in the green belt-less than 10 homes	3%	21%	66%
Edge of the village in the green belt-carefully designed larger developments	2%	7%	81%

Q26. If the village has to be extended, in which direction would the development be acceptable and under what restrictions?

Direction development is <u>acceptable</u> :	Strongly agree	Agree	Total
Towards Kneeton	9%	30%	39%
Towards the new A46 (off Butt Lane, Springdale, Closes Side Lane)	8%	34%	42%
Towards the A6097 (off Kirk Hill, Brunts Lane)	4%	18%	22%
Towards the River Trent	3%	6%	9%

Q27. If there are to be any developments (housing or business) extending beyond the edge of the village into the countryside what planning controls, if any, should be enforced?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Total
Landscapes of significant character like woodland and ridge and furrow pasture should be preserved	79%	15%	94%
A belt of fields should be kept between the village and the main roads (new A46 and A6097)	75%	18%	93%

Additional restriction relevant for one Green Belt Site

Q31. There are a number of wildlife sites that have been suggested as important for East Bridgford. What is your opinion?

	Very important	Important	Total
Ridge and furrow pasture (as in Springdale Meadow)	50%	34%	84%

Villagers rate Housing lowest on the need for development

Q20. What types of development do you think would be desirable within the parish?

Answer Options	Strongly Agree	Agree	Total
Better communal facilities for sports and leisure	17%	36%	53%
More or improved shopping facilities	8%	20%	28%
More employment opportunities	5%	25%	30%
More houses	3%	12%	16%

Villagers have clear opinions on the type of housing

Q21. Taking into account the housing needs and the character of the parish, if new homes are to be built what types would be suitable?

Sheltered housing and starter homes are the most suitable, Housing Association lets the least. Larger exec homes and flats are the least acceptable types.

Answer Options	Strongly agree	Agree	Total
Sheltered Accommodation for the elderly	26%	49%	75%
Starter homes for young people	24%	46%	70%
Affordable housing for lower wage earners	29%	39%	59%
Houses for restricted sale giving preference to local people	20%	42%	63%
Houses for unrestricted sale to private buyers	5%	34%	34%
Housing association/council houses for letting	9%	23%	31%
Bungalows	18%	49%	66%
Two -Three bedroom houses	15%	59%	74%
Four bedroom or larger executive homes	5%	27%	32%
Flats	4%	19%	23%

Q24. What are the problems facing people moving within EB or coming to live in EB who are looking for different types of accommodation?

Answer Options (based on 101 responses)	Shortage	Price	No particular problem
Larger family homes	6%	36%	38%
Rented Accommodation	35%	10%	36%
Single Storey homes	34%	17%	29%
Starter homes	49%	25%	15%

EB Housing Needs Study 2016

Midlands Rural Housing has conducted a survey of housing needs in EB. No results have yet been published (22/03/2017). Until it is:

- no comparison can be made with the Community Plan Appraisal data on housing need;
- we cannot evaluate the relevance of local housing needs to the Green Belt Review

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.