



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

Langridge Homes  
Ltd 827055 agent  
Geoffrey Prince  
196755

## 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)
Langridge Homes Ltd	Name	Geoffrey Prince Associates Ltd
17-21 Clumber Avenue Sherwood Rise Nottingham NG5 1AG  Attn; John Fletcher	Address	16 Kimble Close Knightcote Southam Warwickshire CV47 2SJ  Attn: Geoffrey Prince
jo	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** .....

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

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

*In our opinion the Local Plan Part 2 will need to identify sites for more than 2,000 homes. We estimate that this requirement is in the order of 2,750 homes, having regard to realistic delivery rates and timescales from sites which have yet to be allocated (most of which are currently in the Green Belt), and can only be brought forward after the Plan has been adopted.*

*Given that the Plan is unlikely to be adopted until June 2018 at the earliest, then it is only after that date that planning applications for new allocated sites can come forward. Preparation of applications and negotiation of planning permissions including S106 Agreements is likely to take say 9 months until say 31 March 2019. It is likely to take another 12 months (2019/20) to secure Reserve Matter Approvals, discharge conditions, mobilise and undertake site enabling works. Thus the first house completions on the allocated sites can be only be expected to appear in 2020/21.*

*We therefore contend that the 5 Year HLS and Housing Trajectory at Appendix A are extremely optimistic and not realistic as they show new allocation sites delivering houses from 2019/20 onwards.*

*The start dates for the strategic site allocations made in the Local Plan Part 1 with the exception of land at Melton Road, Edwalton, and Cotgrave Colliery site (both under construction) are also optimistic given that planning applications have yet to be submitted for land at Clifton and at East of Gamston, whilst only outline planning permissions have been granted for the large site allocations at RAF Newton and Bingham. The trajectory shows development at these sites commencing in 2018/19 (and 2019/20 for East of Gamston). In our opinion the earliest these sites can assume to deliver houses is from 2019/20. Similarly the sites to be allocated in the villages of Keyworth, Radcliffe and Ruddington show delivery from 2019/20. We consider that a realistic timescale for delivery to commence is 2020/21.*

*We therefore estimate that sites for an additional 750 houses need to be allocated to ensure that Rushcliffe will be able to demonstrate a 5 year HLS at the earliest time when the plan is likely to be adopted.*

## **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.*

*There appears to be some inconsistencies in delivery rates from these sites. Land at Melton Road, Edwalton is shown as delivering 150 houses pa over the plan period, which seems realistic having regard to market demand and the ability of house-builders to build out sites, even with more than one sales outlet.*

*However, both land at Clifton and at East of Gamston where planning applications have yet to be submitted, the housing trajectory shows delivery of 250 dwellings per annum for most of the plan period. We do not think it is sustainable to achieve these rates of completions on two strategic sites concurrently as it would involve each site each having 5 sales outlets for 5 different house-builders. At most house-builders can expect to achieve an average sales rate of 1 house per week per sales outlet (the national average is in the range of 0.7 to 0.8 homes per week). In our opinion therefore this level of delivery is unsustainable and not achievable.*

**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)	✓		
Any other location (please specify which)			

*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.*

No further comment

## 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)?

<b>Yes</b> .....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>No</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Don't know</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

*The Crown Estate which owns most of the land at Bingham has not demonstrated a commitment to bring forward the land north of Bingham for which it has outline planning permission. Given that the Crown Estate controls most of the potentially developable land around Bingham we do not consider that the allocation of anymore land at Bingham could be delivered during the plan period. We also note that there are difficulties in expanding the town centre to meet the needs of a rapidly expanding population, whilst access to and parking at the railway station is constrained.*

### ***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)?

<b>Yes</b> .....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>No</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Don't know</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

*Cotgrave represents the optimum Key Settlement where a significant proportion of the additional housing requirement should be allocated. It has a good range of services, the town centre regeneration and multi- service centre building (MSC) proposals are well developed and can expect to be implemented soon, Cotgrave Colliery housing development scheme is well underway and can expect to be complete by 2019/20, and it has good transport links (public transport and road) to Nottingham and good strategic road links (via the A46 and A52) to other centres of population and employment across the East Midlands and beyond.*

