



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

Response Form

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

localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk

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)	
Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group (RNCSIG)	Name	Click here to enter text.
Gordon Dyne (Chair - RNCSIG) 6 Lyons Close Ruddington Notts NG11 6BQ.	Address	Click here to enter text.
	E-mail	Click here to enter text.

Housing Development

Housing Land Supply

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

Yes

No

Don't know

 No

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

RNCSIG feel that every effort should be made to limit land take from the wider countryside by ensuring timely use of sites already identified. Existing identified sites should be sympathetically, but efficiently developed. We are unclear why the existing sites cannot be 'encouraged' to get a move on, for the delays seem to us to be leading to pressure for additional sites to be allocated.

In keeping with the Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy proposed housing allocations should avoid damaging developments near SSSI's, Local Wildlife Sites and Nature Reserves, as well as ensuring that both strategic and local Green Corridors are not squeezed. In addition RNCSIG feel that further major intrusions into the wider landscape should be avoided.

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

Ye
s

No

Don't know

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

On a landscape scale we would not support further intrusion into the wider countryside in by these sites, above existing allocations.

They would also potentially put further pressure on important wildlife sites and corridors such as Fairham Brook and Sharphill Wood.

Question 3: Do you support housing development at:

**Yes –
all of
site**

**Yes –
but
only**

No

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

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

This site is close to a designated Local Wildlife Site, if development were permitted we would expect S106 funding to buffer the site.

Housing Development at the 'Key Settlements'

Bingham

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

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

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

RNCSIG feel that every effort should be made to limit land take from the wider countryside by ensuring timely use of sites already identified. Existing identified sites should be sympathetically, but efficiently developed. We are unclear why the existing sites cannot be 'encouraged' to get a move on, for the delays seem to us to be leading to pressure for additional sites to be allocated.

Cotgrave

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

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/> N O
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

RNCSIG feel that every effort should be made to limit land take from the wider countryside by ensuring timely use of sites already identified. Existing identified sites should be sympathetically, but efficiently developed. We are unclear why the existing sites cannot be 'encouraged' to get a move on, for the delays seem to us to be leading to pressure for additional sites to be allocated.

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.

RNCSIG feel that every effort should be made to limit land take from the wider countryside by ensuring timely use of sites already identified. Existing identified sites should be sympathetically, but efficiently developed. We are unclear why the existing sites cannot be 'encouraged' to get a move on, for the delays seem to us to be leading to pressure for additional sites to be allocated.

Question 7: Do you support housing development at:

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

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<i>Site COT1 – Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park (potential capacity around 240 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site COT2 – Land at Main Road (potential capacity around 50 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>Site COT3 – Land rear of and to the west of Main Road (potential capacity around 125 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site COT4 Land off Woodgate Lane (potential capacity around 80 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site COT5 – Bakers Hollow (potential capacity around 60 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site COT6 – The Brickyard, Owthorpe Road (potential capacity around 100 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<i>Site COT7– Land behind Firdale (2) (potential capacity around 65 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site COT8 – Land behind Firdale (potential capacity around 95 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site COT9 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (1) (potential capacity around 140 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

The areas to the south, east and north of Cotgrave are part of the Cotgrave Forest Focal Area and we would want to keep opportunities open to extend woodland and promote north/south wildlife corridors.

COT1 – would support only limited infill on this site in order to buffer the woodland to the north.

Cot6 and Cot12 represent barriers to movement through the woodland around the eastern edge of Cotgrave.

Cot11 – there should be no further development towards the edge of the Grantham Canal which is both a designated Local Wildlife Site and a Green Corridor.. Close development will have a negative impact on it`s wildlife value. If the land were allocated we would expect S106 money to be spent on buffering etc.

Other possible sites do not appear to have significant wildlife related implications and we therefore express no opinion on their possible allocation. However we reserve the right to object to any of these if additional evidence of mate rail wildlife related issues is identified

East Leake

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

Yes

No

No

Don't know

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

RNCSIG feel that every effort should be made to limit land take from the wider countryside by ensuring timely use of sites already identified. Existing identified sites should be sympathetically, but efficiently developed. We are unclear why the existing sites cannot be 'encouraged' to get a move on, for the delays seem to us to be leading to pressure for additional sites to be allocated.

Question 9: Do you support housing development at:

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site EL9 – Land south of West Leake Road (potential capacity around 50 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site EL10 – Land north of West Leake Road (potential capacity around 75 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site EL11 – Brook Furlong Farm (potential capacity around 70 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> no
Site EL12 – Land off Rempstone Road (north) (potential capacity around 235 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	no <input type="checkbox"/>

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

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.

EL11, EL12, EL13 and EL14 represent a further intrusion of East Leake into the wider landscape.

EL14 is also adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site and green corridor. If the land were allocated we would expect S106 money to be spent on buffering etc.

