

Comment

Agent Ms Caroline Chave (1073534)

Email Address

Company / Organisation Chave Planning

Address Enterprise Centre
Bridge Street
Derby
DE13LD

Consultee Mrs B Mordecai (1073539)

Address 211 Loughborough Road
Ruddington
Nottingham
NG11 6NY

Event Name Local Plan Part 2 Further Options

Comment by Mrs B Mordecai

Comment ID 99

Response Date 31/03/17 11:14

Status Submitted

Submission Type Web

Version 0.1

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? No

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

It is likely that the Local Plan Part 2 will need to provide enough land for more than 2,000 homes in order to achieve a continuing 5 year supply from adoption.

The calculation in Appendix 1 to the consultation document sets out a basic assessment of the supply from April 2019, but this factors in assumptions about delivery of sites during the three monitoring years commencing 2016, 2017 and 2018. A 5 year supply calculation is normally undertaken based on known completions, making a forecast over the next 5 years, therefore this 'forward look' methodology should be used with caution. There is no information to support the assumptions applied to the delivery of individual sites in 2016, 2017 and 2018 and therefore it cannot be robustly concluded that the provision of land for 2,000 homes will result in a 5 year supply as predicted.

Furthermore, the strategic allocation East of Gamston/North of Tollerton is projected to deliver housing from 2019/20 onwards. In order for this to be the case, the following timeline would be realistic:

December 2017 – submit outline planning application

March 2018 – outline planning permission granted

April to October 2018 – site marketing and disposal

October 2018 to April 2019 – reserved matters approval/discharge conditions

April 2019 – development commences

However, before the outline planning application can be submitted there needs to be a masterplanning exercise, which will be subject to consultation. There is no sign of this taking place and therefore the above timescale would not be realistic. Furthermore there is no indication of how the strategic infrastructure for this major site will be delivered and whether any infrastructure improvements will need to be in place before the development can be occupied. This would further impact on the delivery timescale.

Information to support the assumptions applied to the delivery of individual sites will need to be tested at examination. As such the Council should include this information in the next consultation so that it can be assessed by those consulted and the robustness of the housing supply tested.

Fundamentally, the addition of 900 homes to the amount to be allocated will not necessarily translate to those 900 homes being delivered by 2024 to address the identified shortfall. The delivery of proposed site allocations will have to be charted on the trajectory on a realistic timescale. The delivery of some sites may continue beyond 2024, meaning that more than 900 additional homes will need to be allocated overall in order to provide 900 homes before 2024 to address the shortfall.

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

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

We agree with the Council's assessment that expanding the housing allocations adjacent to the main urban area would not help to address the more immediate housing land supply shortfall. Additional housing sites in other locations up to around 150 dwellings are likely to make the fullest contribution to the immediate housing land supply.

Question 17

The villages which we have identified as potentially suitable to accommodate a limited level of housing development on greenfield sites are as follows:

- . Cropwell Bishop;
- . East Bridgford;
- . Gotham;
- . Sutton Bonington; and
- . Tollerton

These particular villages have been identified because, while they do not provide for a full range of facilities as is the case at West Bridgford and the key settlements, the basic level of facilities (e.g. schools; doctors' surgery) that are available are deemed capable of potentially supporting a relatively limited level of housing growth without compromising the strategy set out in Local Plan Part 1 (Core Strategy) for the distribution of new housing.

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

Cropwell Bishop

East Bridgford

Gotham

Sutton Bonington

Tollerton

Any other settlement (please specify which)

Question 19

There are a number of sites that have been put forward by developers and others as potentially suitable for housing development at Cropwell Bishop. These are shown on the plan below. Most of the sites, if identified as suitable for housing development, should be able to deliver new homes relatively quickly and, therefore, contribute to resolving the current shortfall in the amount of land that is available for housing development over the next few years.

We would like to know what you think about the suitability of each of those individual sites shown on the plan below and whether, in each case, the site should or should not be allocated for housing development. For any one site, it should be noted that there may be the option to develop only part of the site rather than its whole.

The development of any one of these sites would be likely to result in impacts which require mitigation and also opportunities to improve the local area. We would need to consider the facilities and services required, the type and design of housing, and how the site would be accessed by car and public transport, amongst a number of other issues.

Do you support housing development at:

Site CBI1 – Land to the south of Nottingham Road and east of Kinoulton Road (potential capacity around 30 homes)

Site CBI2 – Land north of Memorial Hall (1) (potential capacity around 75 homes)

Site CBI3– Land north of Memorial Hall (2) (potential capacity around 60 homes)

Site CBI4 – Land north of Fern Road (2) (potential capacity around 30 homes)

Site CBI5 – Land north of Fern Road (1) (potential capacity around 250 homes)

Site CBI6 – Land to the north of Fern Road (3) (potential capacity around 70 homes)

Any other location (please specify which)

Question 21

There are a number of sites that have been put forward by developers and others as potentially suitable for housing development at East Bridgford. These are shown on the plan below. Most of the sites, if identified as suitable for housing development, should be able to deliver new homes relatively quickly and, therefore, contribute to resolving the current shortfall in the amount of land that is available for housing development over the next few years.