*As such there will be a growing demand over the plan period to 2028 for more homes at Cotgrave after 2019/20 when the Colliery scheme is complete.*

*We note that sites with a total capacity for 1,600 dwellings have been put forward. Whilst we would not propose that all the site be allocated for development over the plan period, we do consider that Cotgrave could accept another 1,000 or so new homes during the plan period, which would continue the current rate of development of around 100 homes per annum.*

*We consider that priority should be given to sites nearest to the town centre where facilities would be within walking distance of the new homes. In this regard Site Ref COT3 which adjoins the town centre represents a priority site for development.*

**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.*

*As noted above (Question 5) we propose that around 1,000 additional homes be allocated in Cotgrave in order to:*

- Support the town centre regeneration scheme;*
- Contribute towards achieving a sustainable community with a more balanced population in terms of demographics and socio economic profile;*
- Meet market demand.*

*We also consider that additional land should be identified as safeguarded land to provide opportunities for development beyond the plan period.*

*Although further housing development at Cotgrave would involve amendments to the Green belt boundary around the edge of Cotgrave, studies have demonstrated that the impact on the purposes of the Green Belt would be low – medium.*

*At the Public Examination of the Local Plan Core Strategy the Inspector concluded d that exceptional circumstances to remove sites from the Green Belt exist, in so far as the objectively assessed housing need can not be met without the removal of land from the Green Belt and that to provide for a lower amount of housing is not sustainable when considering environmental, social and economic factors.*

**Question 7: 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 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>			

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

*Site COT03 (formerly Green Belt Site Ref COT8 and SHLAA Site Ref 364) is owned by Langridge Homes, which has previously made submissions on this site (these are attached to this representation). The site is available now and deliverable subject to policy changing, and could deliver upto 125 new homes during the 5 year housing supply period (we estimate the total capacity of the site to be for 148 homes). The site can either be developed in one or two standalone phases. Phase 1 nearest to the historic core could provide some 80 dwellings (2.9 ha), while phase 2 could deliver another 68 dwellings (3.4 ha). Due to the proximity of the Phase 1 site to local facilities including All Saints Church, we propose that some of the units be specifically developed for elderly persons/those with special needs.*

*As part of our earlier submission we have undertaken an assessment of the impact of the development on the setting of the Grade 1 All Saints Church and the town's historic core. Our evidence demonstrates that the proposals would not have an adverse or significant effect on the setting of this church, as it is separated from the church (and the historic core) by existing, modern development. Also land nearest to the church will be hidden from view as it on lower lying land than the adjoining developed land and the church itself. Further the development will not impact on long distance views of the church from public vantage points including public footpaths beyond the development site, as there are none.*

*It has also been suggested that the development of this site would reduce the distance between the settlement and the main urban area, and that this distance will be reduced further as the strategic allocation at Tollerton is brought forward for development. Again, we have examined this issue and given the relatively small scale nature of this development there would be no perceptible change to the reduction of this gap, which is around 2.5 miles; the topography would also ensure that development to the north and west of Cotgrave is not visible from the main urban area and vice versa.*

*The topography supported by strong structural landscape planting long the northern and western site boundaries would also help to contain the proposed development, which represents a rounding off of the built form of Cotgrave in this part of the settlement.*

*We regard some of the propose site allocations as being too peripheral having regard to access by non-motorised modes of transport to the existing local services and the proposed new town centre, are not well contained by landscape features, and/or are in close proximity to non conforming uses such as the sewage treatment works.*

**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?

<b>Yes</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>No</b> .....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Don't know</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Planning permissions already exists for 800 dwelling units, which represents sufficient additional housing for this village during the plan period, equivalent to a rate of development of 70-80 homes per annum.

**Question 9:** Do you support housing development at:

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
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"/>
Site EL12 – Land off Rempstone Road (north) (potential capacity around 235 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>
Site EL13 – Land off Rempstone Road (south) (potential capacity around 120 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site EL14 – Land north of Lantern Lane (2) (potential capacity around 360 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.