Other possible sites do not appear to have significant wildlife related implications and we therefore express no opinion on their possible allocation. However we reserve the right to object to any of these if additional evidence of mate rail wildlife related issues is identified

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.*

RNCSIG feel that every effort should be made to limit land take from the wider countryside by ensuring timely use of sites already identified. Existing identified sites should be sympathetically, but efficiently developed. We are unclear why the existing sites cannot be ‘encouraged’ to get a move on, for the delays seem to us to be leading to pressure for additional sites to be allocated.

Question 11: Do you support housing development at:

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<i>Site KEY1 – Land east of Willow Brook (potential capacity around 40 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Part <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site KEY2 – Land off Selby Lane and Willowbrook (potential capacity around 15 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site KEY3 – Land south of Selby Lane (potential capacity around 60 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site KEY4 – Land off Nicker Hill (potential capacity around 450 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	no <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site KEY5 – Hill Top Farm, Platt Lane (1) (potential capacity around 50 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>Site KEY6 – Hill Top Farm, Platt Lane (2) (potential capacity around 80 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site KEY7 – Shelton Farm, Platt Lane (potential capacity around 160 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	no <input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site KEY8 – Land between Platt Lane and Station Road (potential capacity around 180 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site KEY9 – Land north of Debdale Lane (1) (potential capacity around 110 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

KEY1 stretch of ancient hedge running down Willow Brook which should be adequately buffered and protected

KEY4 and KEY 7 is adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site and should therefore be protected from development. If the land were allocated we would expect S106 money to be spent on buffering etc.

KEY10 is an area of historical ridge and furrow and areas of woodland which should be conserved – one at the north end of Key10. If the land were allocated we would expect S106 money to be spent on buffering etc.

KEY5 – This is a steep, narrow site above the brook and by a small area of wood and should not be developed.

KEY14 – but need to ensure that the hedge around the Keyworth Wildflower Meadow is buffered.

Other possible sites do not appear to have significant wildlife related implications and we therefore express no opinion on their possible allocation. However we reserve the right to object to any of these if additional evidence of mate rail wildlife related issues is identified

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

RNCSIG feel that every effort should be made to limit land take from the wider countryside by ensuring timely use of sites already identified. Existing identified sites should be sympathetically, but efficiently developed. We are unclear why the existing sites cannot be ‘encouraged’ to get a move on, for the delays seem to us to be leading to pressure for additional sites to be allocated.

Question 13: Do you support housing development at:

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

RAD12 is adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site , nearby development would damage this site and must be buffered. *If the land were allocated we would expect S106 money to be spent on buffering etc.*

Other possible sites do not appear to have significant wildlife related implications and we therefore express no opinion on their possible allocation. However we reserve the right to object to any of these if additional evidence of mate rail wildlife related issues is identified

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.*

RNCSIG feel that every effort should be made to limit land take from the wider countryside by ensuring timely use of sites already identified. Existing identified sites should be sympathetically, but efficiently developed. We are unclear why the existing sites cannot be ‘encouraged’ to get a move on, for the delays seem to us to be leading to pressure for additional sites to be allocated.

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

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site RUD11 – Old Loughborough Road (potential capacity around 40 homes)	<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"/> no
Site RUD13 – Land opposite Mere Way (potential capacity around 170 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	no <input type="checkbox"/>

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site RUD14 – Croft House (potential capacity around 25 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	no <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.

RUD12, RUDD13 and RUDD14 represent a further intrusion into the wider landscape

Other possible sites do not appear to have significant wildlife related implications and we therefore express no opinion on their possible allocation. However we reserve the right to object to any of these if additional evidence of mate rail wildlife related issues is identified

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.

RNCSIG feel that every effort should be made to limit land take from the wider countryside by ensuring timely use of sites already identified. Existing identified sites should be sympathetically, but efficiently developed. We are unclear why the existing sites cannot be ‘encouraged’ to get a move on, for the delays seem to us to be leading to pressure for additional sites to be allocated.

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

	Yes	No	Don't know
<i>Cropwell Bishop</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
<i>East Bridgford</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Gotham</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
<i>Sutton Bonington</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Tollerton</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
<i>Any other settlement (please specify which)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

RNCSIG feel that every effort should be made to limit land take from the wider countryside by ensuring timely use of sites already identified. Existing identified sites should be sympathetically, but efficiently developed. We are unclear why the existing sites cannot be ‘encouraged’ to get a move on, for the delays seem to us to be leading to pressure for additional sites to be allocated.

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.*

RNCSIG feel that every effort should be made to limit land take from the wider countryside by ensuring timely use of sites already identified. Existing identified sites should be sympathetically, but efficiently developed. We are unclear why the existing sites cannot be 'encouraged' to get a move on, for the delays seem to us to be leading to pressure for additional sites to be allocated.

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"/>	no <input type="checkbox"/>
Site CBI3 – Land north of Memorial Hall (2) (potential capacity around 60 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	no <input type="checkbox"/>
Site CBI4 – Land north of Fern Road (2) (potential capacity around 30 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site CBI5 – Land north of Fern Road (1) (potential capacity around 250 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	no <input type="checkbox"/>

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

CB12 and CBI3 would bring development adjacent to Grantham Canal which is an important Local Wildlife Site and Green Corridor. Such development would be detrimental to the canal's wildlife value. If the land were allocated we would expect S106 money to be spent on buffering etc.

