



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

## 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](mailto: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)
Judy Raven, Clerk to Gotham Parish Council	<b>Name</b>	Click here to enter text.
33, Leake Road Gotham NG11 0HW	<b>Address</b>	Click here to enter text.
	<b>E-mail</b>	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.*

**The relationship of the Core Strategy and the Part Two Local Plan.** Our view is that any solution Rushcliffe BC come up with must be within the spatial framework set out in the Core Strategy and the settlement hierarchy ; particularly the restriction of development in other villages such as Gotham to local needs. Any other approach would necessitate the full or partial review of the Core Strategy.

**Causes of under performance.** There are some key areas of work that ought to have been carried out before the report was published. Perhaps the most important of these is some study of the causes of the underperformance in house construction and an assessment of whether allocating extra land will of itself bring completions back on track. What is proposed is an average completion rate of 1400 for the period 2019 to 2024 compared with the period 400 for the period 2011 to 2019. This seems highly unlikely. All of this may seem a bit academic in the light of the case set out later in this response that housing in Gotham is to be for local needs only whatever the land supply position; but a failure to identify the real causes of housing underperformance will mean that we arrive at the same "land supply crisis" next year and year after and at some point developers and landowners may present a freeing up of policy in "third tier" villages like Gotham as an appropriate response. Past appeal decisions in villages such as Aslockton suggest this could become a real danger.

**Duty to co operate.** This is simply mentioned. There is no evidence that Rushcliffe has asked neighbouring authorities, particularly Nottingham City, if they can provide more land. It may also be appropriate to jointly commission research into the causes of poor performance. A review of job creation in Greater Nottingham over the last five years might well shed some light on the issue.

**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.*

**Settlement Hierarchy and Thresholds.** If we accept for the moment the need to find land for a further 900 dwellings then there needs to be a sequential search based on the Spatial Policy of the Core Strategy which remain the statutory framework into which any Part 2 Local Plan must fit. The hierarchy is set out below.

**1. The Main Urban Area of West Bridgford.** The Further Options document assumes there are no sites additional to those already identified in the January 2016 document. It is not clear how closely the issue was assessed

**2. Key Settlements.** These are listed below

Bingham (no further sites are identified).

Cotgrave (sites are included in the plan with a capacity of more than 900 dwellings but infrastructure thresholds have not been examined. It is arguable that a capacity exercise for this and other key settlements should have been carried out before the further options document was published.)

East Leake (already set to take twice the number in the Core Strategy albeit that is a minimum figure. The document takes the view that the limit has been reached).

Keyworth (the document accepts the principle of development over the level in the 2016 document but subject to infrastructure constraints, Sites with a capacity of over 1200 dwellings are identified).

Radcliffe on Trent (the approach is similar to Keyworth but the sites identified have a capacity of 295 dwellings).

Ruddington (the approach is similar to Keyworth but the sites identified have a capacity of 300 dwellings).

Sites are identified in the key settlements for over 2500 dwellings. The Core Strategy says that after West Bridgford the key settlements are the first port of call. If only 30% of the identified sites were included in the Local Plan that would meet the 900 requirement. Until further work is carried out on the key settlements it would be premature as well as inappropriate for the BC to lay down a housing figure for Gotham on land supply rather than local need grounds.

**3. The local need villages.** Bradmore, Bunny, Cropwell Butler, Gotham, Newton, Plumtree, Shelford, Upper Saxondale. It is for those Parish Councils to assess what local needs are but the likelihood is that these settlements, in aggregate, will accommodate some housing and in aggregate it could amount to several hundred. In due course this will add to supply but for the reasons explained below it should be seen as any part of a five year land supply solution.

The presentation of material on settlements at all levels of the hierarchy in the same format and we find this misleading and inappropriate.