We would like to know what you think about the suitability of each of those individual sites shown on the plan below and whether, in each case, the site should or should not be allocated for housing development. For any one site, it should be noted that there may be the option to develop only part of the site rather than its whole.

The development of any one of these sites would be likely to result in impacts which require mitigation and also opportunities to improve the local area. We would need to consider the facilities and services required, the type and design of housing, and how the site would be accessed by car and public transport, amongst a number of other issues.

Do you support housing development at:

Site EBR1 – Land behind Kirk Hill (east) (potential capacity around 15 homes)

Site EBR2 – Land behind Kirk Hill (west) (potential capacity around 70 homes)

Site EBR3 – Land north of Kneeton Road (1) (potential capacity around 95 homes)

Site EBR4 – Land north of Kneeton Road (2) (potential capacity around 150 homes)

Site EBR5 – Land at Lammas Lane (potential capacity around 40 homes)

Site EBR6 – Closes Side Lane (west) (potential capacity around 20 homes)

Site EBR7 – Closes Side Lane (east) (potential capacity around 20 homes)

Site EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane (potential capacity around 20 homes)

Site EBR9 – Land to the south of Springdale Lane (potential capacity around 30 homes)

Any other location (please specify which)

Question 23

There are a number of sites that have been put forward by developers and others as potentially suitable for housing development at Gotham. These are shown on the plan below. Most of the sites, if identified as suitable for housing development, should be able to deliver new homes relatively quickly and, therefore, contribute to resolving the current shortfall in the amount of land that is available for housing development over the next few years.

We would like to know what you think about the suitability of each of those individual sites shown on the plan below and whether, in each case, the site should or should not be allocated for housing development. For any one site, it should be noted that there may be the option to develop only part of the site rather than its whole.

The development of any one of these sites would be likely to result in impacts which require mitigation and also opportunities to improve the local area. We would need to consider the facilities and services required, the type and design of housing, and how the site would be accessed by car and public transport, amongst a number of other issues.

Do you support housing development at:

Site GOT1 – Land to the rear of former British Legion (potential capacity around 25 homes)

Site GOT2 – Land north of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (west) (potential capacity around 50 homes)

Site GOT3 – Land north of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (east) (potential capacity around 20 homes)

Site GOT4 – The Orchards, Leake Road (potential capacity around 50 homes)

Site GOT5 – Land east of Gypsum Way/The Orchards (potential capacity around 200 homes)

Site GOT6 – East of Leake Road (potential capacity around 45 homes)

Site GOT7 – Land east of Hill Road (potential capacity around 160 homes)

Site GOT8 – Land south of Moor Lane (potential capacity around 15 homes)

Any other location (please specify which)

Question 25

There is one site that has been put forward by a landowner as potentially suitable for housing development at Sutton Bonington. This is shown on the plan below. The site, if identified as suitable for housing development, should be able to deliver new homes relatively quickly and, therefore, contribute to resolving the current shortfall in the amount of land that is available for housing development over the next few years.

We would like to know what you think about the suitability of the site shown on the plan below and whether it should or should not be allocated for housing development. For any one site, it should be noted that there may be the option to develop only part of the site rather than its whole.

The development of the site would be likely to result in impacts which require mitigation and also opportunities to improve the local area. We would need to consider the facilities and services required, the type and design of housing, and how the site would be accessed by car and public transport, amongst a number of other issues.

Do you support housing development at:

Site SUT1 – Land north of Park Lane (potential capacity around 140 homes)

Any other location (please specify which)

Comment

Agent	Ms Caroline Chave (1073534)
Email Address	caroline@chaveplanning.com
Company / Organisation	Chave Planning
Address	Enterprise Centre Bridge Street Derby DE13LD
Consultee	Mrs B Mordecai (1073539)
Address	211 Loughborough Road Ruddington Nottingham NG11 6NY
Event Name	Local Plan Part 2 Further Options
Comment by	Mrs B Mordecai
Comment ID	100
Response Date	31/03/17 11:17
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
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.

The Core Strategy sets out a minimum requirement of 250 homes at Ruddington. In view of our representations in response to Q1 of this consultation, it is likely that housing provision will need to be in excess of the minimum figure at this key settlement. Ruddington is a highly sustainable settlement with an excellent range of local services and a frequent bus service. Potential site allocations on the edge of the built up area would have good accessibility due to the compact nature of Ruddington's built up area. It is considered that opportunities for sustainable development at Ruddington should be maximised in preference to allocating sites at 'other villages', which are less sustainable settlements.