CB5 and CBI6 are a major intrusion into the wider landscape and as such would not be supported.

Other possible sites do not appear to have significant wildlife relateHowever we reserve the right to object to any of these if additional evidence of mate rail wildlife related issues is identifiedd implications and we therefore express no opinion on their possible allocation.

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.

RNCSIG feel that every effort should be made to limit land take from the wider countryside by ensuring timely use of sites already identified. Existing identified sites should be sympathetically, but efficiently developed. We are unclear why the existing sites cannot be 'encouraged' to get a move on, for the delays seem to us to be leading to pressure for additional sites to be allocated.

Question 21: Do you support housing development at:

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
<i>Site EBR1 – Land behind Kirk Hill (east) (potential capacity around 15 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site EBR2 – Land behind Kirk Hill (west) (potential capacity around 70 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> no
<i>Site EBR3 – Land north of Kneeton Road (1) (potential capacity around 95 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> no
<i>Site EBR4 – Land north of Kneeton Road (2) (potential capacity around 150 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> no
<i>Site EBR5 – Land at Lammas Lane (potential capacity around 40 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site EBR6 – Closes Side Lane (west) (potential capacity around 20 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site EBR7 – Closes Side Lane (east) (potential capacity around 20 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane (potential capacity around 20 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site EBR9 – Land to the south of Springdale Lane (potential capacity around 30 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Any other location (please specify which)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

EBR2 is adjacent to a newly created woodland copse which should be protected.

EBR3 and EBR4 represent a major intrusion into the wider landscape.

Other possible sites do not appear to have significant wildlife related implications and we therefore express no opinion on their possible allocation. However we reserve the right to object to any of these if additional evidence of mate rail wildlife related issues is identified

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.*

RNCSIG feel that every effort should be made to limit land take from the wider countryside by ensuring timely use of sites already identified. Existing identified sites should be sympathetically, but efficiently developed. We are unclear why the existing sites cannot be ‘encouraged’ to get a move on, for the delays seem to us to be leading to pressure for additional sites to be allocated.

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

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site GOT1 – Land to the rear of former British Legion (potential capacity around 25 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Site GOT2 – Land north of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (west) (potential capacity around 50 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site GOT3 – Land north of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (east) (potential capacity around 20 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site GOT4 – The Orchards, Leake Road (potential capacity around 50 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site GOT5 – Land east of Gypsum Way/The Orchards (potential capacity around 200 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Site GOT6 – East of Leake Road (potential capacity around 45 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site GOT7 – Land east of Hill Road (potential capacity around 160 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	no <input type="checkbox"/>
Site GOT8 – Land south of Moor Lane (potential capacity around 15 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.

GOT1 – good wildlife habitat developing should be protected, and is part of a green corridor stretching up to the Gotham Sandbanks SSSI *If the land were allocated we would expect S106 money to be spent on buffering etc.*

GOT5 and GOT7 – is adjacent to Local Wildlife Site and represents a major intrusion into the wider landscape. *If the land were allocated we would expect S106 money to be spent on buffering etc.*

Other possible sites do not appear to have significant wildlife related implications and we therefore express no opinion on their possible allocation. However we reserve the right to object to any of these if additional evidence of mate rail wildlife related issues is identified

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.*

RNCSIG feel that every effort should be made to limit land take from the wider countryside by ensuring timely use of sites already identified. Existing identified sites should be sympathetically, but efficiently developed. We are unclear why the existing sites cannot be 'encouraged' to get a move on, for the delays seem to us to be leading to pressure for additional sites to be allocated.

Question 25: Do you support housing development at:

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

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

This site does not appear to have significant wildlife related implications and we therefore express no opinion on their possible allocation. However we reserve the right to object to any of these if additional evidence of mate rail wildlife related issues is identified

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.

RNCSIG feel that every effort should be made to limit land take from the wider countryside by ensuring timely use of sites already identified. Existing identified sites should be sympathetically, but efficiently developed. We are unclear why the existing sites cannot be 'encouraged' to get a move on, for the delays seem to us to be leading to pressure for additional sites to be allocated.

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

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

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

TOL3 is a major intrusion into the wider landscape and risks linking up with the Greater Gamston extension isolating woodland and creating a landscape scale barrier.

Other possible sites do not appear to have significant wildlife related implications and we therefore express no opinion on their possible allocation. However we reserve the right to object to any of these if additional evidence of mate rail wildlife related issues is identified

Other issues

Specific provision must be made for S106 funding to compensate for lost habitat. This should be pooled to provide a genuine conservation benefit in the local area and not frittered away in penny packets which in the past have proved at best limited and at worst utterly pointless.

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

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

Or to: localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk

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

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