**Question 3:** Do you support housing development at:

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
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)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site COT2 – Land at Main Road (potential capacity around 50 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site COT3 – Land rear of and to the west of Main Road (potential capacity around 125 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site COT4 Land off Woodgate Lane (potential capacity around 80 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site COT5 – Bakers Hollow (potential capacity around 60 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site COT6 – The Brickyard, Owthorpe Road (potential capacity around 100 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site COT7– Land behind Firdale (2) (potential capacity around 65 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site COT8 – Land behind Firdale (potential capacity around 95 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<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"/>



	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<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:

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but onl y part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site EL9 – Land south of West Leake Road (potential capacity around 50 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site EL10 – Land north of West Leake Road (potential capacity around 75 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site EL11 – Brook Furlong Farm (potential capacity around 70 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site EL12 – Land off Rempstone Road (north) (potential capacity around 235 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site EL13 – Land off Rempstone Road (south) (potential capacity around 120 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site EL14 – Land north of Lantern Lane (2) (potential capacity around 360 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"/>

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>

*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:*

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site KEY1 – Land east of Willow Brook (potential capacity around 40 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site KEY2 – Land off Selby Lane and Willowbrook (potential capacity around 15 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site KEY3 – Land south of Selby Lane (potential capacity around 60 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site KEY4 – Land off Nicker Hill (potential capacity around 450 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site KEY5 – Hill Top Farm, Platt Lane (1) (potential capacity around 50 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site KEY6 – Hill Top Farm, Platt Lane (2) (potential capacity around 80 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site KEY7 – Shelton Farm, Platt Lane (potential capacity around 160 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site KEY8 – Land between Platt Lane and Station Road (potential capacity around 180 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site KEY9 – Land north of Debdale Lane (1) (potential capacity around 110 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site KEY10 – Land south of Debdale Lane (1) (potential capacity around 230 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site KEY11 – Land south of Debdale Lane (2) (potential capacity around 200 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site KEY12 – Land north of Debdale Lane (2) (potential capacity around 160 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site KEY13 – Hillside Farm (potential capacity around 60 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site KEY14 – Land south of Bunny Lane (potential capacity around 410 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.

### **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:

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site RAD11 – North of Holme Lane (potential capacity around 115 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site RAD12 – Land to the north of Shelford Road (potential capacity around 180 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.

### 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			

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but onl y part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>around 60 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<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?*

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
<i>Cropwell Bishop</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>East Bridgford</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Gotham</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Sutton Bonington</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Yes	No	Don't know
<i>Tollerton</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Any other settlement (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.*

**Local Need and timing.** The restriction of housing in settlements such as Gotham is dealt with in the Core Strategy in three places of which the most important is section 1 of the Spatial Policy

*1. The sustainable development of Rushcliffe will be achieved through a strategy that supports a policy of urban concentration with regeneration for the whole of Greater Nottingham to 2028. The settlement hierarchy for Rushcliffe to accommodate this sustainable development is defined on the Key Diagram and consists of:*

- a) the main built up area of Nottingham; and*
- b) Key Settlements identified for growth of Bingham, Cotgrave, East Leake, Keyworth, Radcliffe on Trent and Ruddington.*

***In other settlements (not shown on the Key Diagram), with the exception of Newton and the redevelopment of the former RAF Newton, development will be for local needs only.***

The Core Strategy does not provide a definition of local needs but the Further explanation provided by the supporting text as set out below provides the context for such a definition:

*3.3.5 In line with the strategy, outside of those Key Settlements listed in part1(b) of the policy and with the exception of the former RAF Newton, development will be of a scale appropriate to meet local needs. Former RAF Newton is identified for development in order to regenerate a major brownfield site and to support the existing Newton community.*

*3.3.17 In other settlements, development will meet local needs only. Local needs will be delivered through small scale infill development or on exception sites (see Policy 8). Beyond this, where small scale allocations are appropriate to provide further for local needs, these will be included in the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies Development Plan Document, including Neighbourhood Plans.*

Based on this material our conclusions are

- Neighbourhood Plans have a key role
- The first port of call will be infill sites or rural exception sites
- Any allocations will be small scale.

We have looked at practice in a number of other areas and it is clear that whilst local needs is broader in scope than affordable housing on rural exception sites because it includes market housing and takes a longer term view nevertheless the two concepts are alike in that the starting point is the need for housing of residents in Gotham and other villages both now and over the Plan period.

**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:*

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site CBI1 – Land to the south of Nottingham Road and east of Kinoulton Road (potential capacity around 30 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site CBI2 – Land north of Memorial Hall (1) (potential capacity around 75 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site CBI3– Land north of Memorial Hall (2) (potential capacity around 60 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site CBI4 – Land north of Fern Road (2) (potential capacity around 30 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site CBI5 – Land north of Fern Road (1) (potential capacity around 250 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site CBI6 – Land to the north of Fern Road (3) (potential capacity around 70 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.