Furthermore, it is considered that a range of sites should be allocated at Ruddington. The projected 5 year housing supply deficit will best be addressed through the allocation of a number of sites, where delivery can commence early and in tandem at a range of locations. Sites of up to around 150 dwellings will make the fullest contribution to the immediate housing supply deficit. It is suggested that the allocation of three sites of around 150 dwellings each at Ruddington would be consistent with the Core Strategy and would provide early housing delivery at a sustainable settlement.

Question 15

The plan below identifies sites on the edge of Ruddington that have been put forward by developers and others as potentially suitable for housing development. We have already asked for views on the suitability for development of sites RUD1 to RUD10 as part of the Issues and Options consultation stage which we undertook early last year.

Since last year's consultation a further three sites (RUD11 to RUD14) have been put forward by developers and others as potentially suitable for housing development. We would also like to know what your views are as to whether each one should or should not be allocated for housing development. For any one site, it should be noted that there may be the option to develop only part of the site rather than its whole.

The development of any one of these sites would be likely to result in impacts which require mitigation and also opportunities to improve the local area. We would need to consider the facilities and services required, the type and design of housing, and how the site would be accessed by car and public transport, amongst a number of other issues.

Do you support housing development at:

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

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.

Support – RUD13 – Land Opposite Mere Way

Mrs Mordecai owns land adjacent to RUD13 (RUD14 and RUD6). Mrs Mordecai supports the development of RUD13. The Green Belt Review Part 2(b) identifies RUD13 as of low-medium Green Belt importance. This conclusion is broadly supported, but it is noted that this conclusion is reached regarding RUD13 in isolation. Were RUD13 to be considered in conjunction with RUD6, RUD14 and the Balmore House residential care home, then this wider parcel would contain development and urban influences on the edge of Ruddington. It would have a stronger visual relationship with the built up area and would share boundaries with the built up area to the north and west. As such, consideration of the wider parcel would potentially lead to a lower score being given in terms of Green Belt Purposes which check the unrestricted sprawl of settlements and assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

RUD13 is assessed as parcel RUD/010 in the Landscape & Visual Analysis of Potential Sites (January 2017). Considered in isolation the site is given a 'high' sensitivity score in relation to perceived landscape sensitivity because development of the site would result in the loss of part of the rural setting to the settlement, as well as a perceived urbanisation, especially as the site is slightly separate from the existing urban edge. Again it is considered that, were this site to be considered in conjunction with the RUD6 and RUD14, the perceived urbanisation would not be scored as highly as the site would not be separated from the urban edge and the area would already be partly urbanised.

Generally, it is considered that this area to the south-east of Ruddington – containing parcels RUD5, RUD6, RUD13 and RUD14 - should be looked at comprehensively when considering and choosing between locations for site allocations at Ruddington.

Support – RUD14 – Croft House (The Croft)

Mrs Mordecai owns RUD14 (The Croft) and the adjacent land to the south (RUD6). RUD14 is free from significant physical constraints – suitable access is available and the site could be developed whilst important trees are retained. Trees are located to the site boundaries and in small groups or as specimen trees, which would provide an instant maturity to a high quality and sensitive development.

RUD14 is within the Ruddington Conservation Area. The Ruddington Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Plan (2009) identifies townscape appraisal characteristics that relate to the positivity of the site frontage as an open space, the tree and hedge line to the front boundary and the architectural/historic character of The Croft. Both the tree and hedge line and The Croft itself could be retained as part of a residential development of the site. The identification of the site frontage as a 'positive open space' is related to the Sylvan setting and rural character of development along Loughborough Road. The purpose of this designation does not appear to be to keep the land permanently open. A sensitive and low-density development of the site could retain this Sylvan setting and rural character.

The Conservation Area designation provides its own protection to the character of the site. As such it is not necessary to retain the land in the Green Belt to protect the character of the land. The National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 85 says that, when defining Green Belt boundaries, local authorities should not include land in the Green Belt which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open. Paragraph 86 goes on to say that if it is necessary to prevent development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt. If, however, the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used, such as conservation area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt. This national policy guidance would suggest that the Conservation Area designation should be sufficient to guard against harm to the character of the site and therefore it is not necessary for the land to remain in the Green Belt.

The Draft Green Belt Review Part 2b proposed the removal of Flawforth Avenue and houses fronting Loughborough Road – i.e. the residential area immediately to the north of The Croft – from the Green Belt. The review determined that the area to be removed does not contribute to the openness of the Green Belt and the established hedgerow boundary to the residential development could form a new defensible boundary to the Green Belt. The Croft is a substantial dwelling, the curtilage to which is enclosed by an established hedgerow and trees. The Croft is visually associated with the residential development fronting Loughborough Road and should be considered for removal from the Green Belt alongside it.