No further comment.

### 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.

This is the only settlement with a Neighbourhood Development Plan. The NDP should be respected and no further allocations in addition to those proposed in the NDP should be made.

**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>
Site KEY1 – Land east of Willow Brook (potential capacity around 40 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 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.

No further comment.

### **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.

There is limited scope for additional housing development and without significant linear expansion away from the village core and railway station, and which would represent an unsustainable pattern of development..

**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>
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.

No further comment.

## 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.

*Further housing at Ruddington should be limited, as it could eventually lead to the coalescence with West Bridgford. A key purpose of the Green Belt is to avoid settlements coalescing.*

**Question 15:** Do you support housing development at:

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
Site RUD11 – Old Loughborough Road (potential capacity around 40 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site RUD12 – Land to the east side of Loughborough Road (potential capacity around 60 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site RUD13 – Land opposite Mere Way (potential capacity around 170 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site RUD14 – Croft House (potential capacity around 25 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.

## 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.

No further comment

**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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
East Bridgford	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gotham	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sutton Bonington	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Yes	No	Don't know
Tollerton	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Any other settlement (please specify which)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Only limited new development should be allowed in these villages due to their limited range of local services.

### **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.

No further comment

**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)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site CBI2 – Land north of Memorial Hall (1) (potential capacity around 75 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 CBI3– Land north of Memorial Hall (2) (potential capacity around 60 homes)</i>			
<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.*

*No further comment*

### **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 further comment*

**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>

	<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>			
<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.*

*No further comment*

## **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.*

*No further comment*

**Question 23:** *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 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.*

[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.*

*No further comment*

**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>			
<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.*

*No further comment.*

### **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.*

*No further comment*

**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>			
<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.*

*No further comment*

## **Other issues**

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

*No further comment.*

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.

## **LAPP Part 2 Green Belt Assessment (January 2016)**

### **Representations submitted by GPA Ltd on behalf of Langridge Homes Ltd**

I have been instructed by Langridge Homes Ltd (LH) to comment on the Rushcliffe Borough Council (GBC) Green Belt Assessment (January 2016).

My representations are focussed on Chapter 4 Key Settlements: Bingham, Cotgrave, Keyworth, Radcliffe on Trent and Ruddington of the Rushcliffe Green Belt Review (Part 2 (b)), and more specifically focus on the assessment of Site Ref COT8 (SHLAA Ref 364) Land to the West of Main Road, Cotgrave which is in the Strategic Green Belt Area West (Land between Plumtree Road and Main Road, Cotgrave).

The assessment score for the Strategic Green Belt Area West was 13 (out of 20), which indicated that this area is of low –medium Green Belt importance. The assessment concluded that:

- This area shares two boundaries with Cotgrave in the north west of the settlement, providing an opportunity to round the settlement off without intruding into the open countryside beyond developments along Plumtree Road and Main Road. If restricted it would not constitute urban sprawl;
- Development within this area would however have a negative impact on the setting of Cotgrave’s historic core; and
- As with developments south of Plumtree Road, the expansion of Cotgrave West would reduce the distance between the settlement and the main urban area. This distance will be reduced further as the strategic allocation at Tollerton is brought forward for development.

We consider that the last two of these conclusions are an over exaggeration. The impact on the setting of Cotgrave’s historic core is very much a subjective matter, and clear conclusions can only be reached on this matter following a detailed examination in the context of specific sites. With regards to the narrowing of the distance with the strategic allocation at Tollerton, some 2.5 miles from the western edge of Cotgrave, small scale development will not give rise to any perceptible change to the reduction of this gap due to changes in levels between the two settlements with a slight rise providing a clear physical separation between the two locations.

Notwithstanding the above assessment, Langridge Homes has reviewed its proposals for COT8 and is proposing two options for the development of this site (refer illustrative master plans attached):

- Option 1 (existing COT8) which extends across both fields located immediately to the north of Church Lane and west of Main Road. This scheme has a capacity for around 148 dwellings on a gross site area of 6.3 ha.
- Option 2 which only involves development on the lower field adjoining the edge of the village. This smaller scheme has a capacity for approximately 80 dwellings on a gross site area of 2.9ha.