### **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:**

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site EBR1 – Land behind Kirk Hill (east) (potential capacity around 15 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site EBR2 – Land behind Kirk Hill (west) (potential capacity around 70 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site EBR3 – Land north of Kneeton Road (1) (potential capacity around 95 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site EBR4 – Land north of Kneeton Road (2) (potential capacity around 150 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site EBR5 – Land at Lammas Lane (potential capacity around 40 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site EBR6 – Closes Side Lane (west) (potential capacity around 20 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site EBR7 – Closes Side Lane (east) (potential capacity around 20 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane (potential capacity around 20 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site EBR9 – Land to the south of Springdale Lane (potential capacity around 30 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.

## **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.*

Gotham Parish Council has commenced work on a Neighbourhood Plan. We submit that the assessment of local needs and the identification of the number, type, timing and location of housing to meet it is for the Neighbourhood Plan in the first instance. We will ensure that progress is made on the Neighbourhood Plan at a rate that will allow any implications for greenbelt review and site allocations to inform the Preferred Option Stage of the Part Two Local Plan.

**Question 23:** Do you support housing development at:

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but onl y part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<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"/>
<i>Site GOT5 – Land east of Gypsum Way/The Orchards (potential capacity around 200 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site GOT6 – East of Leake Road (potential capacity around 45 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site GOT7 – Land east of Hill Road (potential capacity around 160 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but onl y part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site GOT8 – Land south of Moor Lane (potential capacity around 15 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.*

Comments on individual sites are made in the Green Belt Review response.

**Recommendations**

1. That further work is required on the causes of the underperformance in house construction and an assessment of whether allocating extra land will of itself bring completions back on track.
2. That the spatial policy of the Core Strategy remains in place and in particular that development in Gotham should be for local needs only
3. That work on the Neighbourhood Plan will identify the correct number, type and location for housing to meet local needs in Gotham to meet local needs over the plan period to 2028
4. Local need is likely to be spread over the full plan period and so it would not be appropriate in any event to look to allocations in Gotham to meet a five year land supply shortfall
5. It is noted that consultation on the preferred option will take place in June 2017. By that time sufficient progress will have been made to enable local needs to be identified.
6. As the Neighbourhood Plan is developed further inputs can be made to the Part Two local plan up to November 2017 when the draft plan is published

In the meantime we would suggest that the BC carry out further work on the capacity of the main urban area, on capacity thresholds and ways to remove them in key settlements and on the causes of under performance in the housing market in Rushcliffe. This latter task would be best carried out in co ordination with the other Districts of Greater Nottingham.

**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:*

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<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:**

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site TOL1 – Land at Burnside Grove (potential capacity around 180 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site TOL2 – West of Tollerton Lane and North of Medina Drive (potential capacity around 360 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site TOL3 – Land east of Tollerton Lane (potential capacity around 50 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.

**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](mailto: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.

## **Submissions on behalf of Gotham Parish Council on the Further Options Document for Part Two of the Rushcliffe Local Plan, the Green Belt review and the CIL Schedule**

### **1. Context**

1.1 These notes form part of the response of Gotham Parish Council to the Further Option Report on Part two of the Rushcliffe Local Plan and on the Green Belt Review and on the proposed CIL schedule. Where appropriate the response forms submitted are cross referenced to this report.

1.2. An Issues and Options Report was published in January 2016 and that document proposed a tight village envelope around Gotham that left no room for or Greenfield development on the edge of the village. The Parish Council supported that approach.

1.3 A Further Option Report is said to be justified on the grounds that housing development has not taken place at the rate set out in the Sore Strategy and the prospects for development on some of the major sites such as Clifton South are less positive than they were twelve months ago.

1.4 Rushcliffe BC seems to see this as giving it the task of securing land to allow 7058 dwellings to be built in the period 2019 to 2024, a rate of just over 1400 per annum. The BC says this requires land additional land capable of being developed in five year with a capacity of 900 dwellings to be identified.