Furthermore, RUD14 could be developed in conjunction with adjacent parcels RUD5, RUD6 and RUD13.

Support – Other Site (RUD6)

Although RUD6 is not included in this consultation, we would highlight that RUD6 could be developed in conjunction with parcels RUD5, RUD13 and RUD14 and this area to the south-east of Ruddington, containing four available sites, should be considered comprehensively when assessing and choosing between sites for allocation at Ruddington.

RUD6 is assessed as parcel RUD/009 in the Landscape & Visual Analysis of Potential Sites (January 2017). This assessment identifies landscape susceptibility of the parcel as low, but says that the removal of the mature boundary vegetation would result in a perceived loss of enclosure and affect some of the characteristics of the Conservation Area. There would be no need to remove any significant amount of this mature boundary vegetation to facilitate development. There is already a break in the boundary at the field access and this would only need to be widened slightly in order to create access to a residential development. As such it is considered the site should be given a lower score in terms of perception of landscape susceptibility. The conclusion to the assessment states that 'the Conservation Area adds visual value, but there is little else which results in an overall low visual value'. It is agreed that the site has limited visual value and it is considered that the Conservation Area is not a factor which adds visual value – either the visual value is there to be seen or it isn't. The fact that the site has a statutory designation should not add to the value of the land unless this is explained with reference to features on the land.

RUD6 is assessed as site 431 in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2016 (SHLAA). The assessment concludes that the site is non-developable. It is considered that this is an inappropriate conclusion to be reached in the SHLAA, supported by such a cursory level of assessment. The SHLAA seems to take a leap forward in assessing the merits of the site as part of the site selection process, rejecting the site due to its characteristics in the Conservation Area along with its Green Belt designation and its location to the east of the A60. It is considered that the SHLAA conclusion should be changed to 'could be suitable if policy changes', allowing the site to be fully assessed in the evidence base for the Local Plan Part 2. The site should not be rejected at SHLAA stage as there are no fundamental physical or policy constraints. The site selection process should fully consider and explain how sites have been chosen for development at Ruddington.

In the Part 2b Green Belt Review Assessment of Additional sites, published February 2017, the boundaries of RUD6 appear to have been altered from the original assessment. RUD6 now includes The Croft (RUD14) and the Balmore House residential care home. However there has been no additional or revised assessment of RUD6. It is considered that the assessment should be updated and it is suggested that, given the presence of development and urban influences in the form of The Croft and Balmore House, this parcel would have a stronger visual relationship with the built up area. As such, this assessment would potentially lead to a lower score being given in terms of Green Belt Purposes which check the unrestricted sprawl of settlements and assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

Do not support – RUD11 (Old Loughborough Road)

RUD11 is not supported because it is remote from the main urban area of Ruddington. It would not be a sustainable location to allocate new housing development, in comparison to other options, because residents would be more reliant on the car to access services in Ruddington. Furthermore, The Part 2b Green Belt Review Assessment of Additional sites, published February 2017, concludes that the land is fundamentally constrained. This appears to be an appropriate conclusion given the importance of the land in maintaining separation between the main built up areas of Ruddington and West Bridgford.

Do not support – RUD12 (Land to the east side of Loughborough Road)

RUD12 is not supported. The Part 2b Green Belt Review Assessment of Additional sites, published February 2017, concludes that the land is fundamentally constrained. This appears to be an appropriate conclusion given that the land preserves the historic setting of Easthorpe House.

Question 17

The villages which we have identified as potentially suitable to accommodate a limited level of housing development on greenfield sites are as follows:

- . Cropwell Bishop;
- . East Bridgford;
- . Gotham;
- . Sutton Bonington; and
- . Tollerton

These particular villages have been identified because, while they do not provide for a full range of facilities as is the case at West Bridgford and the key settlements, the basic level of facilities (e.g. schools; doctors' surgery) that are available are deemed capable of potentially supporting a relatively limited level of housing growth without compromising the strategy set out in Local Plan Part 1 (Core Strategy) for the distribution of new housing.

Should Local Plan Part 2 identify the following 'other' villages as suitable for a limited level of housing growth on greenfield sites?

Cropwell Bishop	.	No
East Bridgford	.	No
Gotham	.	No
Sutton Bonington	.	No
Tollerton	.	No

Any other settlement (please specify which)

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

These settlements are less sustainable than the main settlements identified in the Core Strategy for growth. The Core Strategy identifies these settlements as suitable for housing only to meet local needs. Therefore housing allocations at these settlements would be inconsistent with the Core Strategy.