For both options we have reviewed the Council’s Green Belt Stage 2 Assessment of the COT8 site and these assessments are set out in Tables 1 and 2 below.

---

## COT8 – Option 1 Green Belt Site Assessment

With regards to Option 1 we agree with the Council’s assessment except with respect to the assessment of the Green Belt purpose of ‘*preserving the setting and special character of historic settlements*’. Whilst we acknowledge that the site is close to the historic core of Cotgrave and close to the Grade 1 All Saints Church any development of this site will be separated from the heritage assets by development along Church Lane which includes modern residential development and the Church Lane Nursing Home, which are not listed buildings. These developments obscure views of the church from the site although the church tower will be visible, as it should be, particularly from the upper, more distant part of the site. These views of the church tower would still remain from gardens and new roadways within any future residential development of this site. Ground level views from the church to the north of the settlement are also obscured by existing development. There are no long distance views of the church across the two fields from public vantage points including public footpaths. We therefore conclude that development of the Option 1 proposals for COT8 will not have an adverse or significant effect on the heritage assets, as suggested in the Council’s Green Belt assessment. We therefore conclude that this site should be scored 2 and not 4 for this purpose. Also we consider that the assessment of the purpose *to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment* is too high as the character is one of countryside adjoining the edge of the village. A score of 3 rather than 4 would be more appropriate. This reduces the overall score from 14 to 11, but still leaves it in the low-medium category.

**Table 1 Green Belt Assessment of Option 1 Site**

Green Belt Purpose	Score	Justification	Our Assessment Score	Our Justification
Check unrestricted sprawl of settlements	2	Adjoining Cotgrave on two boundaries, the land is well contained within 2 small fields, hedgerows and brook to the north. The land is flat and can therefore be viewed from some distance however.	2	Agree with RBC Assessment
Prevent merging of settlements	1	Development would result in a minor reduction in the distance between Cotgrave and the main urban area of Nottingham (as now defined by the strategic allocation at Tollerton).	1	Agree with RBC Assessment
Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment	4	Whilst inappropriate development has not encroached, the edge of Cotgrave is a prominent feature. The overriding character is however open countryside	3	Partly agree with RBC Assessment. We consider that a score of 4 is too high, as the character is one countryside adjoining the edge of a village. As such the score should be reduced to 3.
Preserve setting and special character of historic settlement	4	The land is adjacent to Cotgrave’s historic core, which includes the listed	2	The land does not contain or form the setting of a designated asset or non-

		church and several buildings of local interest.		designated asset – the site is close to the All Saints Church (Grade I Listed (but the setting of the church is obscured by existing development along Church Lane including Church Farm Nursing Home. The development on this site will certainly not have an adverse or significant impact on the setting of this heritage asset
Assist in urban regeneration	3	Provided Local Plan policies restrict retail uses outside the town centre, Cotgrave’s town centre regeneration project or the redevelopment of Former Cotgrave Colliery should not be jeopardised by the removal of this site from the Green Belt	3	If Rushcliffe adopted the same approach as Gedling and Broxtowe in their assessment of Green Belt sites, then this purpose would be excluded from the analysis as the scores would be the same for all sites (ie neutral impact on Green Belt Assessments)
<b>Green Belt Score</b>	<b>14</b>		<b>11</b>	
Strategic Green Belt Assessment (Score/Importance)	13		13	
	Low/medium		Low/medium	

### COT8- Option 2 Green Belt Site Assessment

With regards to the smaller Option 2 scheme we disagree with the Council’s assessment of the COT8 site on three counts as follows:

- To check unrestricted sprawl of settlements. In this option development is restricted to the lower field adjoining the urban edge of Cotgrave. As noted in the Strategic Green Belt assessment for this area this area shares two boundaries with Cotgrave in the north west of the settlement, providing an opportunity to round off the settlement off without intruding into the open countryside. By only developing in the nearest field to the edge of the village, then the expansion would be more contained than with the Option 1 proposal. We therefore consider that this site should be accorded a score of 1, compared to the Council’s score of 2 (based on the Option 1 site score).
  