### **2. 2. General points**

#### **2.1 The relationship of the Core Strategy and the Part Two Local Plan.**

Our view is that any solution Rushcliffe BC come up with must be within the spatial framework set out in the Core Strategy and the settlement hierarchy ; particularly the restriction of development in other villages such as Gotham to local needs. Any other approach would necessitate the full or partial review of the Core Strategy.

#### **2.2 Causes of under performance**

There are some key areas of work that ought to have been carried out before the report was published. Perhaps the most important of these is some study of the causes of the underperformance in house construction and an assessment of whether allocating extra land will of itself bring completions back on track. What is proposed is an average completion rate of 1400 for the period 2019 to 2024 compared with the period 400 for the period 2011 to 2019. This seems highly unlikely. All of this may seem a bit academic in the light of the case I will set out later in this report that housing in Gotham is to be for local needs only whatever the land supply position; but a failure to identify the real causes of housing underperformance will mean that we arrive at the same "land supply crisis" next year and year after and at some point developers and landowners may present a freeing up of policy in "third tier" villages Gotham as an appropriate response. Past appeal decisions in villages such as Aslockton suggest this could become a real danger.

#### **2.3 Duty to co operate**

This is simply mentioned. There is no evidence that Rushcliffe has asked neighbouring authorities, particularly Nottingham City, if they can provide more land. It may also be appropriate to jointly commission research into the causes of poor performance. A review of job creation in Greater Nottingham over the last five years might well shed some light on the issue.

## **2.4 Settlement Hierarchy and Thresholds**

If we accept for the moment the need to find land for a further 900 dwellings then there needs to be a sequential search based on the Spatial Policy of the Core Strategy which remain the statutory framework into which any Part 2 Local Plan must fit. The hierarchy is set out below.

## **2.5 The Main Urban Area of West Bridgford**

The Further Options document assumes there are no sites additional to those already identified in the January 2016 document. It is not clear how closely the issue was assessed

## **2.6 Key Settlements**

These are listed below

Bingham( no further sites are identified ).

Cotgrave (sites are included in the plan with a capacity of more than 900 dwellings but infrastructure thresholds have not been examined. It is arguable that a capacity exercise for this and other key settlements should have been carried out before the further options document was published).

East Leake (already set to take twice the number in the Core Strategy albeit that is a minimum figure. The document takes the view that the limit has been reached).

Keyworth (the document accepts the principle of development over the level in the 2016 document but subject to infrastructure constraints, Sites with a capacity of over 1200 dwellings are identified).

Radcliffe on Trent (the approach is similar to Keyworth but the sites identified have a capacity of 295 dwellings).

Ruddington (the approach is similar to Keyworth but the sites identified have a capacity of 300 dwellings).

Sites are identified in the key settlements for over 2500 dwellings. The Core Strategy says that after West Bridgford the key settlements are the first port of call. If only 30% of the identified sites were included in the Local Plan that would meet the 900 requirement. Until further work is carried out on the key settlements it would be premature as well as inappropriate for the BC to lay down a housing figure for Gotham on land supply rather than local need grounds.

## **2.7 The local need villages**

Bradmore, Bunny, Cropwell Butler, Gotham, Newton, Plumtree, Shelford, Upper Saxondale. It is for those Parish Councils to assess what local needs are but the likelihood is that these settlements, in aggregate, will accommodate some housing and in aggregate it could

amount to several hundred. In due course this will add to supply but for the reasons explained below it should be seen as any part of a five year land supply solution.

The presentation of material on settlements at all levels of the hierarchy in the same format and we find this misleading and inappropriate.

### **3 Local Need and timing**

3.1 The restriction of housing in settlements such as Gotham is dealt with in the Core Strategy in three places of which the most important is section 1 of the Spatial Policy

*1. The sustainable development of Rushcliffe will be achieved through a strategy that supports a policy of urban concentration with regeneration for the whole of Greater Nottingham to 2028. The settlement hierarchy for Rushcliffe to accommodate this sustainable development is defined on the Key Diagram and consists of:*

- a) the main built up area of Nottingham; and*
- b) Key Settlements identified for growth of Bingham, Cotgrave, East Leake, Keyworth, Radcliffe on Trent and Ruddington.*

***In other settlements (not shown on the Key Diagram), with the exception of Newton and the redevelopment of the former RAF Newton, development will be for local needs only.***

The Core Strategy does not provide a definition of local needs but the Further explanation provided by the supporting text as set out below provides the context for such a definition