Question 19

There are a number of sites that have been put forward by developers and others as potentially suitable for housing development at Cropwell Bishop. These are shown on the plan below. Most of the sites, if identified as suitable for housing development, should be able to deliver new homes relatively quickly and, therefore, contribute to resolving the current shortfall in the amount of land that is available for housing development over the next few years.

We would like to know what you think about the suitability of each of those individual sites shown on the plan below and whether, in each case, the site should or should not be allocated for housing development. For any one site, it should be noted that there may be the option to develop only part of the site rather than its whole.

The development of any one of these sites would be likely to result in impacts which require mitigation and also opportunities to improve the local area. We would need to consider the facilities and services required, the type and design of housing, and how the site would be accessed by car and public transport, amongst a number of other issues.

Do you support housing development at:

Site CBI1 – Land to the south of Nottingham Road and east of Kinoulton Road (potential capacity around 30 homes)

Site CBI2 – Land north of Memorial Hall (1) (potential capacity around 75 homes)

Site CBI3– Land north of Memorial Hall (2) (potential capacity around 60 homes)

Site CBI4 – Land north of Fern Road (2) (potential capacity around 30 homes)

Site CBI5 – Land north of Fern Road (1) (potential capacity around 250 homes)

Site CBI6 – Land to the north of Fern Road (3) (potential capacity around 70 homes)

Any other location (please specify which)

Question 21

There are a number of sites that have been put forward by developers and others as potentially suitable for housing development at East Bridgford. These are shown on the plan below. Most of the sites, if identified as suitable for housing development, should be able to deliver new homes relatively quickly and, therefore, contribute to resolving the current shortfall in the amount of land that is available for housing development over the next few years.

We would like to know what you think about the suitability of each of those individual sites shown on the plan below and whether, in each case, the site should or should not be allocated for housing development. For any one site, it should be noted that there may be the option to develop only part of the site rather than its whole.

The development of any one of these sites would be likely to result in impacts which require mitigation and also opportunities to improve the local area. We would need to consider the facilities and services required, the type and design of housing, and how the site would be accessed by car and public transport, amongst a number of other issues.

Do you support housing development at:

Site EBR1 – Land behind Kirk Hill (east) (potential capacity around 15 homes)

Site EBR2 – Land behind Kirk Hill (west) (potential capacity around 70 homes)

Site EBR3 – Land north of Kneeton Road (1) (potential capacity around 95 homes)

Site EBR4 – Land north of Kneeton Road (2) (potential capacity around 150 homes)

Site EBR5 – Land at Lammas Lane (potential capacity around 40 homes)

Site EBR6 – Closes Side Lane (west) (potential capacity around 20 homes)

Site EBR7 – Closes Side Lane (east) (potential capacity around 20 homes)

Site EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane (potential capacity around 20 homes)

Site EBR9 – Land to the south of Springdale Lane (potential capacity around 30 homes)

Any other location (please specify which)

Question 23

There are a number of sites that have been put forward by developers and others as potentially suitable for housing development at Gotham. These are shown on the plan below. Most of the sites, if identified as suitable for housing development, should be able to deliver new homes relatively quickly and, therefore, contribute to resolving the current shortfall in the amount of land that is available for housing development over the next few years.

We would like to know what you think about the suitability of each of those individual sites shown on the plan below and whether, in each case, the site should or should not be allocated for housing development. For any one site, it should be noted that there may be the option to develop only part of the site rather than its whole.

The development of any one of these sites would be likely to result in impacts which require mitigation and also opportunities to improve the local area. We would need to consider the facilities and services required, the type and design of housing, and how the site would be accessed by car and public transport, amongst a number of other issues.

Do you support housing development at:

**Site GOT1 – Land to the rear of former British Legion
(potential capacity around 25 homes)**

**Site GOT2 – Land north of Kegworth Road/Home
Farm (west) (potential capacity around 50 homes)**

**Site GOT3 – Land north of Kegworth Road/Home
Farm (east) (potential capacity around 20 homes)**

**Site GOT4 – The Orchards, Leake Road (potential
capacity around 50 homes)**

**Site GOT5 – Land east of Gypsum Way/The Orchards
(potential capacity around 200 homes)**

**Site GOT6 – East of Leake Road (potential capacity
around 45 homes)**

**Site GOT7 – Land east of Hill Road (potential capacity
around 160 homes)**

**Site GOT8 – Land south of Moor Lane (potential
capacity around 15 homes)**

Any other location (please specify which)

Question 25

There is one site that has been put forward by a landowner as potentially suitable for housing development at Sutton Bonington. This is shown on the plan below. The site, if identified as suitable for housing development, should be able to deliver new homes relatively quickly and, therefore, contribute to resolving the current shortfall in the amount of land that is available for housing development over the next few years.