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. In option 2 only the lower lying field is proposed for development. The site has a ragged edge along its eastern and southern boundaries where it adjoins the edge of the village. The village edge is the overriding feature of this piece of land. Strong landscape planting including reinforcement of hedgerows will provide a strong defensible boundary to deter further outward expansion of what effectively resembles a small rounding off of the settlement in this location. Development further to the west would in any event be constrained by the Cotgrave Sewage Treatment Works, approximately 300m from this site. We therefore consider that the score for this site should be reduced from 4 to 1.

To preserve the setting and special character of historic settlements. Whilst we acknowledge that the site is close to the historic core of Cotgrave and close to the Grade 1 All Saints Church any development of this site will be separated from the heritage assets by development along Church Lane which includes modern residential development and the Church Lane Nursing Home, which are not listed buildings. These buildings obscure views of the church from the site from the church. although the church tower will be visible, as it should be, particularly from the upper part of the site. These views of the church tower would still remain from gardens and new roadways within any future residential development of this site. Ground level views from the church to this field will be obscured by existing development and also the low lying position of this field relatively to surrounding development. There are no long distance views of the church across the field from public vantage points including public footpaths. We therefore conclude that development of the Option 2 proposals for COT8 will not have an adverse or significant effect on the heritage assets, as suggested in the Council's Green Belt assessment. Indeed we consider that this site scores better than the Option 1 site with regards to this Green Belt purpose. We therefore conclude that this site should be scored 1 and not 4 for this purpose.

These adjustments to the assessment scores for the Option 2 site give it an overall score of 7 (out of 20) which means it is of low Green Belt importance. As such this site must be regarded as being of the most suitable SHLAA sites for development in Cotgrave.

We set out our case for making additional allocations at Cotgrave in our representations on the LAPP Part 2.

**Table 2 Green Belt Assessment of Option 2 Site**

Green Belt Purpose	Score	Justification	Our Assessment Score	Our Justification
Check unrestricted sprawl of settlements	2	Adjoining Cotgrave on two boundaries, the land is well contained within 2 small fields, hedgerows and brook to the north. The land is flat and can therefore be viewed from some distance however.	1	In this option development would only take place in one compact field adjoining the built up edge of Cotgrave. The land is lowlying and barely visible when viewed from some distance as it appears as part of the village edge
Prevent merging of settlements	1	Development would result in a minor reduction in the distance between Cotgrave and the main urban area of Nottingham (as now defined by the strategic allocation at Tollerton).	1	Agree with RBC Assessment
Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment	4	Whilst inappropriate development has not encroached, the edge of Cotgrave is a prominent feature. The overriding character is however open countryside	1	The site has a ragged edge along its eastern and southern boundaries where it adjoins the edge of the village. The village edge is the over-riding feature of this piece of land.

Preserve setting and special character of historic settlement	4	The land is adjacent to Cotgrave's historic core, which includes the listed church and several buildings of local interest.	1	The land does not contain or form the setting of a designated asset or non designated asset – the site is close to the All Saints Church (Grade I Listed) but the setting of the church is obscured by existing development along Church Lane including Church Farm Nursing Home, and also topography – the site is lowlying. The development on this site will certainly not have an adverse or significant impact on the setting of this heritage asset.
Assist in urban regeneration	3	Provided Local Plan policies restrict retail uses outside the town centre, Cotgrave's town centre regeneration project or the redevelopment of Former Cotgrave Colliery should not be jeopardised by the removal of this site from the Green Belt	3	If Rushcliffe adopted the same approach as Gedling and Broxtowe in their assessment of Green Belt sites, then this purpose would be excluded from the analysis as the scores would be the same for all sites (ie neutral impact on Green Belt Assessments)
Green Belt Score	14		7	
Strategic Green Belt Assessment (Score/Importance)	13		13	
	Low/medium		Low/medium	

Geoffrey Prince  
Geoffrey Prince Associates Limited  
16 Kimble Close  
Knightcote  
Southam  
Warwickshire  
CV47 2SJ

March 2016

General Notes:  
Do not scale off this drawing. Do not rely on this drawing for purposes other than that stated in the title block status.  
Read this drawing with all other project related architects drawn and specified information including risk assessments.  
Constructors must be familiar with the client's building asbestos register ahead of facilitating work contained on this drawing.