*3.3.5 In line with the strategy, outside of those Key Settlements listed in part1(b) of the policy and with the exception of the former RAF Newton, development will be of a scale appropriate to meet local needs. Former RAF Newton is identified for development in order to regenerate a major brownfield site and to support the existing Newton community.*

*3.3.17 In other settlements, development will meet local needs only. Local needs will be delivered through small scale infill development or on exception sites (see Policy 8). Beyond this, where small scale allocations are appropriate to provide further for local needs, these will be included in the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies Development Plan Document, including Neighbourhood Plans.*

3.2 Based on this material our conclusions are

- Neighbourhood Plans have a key role
- The first port of call will be infill sites or rural exception sites
- Any allocations will be small scale.

We have looked at practice in a number of other areas and it is clear that whilst local needs is broader in scope than affordable housing on rural exception sites because it includes market housing and takes a longer term view nevertheless the two concepts are alike in that the starting point is the need for housing of residents in Gotham both now and over the Plan period.

3.3 Gotham Parish Council has commenced work on a Neighbourhood Plan. We submit that the assessment of local needs and the identification of the number, type, timing and location of housing to meet it is for the Neighbourhood Plan in the first instance. We will ensure that progress is made on the Neighbourhood Plan at a rate that will allow any implications for greenbelt review and site allocations to inform the Preferred Option Stage of the Part Two Local Plan.



## **4. Green belt**

4.1 The review of the greenbelt is at a higher level of detail than has previously been undertaken. It also seems to be very much related to SHLAA sites and for the reasons set out above we do not think that is an appropriate starting point. We have a number of technical reservations; namely

- The analysis assumes all five purposes are of equal value
- The scoring system is relatively rough and ready
- The purposes of protecting the open countryside and checking unrestricted sprawl should be seen in the context of the settlement concerned. An area of housing that would not be “sprawl” in a large urban area would be perceived as that in a small settlement such as Gotham
- The category Preserve setting and special character of historic settlement seems to have been interpreted very narrowly as the immediate setting of heritage assets. In settlements such as Gotham settlement size, shape and in particular relation to the landscape and the historic value of landscapes are all relevant issues.

4.2 This stage of a greenbelt review is clearly a matter of subjective opinion. In the spirit of localism residents need to have a major input. The Neighbourhood Plan will allow them to do that in an informed way with adequate time for reflection and discussion. We see no need for firm decisions on the value of parts of the greenbelt in Gotham at this stage and we propose that the examination of the greenbelt around Gotham should be one of the tasks undertaken by the Neighbourhood Plan although we recognize that the Neighbourhood Plan cannot of itself amend greenbelt boundaries.

4.3 Notwithstanding our objections to the methodology we set out at Appendix One and summarise below our own assessment of the value of a number greenbelt areas dealt with in the review against greenbelt purposes as well as other material planning considerations such as the value of agricultural land and bio diversity. We get very different results and this underlines our point that the detailed review is best carried out in the context of the Neighbourhood Plan which will allow time for a properly informed process of public consultation.

## **5. Recommendations**

1. That further work is required on the causes of the underperformance in house construction and an assessment of whether allocating extra land will of itself bring completions back on track.
2. That the spatial policy of the Core Strategy remains in place and in particular that development in Gotham should be for local needs only
3. That work on the Neighbourhood Plan will identify the correct number, type and location for housing to meet local needs in Gotham to meet local needs over the plan period to 2028

4. Local need is likely to be spread over the full plan period and so it would not be appropriate in any event to look to allocations in Gotham to meet a five year land supply shortfall
5. It is noted that consultation on the preferred option will take place in June 2017. By that time sufficient progress will have been made to enable local needs to be identified.
6. As the Neighbourhood Plan is developed further inputs can be made to the Part Two local plan up to November 2017 when the draft plan is published

In the meantime we would suggest that the BC carry out further work on the capacity of the main urban area, on capacity thresholds and ways to remove them in key settlements and on the causes of under performance in the housing market in Rushcliffe. This latter task would be best carried out in co ordination with the other Districts of Greater Nottingham

**March 29<sup>th</sup> 2017**

**Response Form**

Your Details		Agent details (where applicable)
Judy Raven, Clerk to Gotham Parish Council	<b>Name</b>	
33, Leake Road Gotham NG11 0HW	<b>Address</b>	
<a href="mailto:gothamparishclerk@outlook.com">gothamparishclerk@outlook.com</a>	<b>E-mail</b>	

**1. Green Belt Review Part 2 (b): Additional sites review**

Do you agree or disagree with the review of the additional Green Belt sites around Rushcliffe's Key Settlements and other villages against the purposes for including land within the Green Belt? If you disagree, state why the assessment is incorrect and provide your Green Belt score and conclusions on Green Belt importance. Your comment should focus on the land's performance against Green Belt purposes.