We would like to know what you think about the suitability of the site shown on the plan below and whether it should or should not be allocated for housing development. For any one site, it should be noted that there may be the option to develop only part of the site rather than its whole.

The development of the site would be likely to result in impacts which require mitigation and also opportunities to improve the local area. We would need to consider the facilities and services required, the type and design of housing, and how the site would be accessed by car and public transport, amongst a number of other issues.

Do you support housing development at:

Site SUT1 – Land north of Park Lane (potential capacity around 140 homes)

Any other location (please specify which)

Comment

Agent	Ms Caroline Chave (1073534)
Email Address	caroline@chaveplanning.com
Company / Organisation	Chave Planning
Address	Enterprise Centre Bridge Street Derby DE13LD
Consultee	Mrs B Mordecai (1073539)
Address	211 Loughborough Road Ruddington Nottingham NG11 6NY
Event Name	Local Plan Part 2 Further Options
Comment by	Mrs B Mordecai
Comment ID	97
Response Date	31/03/17 11:13
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

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

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

We agree with the Council's assessment that additional housing delivery at Bingham would not help to address the more immediate housing land supply shortfall. Additional housing sites in other locations up to around 150 dwellings are likely to make the fullest contribution to the immediate housing land supply.

Question 17

The villages which we have identified as potentially suitable to accommodate a limited level of housing development on greenfield sites are as follows:

- . Cropwell Bishop;
- . East Bridgford;

- . Gotham;
- . Sutton Bonington; and
- . Tollerton

These particular villages have been identified because, while they do not provide for a full range of facilities as is the case at West Bridgford and the key settlements, the basic level of facilities (e.g. schools; doctors' surgery) that are available are deemed capable of potentially supporting a relatively limited level of housing growth without compromising the strategy set out in Local Plan Part 1 (Core Strategy) for the distribution of new housing.

Should Local Plan Part 2 identify the following 'other' villages as suitable for a limited level of housing growth on greenfield sites?

Cropwell Bishop

East Bridgford

Gotham

Sutton Bonington

Tollerton

Any other settlement (please specify which)

Question 19

There are a number of sites that have been put forward by developers and others as potentially suitable for housing development at Cropwell Bishop. These are shown on the plan below. Most of the sites, if identified as suitable for housing development, should be able to deliver new homes relatively quickly and, therefore, contribute to resolving the current shortfall in the amount of land that is available for housing development over the next few years.

We would like to know what you think about the suitability of each of those individual sites shown on the plan below and whether, in each case, the site should or should not be allocated for housing development. For any one site, it should be noted that there may be the option to develop only part of the site rather than its whole.

The development of any one of these sites would be likely to result in impacts which require mitigation and also opportunities to improve the local area. We would need to consider the facilities and services required, the type and design of housing, and how the site would be accessed by car and public transport, amongst a number of other issues.

Do you support housing development at:

Site CBI1 – Land to the south of Nottingham Road and east of Kinoulton Road (potential capacity around 30 homes)

Site CBI2 – Land north of Memorial Hall (1) (potential capacity around 75 homes)

Site CBI3– Land north of Memorial Hall (2) (potential capacity around 60 homes)

Site CBI4 – Land north of Fern Road (2) (potential capacity around 30 homes)

Site CBI5 – Land north of Fern Road (1) (potential capacity around 250 homes)

Site CBI6 – Land to the north of Fern Road (3) (potential capacity around 70 homes)

Any other location (please specify which)

Question 21

There are a number of sites that have been put forward by developers and others as potentially suitable for housing development at East Bridgford. These are shown on the plan below. Most of the sites, if identified as suitable for housing development, should be able to deliver new homes relatively quickly and, therefore, contribute to resolving the current shortfall in the amount of land that is available for housing development over the next few years.

We would like to know what you think about the suitability of each of those individual sites shown on the plan below and whether, in each case, the site should or should not be allocated for housing development. For any one site, it should be noted that there may be the option to develop only part of the site rather than its whole.

The development of any one of these sites would be likely to result in impacts which require mitigation and also opportunities to improve the local area. We would need to consider the facilities and services required, the type and design of housing, and how the site would be accessed by car and public transport, amongst a number of other issues.