Ordnance Survey©Crown Copyright 2010. All rights reserved. Licence number LIG0332

**Accommodation Schedule**

- 8 No. 5 Bed Houses (5.4%)
- 20 No. 4 Bed Houses (13.5%)
- 53 No. 3 Bed Houses (35.8%)
- 2 No. 3 Bed Bungalows (1.4%)
- 24 No. 2 Bed Houses (16.2%)
- 11 No. 2 Bed Bungalows (7.4%)
- 21 No. 2 Bed Flats (14.1%)
- 6 No. 1 Bed Bungalows (4.1%)
- 3 No. 1 Bed Flats (2.0%)

Total = 148 Dwellings  
Site Area = 6.3ha  
Public Open Space = 0.8ha

23 Dwellings / ha inclusive of open space  
26 Dwellings / ha exclusive of open space

**HouseType Key**

- 5 Bed House
- 4 Bed House
- 3 Bed House
- 3 Bed Bungalow
- 2 Bed House
- 2 Bed Bungalow
- 1 Bed Bungalow
- Flats
- Garage / Carport

N



**Halsall Lloyd Partnership**  
ARCHITECTS & DESIGNERS  
Liverpool 0151 7088944 Nottingham 0115 9897989 Newcastle 0191 4650055 Preston 01772 719988

Client: **Langridge Homes Limited**

Title: **Option 1 Site Layout**

Status: **PRELIMINARY**

Project: **Main Road, Cotgrave**

Job No.: **N1127 101** Drawn By: **A** Scale: **1:1000** Date: **Aug '13**

Drawn: **CS** Chk: **MJ**

This drawing is protected by the copyright of the Halsall Lloyd Partnership Architects & Designers

www.hlpdesign.com

General Notes:  
Do not scale off this drawing. Do not rely on this drawing for purposes other than that stated in the title block Status.  
Read this drawing with all other project related architects drawn and specified information including risk assessments.  
Contributors must be familiar with the client's building asbestos register ahead of fabricating work contained on this drawing.



Accommodation Schedule - Option 3

- 2 No. 5 Bed Houses (2.5%)
  - 8 No. 4 Bed Houses (10%)
  - 19 No. 3 Bed Houses (23.7%)
  - 10 No. 2 Bed Houses (12.5%)
  - 11 No. 2 Bed Bungalows (13.7%)
  - 21 No. 2 Bed Flats (26.3%)
  - 6 No. 1 Bed Bungalows (7.5%)
  - 3 No. 1 Bed Flats (3.8%)
- Total = 80 Dwellings  
Site Area = 2.9ha  
Public Open Space = 0.25ha
- 27 Dwellings / ha inclusive of open space  
30 Dwellings / ha exclusive of open space

House type Key

5 Bed House
4 Bed House
3 Bed House
3 Bed Bungalow
2 Bed House
2 Bed Bungalow
1 Bed Bungalow
Flats
Garage / Carport

Ordnance Survey © Crown Copyright 2010. All rights reserved. Licence number: LG0332

**Halsall Lloyd Partnership**  
ARCHITECTS & DESIGNERS  
Liverpool 0151 7088944 Nottingham 0115 987969 Newcastle 0191 4950055 Preston 01772 719066

Client <b>Langridge Homes Limited</b>	Title <b>Option 3 Site Layout</b>	Revisions	
Project <b>Main Road, Cotgrave</b>	Status <b>PRELIMINARY</b>	Dwn. CC	Chk. MLJ
Job No. <b>N1127</b>	Drawg No. <b>105</b>	Rev.	Scale #42
		Date	Mar 2018

This drawing is protected by the copyright of the Halsall Lloyd Partnership Architects & Designers

www.hlppdesign.com