The review of the greenbelt is at a higher level of detail than has previously been undertaken. It also seems to be very much related to SHLAA sites and for the reasons set out in our LAPP response we do not think that is an appropriate starting point. We have a number of technical reservations; namely

- The analysis assumes all five purposes are of equal value
- The scoring system is relatively rough and ready
- The purposes of protecting the open countryside and checking unrestricted sprawl should be seen in the context of the settlement concerned. An area of housing that would not be “sprawl” in a large urban area would be perceived as that in a small settlement such as Gotham
- The category ‘Preserve setting and special character of historic settlement’ seems to have been interpreted very narrowly as the immediate setting of heritage assets. In settlements such as Gotham settlement size, shape and in particular relation to the landscape and the historic value of landscapes are all relevant issues.
- Issues such as current use e.g. value as agricultural land and biodiversity are ignored.

This stage of a greenbelt review is clearly a matter of subjective opinion. In the spirit of localism residents need to have a major input. The Neighbourhood Plan will allow them to do that in an informed way with adequate time for reflection and discussion. We see no need for firm decisions on the value of parts of the greenbelt in Gotham at this stage and we propose that the examination of the greenbelt around Gotham should be one of the tasks undertaken by the Neighbourhood Plan although we recognize that the Neighbourhood Plan cannot of itself amend greenbelt boundaries.

Notwithstanding our objections to the methodology we set out below our own assessment of the value of a number greenbelt areas dealt with in the review against greenbelt purposes. We get different results and this underlines our point that the detailed review is best carried out in the context of the Neighbourhood Plan which will allow time for a properly informed process of public consultation.

LAPP area	GBR area	Sprawl	Merging	Encroachment	Historic	Urban	Total
<b>GOT 1</b>	<b>GOT 2</b>	1	1	4	1	3	10
<b>GOT 2</b>	<b>GOT 1</b>	3	1	2	4	3	13
<b>GOT 3</b>	<b>GOT 1</b>	3	1	2	4	3	13
<b>GOT 4</b>	<b>GOT 7</b>	3	1	3	5	3	15
<b>GOT 5</b>	<b>GOT 6</b>	3	1	3	1	3	11
<b>GOT 6</b>	<b>GOT 4</b>	4	1	4	2	3	14
<b>GOT 7</b>	<b>GOT 5</b>	4	1	3	1	3	12
<b>GOT 8</b>	<b>GOT 3</b>	2	1	4	1	3	11

The new values are in red. They mainly reflect the added historic value of ridge and farrow agriculture and local history such as disused railway lines, and a more specific determination of sprawl. We refer to other respondents with more local knowledge to provide more detail.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## 2. Please provide any others comments you wish to make

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Please return by **5pm 31 March 2017**

to: Planning Policy  
Rushcliffe Borough Council  
Rushcliffe Arena  
Rugby Road  
West Bridgford  
Nottingham  
NG2 7YG

Or to: [localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk](mailto: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.



# Rushcliffe Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule

## 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](mailto: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)
Judy Raven, Clerk to Gotham Parish Council	Name	
33, Leake Road Gotham NG11 0HW	Address	
<a href="#">m</a>	E-mail	

### Your Comments



Gotham Parish Council believe that the the implementation of a CIL could provide the basis for much needed infrastructure at local level. However it is not clear how how parishes who suffer the negative impact of housing development in neighbouring parishes will have the effects mitigated.

A case in point would be Clifton South which lies in Barton in Fabis parish and could be a source of a large CIL sum being made available to that parish. Yet it will be Gotham that bears the brunt of increased traffic. How will the CIL help us?

Please continue on a separate sheet of paper as necessary

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](mailto: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.