Do you support housing development at:

Site EBR1 – Land behind Kirk Hill (east) (potential capacity around 15 homes)

Site EBR2 – Land behind Kirk Hill (west) (potential capacity around 70 homes)

Site EBR3 – Land north of Kneeton Road (1) (potential capacity around 95 homes)

Site EBR4 – Land north of Kneeton Road (2) (potential capacity around 150 homes)

Site EBR5 – Land at Lammas Lane (potential capacity around 40 homes)

Site EBR6 – Closes Side Lane (west) (potential capacity around 20 homes)

Site EBR7 – Closes Side Lane (east) (potential capacity around 20 homes)

Site EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane (potential capacity around 20 homes)

Site EBR9 – Land to the south of Springdale Lane (potential capacity around 30 homes)

Any other location (please specify which)

Question 23

There are a number of sites that have been put forward by developers and others as potentially suitable for housing development at Gotham. These are shown on the plan below. Most of the sites, if identified as suitable for housing development, should be able to deliver new homes relatively quickly and, therefore, contribute to resolving the current shortfall in the amount of land that is available for housing development over the next few years.

We would like to know what you think about the suitability of each of those individual sites shown on the plan below and whether, in each case, the site should or should not be allocated for housing development. For any one site, it should be noted that there may be the option to develop only part of the site rather than its whole.

The development of any one of these sites would be likely to result in impacts which require mitigation and also opportunities to improve the local area. We would need to consider the facilities and services required, the type and design of housing, and how the site would be accessed by car and public transport, amongst a number of other issues.

Do you support housing development at:

**Site GOT1 – Land to the rear of former British Legion
(potential capacity around 25 homes)**

**Site GOT2 – Land north of Kegworth Road/Home Farm
(west) (potential capacity around 50 homes)**

**Site GOT3 – Land north of Kegworth Road/Home Farm
(east) (potential capacity around 20 homes)**

**Site GOT4 – The Orchards, Leake Road (potential capacity
around 50 homes)**

**Site GOT5 – Land east of Gypsum Way/The Orchards
(potential capacity around 200 homes)**

**Site GOT6 – East of Leake Road (potential capacity
around 45 homes)**

**Site GOT7 – Land east of Hill Road (potential capacity
around 160 homes)**

**Site GOT8 – Land south of Moor Lane (potential capacity
around 15 homes)**

Any other location (please specify which)

Question 25

There is one site that has been put forward by a landowner as potentially suitable for housing development at Sutton Bonington. This is shown on the plan below. The site, if identified as suitable for housing development, should be able to deliver new homes relatively quickly and, therefore, contribute to resolving the current shortfall in the amount of land that is available for housing development over the next few years.

We would like to know what you think about the suitability of the site shown on the plan below and whether it should or should not be allocated for housing development. For any one site, it should be noted that there may be the option to develop only part of the site rather than its whole.

The development of the site would be likely to result in impacts which require mitigation and also opportunities to improve the local area. We would need to consider the facilities and services required, the type and design of housing, and how the site would be accessed by car and public transport, amongst a number of other issues.

Do you support housing development at:

**Site SUT1 – Land north of Park Lane (potential capacity
around 140 homes)**

Any other location (please specify which)

Comment

Agent	Ms Caroline Chave (1073534)
Email Address	caroline@chaveplanning.com
Company / Organisation	Chave Planning
Address	Enterprise Centre Bridge Street Derby DE13LD
Consultee	Mrs B Mordecai (1073539)
Address	211 Loughborough Road Ruddington Nottingham NG11 6NY
Event Name	Local Plan Part 2 Further Options
Comment by	Mrs B Mordecai
Comment ID	97
Response Date	31/03/17 11:13
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

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

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

We agree with the Council's assessment that additional housing delivery at Bingham would not help to address the more immediate housing land supply shortfall. Additional housing sites in other locations up to around 150 dwellings are likely to make the fullest contribution to the immediate housing land supply.

Question 17

The villages which we have identified as potentially suitable to accommodate a limited level of housing development on greenfield sites are as follows:

- . Cropwell Bishop;
- . East Bridgford;

- . Gotham;
- . Sutton Bonington; and
- . Tollerton

These particular villages have been identified because, while they do not provide for a full range of facilities as is the case at West Bridgford and the key settlements, the basic level of facilities (e.g. schools; doctors' surgery) that are available are deemed capable of potentially supporting a relatively limited level of housing growth without compromising the strategy set out in Local Plan Part 1 (Core Strategy) for the distribution of new housing.

Should Local Plan Part 2 identify the following 'other' villages as suitable for a limited level of housing growth on greenfield sites?

Cropwell Bishop

East Bridgford

Gotham

Sutton Bonington

Tollerton

Any other settlement (please specify which)

Question 19

There are a number of sites that have been put forward by developers and others as potentially suitable for housing development at Cropwell Bishop. These are shown on the plan below. Most of the sites, if identified as suitable for housing development, should be able to deliver new homes relatively quickly and, therefore, contribute to resolving the current shortfall in the amount of land that is available for housing development over the next few years.

We would like to know what you think about the suitability of each of those individual sites shown on the plan below and whether, in each case, the site should or should not be allocated for housing development. For any one site, it should be noted that there may be the option to develop only part of the site rather than its whole.

The development of any one of these sites would be likely to result in impacts which require mitigation and also opportunities to improve the local area. We would need to consider the facilities and services required, the type and design of housing, and how the site would be accessed by car and public transport, amongst a number of other issues.

Do you support housing development at:

Site CBI1 – Land to the south of Nottingham Road and east of Kinoulton Road (potential capacity around 30 homes)

Site CBI2 – Land north of Memorial Hall (1) (potential capacity around 75 homes)

Site CBI3– Land north of Memorial Hall (2) (potential capacity around 60 homes)

Site CBI4 – Land north of Fern Road (2) (potential capacity around 30 homes)

Site CBI5 – Land north of Fern Road (1) (potential capacity around 250 homes)

Site CBI6 – Land to the north of Fern Road (3) (potential capacity around 70 homes)

Any other location (please specify which)

Question 21

There are a number of sites that have been put forward by developers and others as potentially suitable for housing development at East Bridgford. These are shown on the plan below. Most of the sites, if identified as suitable for housing development, should be able to deliver new homes relatively quickly and, therefore, contribute to resolving the current shortfall in the amount of land that is available for housing development over the next few years.

We would like to know what you think about the suitability of each of those individual sites shown on the plan below and whether, in each case, the site should or should not be allocated for housing development. For any one site, it should be noted that there may be the option to develop only part of the site rather than its whole.

The development of any one of these sites would be likely to result in impacts which require mitigation and also opportunities to improve the local area. We would need to consider the facilities and services required, the type and design of housing, and how the site would be accessed by car and public transport, amongst a number of other issues.

Do you support housing development at:

Site EBR1 – Land behind Kirk Hill (east) (potential capacity around 15 homes)

Site EBR2 – Land behind Kirk Hill (west) (potential capacity around 70 homes)

Site EBR3 – Land north of Kneeton Road (1) (potential capacity around 95 homes)

Site EBR4 – Land north of Kneeton Road (2) (potential capacity around 150 homes)

Site EBR5 – Land at Lammas Lane (potential capacity around 40 homes)

Site EBR6 – Closes Side Lane (west) (potential capacity around 20 homes)

Site EBR7 – Closes Side Lane (east) (potential capacity around 20 homes)

Site EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane (potential capacity around 20 homes)

Site EBR9 – Land to the south of Springdale Lane (potential capacity around 30 homes)

Any other location (please specify which)

Question 23

There are a number of sites that have been put forward by developers and others as potentially suitable for housing development at Gotham. These are shown on the plan below. Most of the sites, if identified as suitable for housing development, should be able to deliver new homes relatively quickly and, therefore, contribute to resolving the current shortfall in the amount of land that is available for housing development over the next few years.

We would like to know what you think about the suitability of each of those individual sites shown on the plan below and whether, in each case, the site should or should not be allocated for housing development. For any one site, it should be noted that there may be the option to develop only part of the site rather than its whole.

The development of any one of these sites would be likely to result in impacts which require mitigation and also opportunities to improve the local area. We would need to consider the facilities and services required, the type and design of housing, and how the site would be accessed by car and public transport, amongst a number of other issues.

Do you support housing development at:

**Site GOT1 – Land to the rear of former British Legion
(potential capacity around 25 homes)**

**Site GOT2 – Land north of Kegworth Road/Home Farm
(west) (potential capacity around 50 homes)**

**Site GOT3 – Land north of Kegworth Road/Home Farm
(east) (potential capacity around 20 homes)**

**Site GOT4 – The Orchards, Leake Road (potential capacity
around 50 homes)**

**Site GOT5 – Land east of Gypsum Way/The Orchards
(potential capacity around 200 homes)**

**Site GOT6 – East of Leake Road (potential capacity
around 45 homes)**

**Site GOT7 – Land east of Hill Road (potential capacity
around 160 homes)**

**Site GOT8 – Land south of Moor Lane (potential capacity
around 15 homes)**

Any other location (please specify which)

Question 25

There is one site that has been put forward by a landowner as potentially suitable for housing development at Sutton Bonington. This is shown on the plan below. The site, if identified as suitable for housing development, should be able to deliver new homes relatively quickly and, therefore, contribute to resolving the current shortfall in the amount of land that is available for housing development over the next few years.

We would like to know what you think about the suitability of the site shown on the plan below and whether it should or should not be allocated for housing development. For any one site, it should be noted that there may be the option to develop only part of the site rather than its whole.

The development of the site would be likely to result in impacts which require mitigation and also opportunities to improve the local area. We would need to consider the facilities and services required, the type and design of housing, and how the site would be accessed by car and public transport, amongst a number of other issues.

Do you support housing development at:

**Site SUT1 – Land north of Park Lane (potential capacity
around 140 homes)**

Any other location (please specify which)