

# TABU

## TOLLERTON AGAINST BACKDOOR URBANISATION

Chair: Sue Ball  
Secretary: Hazel Salisbury

29 March 2017

Planning Policy  
Rushcliffe Borough Council

Dear Sir/Madam

### **Rushcliffe Local Plan and Green Belt Review**

TABU is submitting responses to the Council's Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies – Further Options, and to the Green Belt Review Part 2 (b) – Additional Sites. We are a community organisation in Tollerton who have led the community in responding to attempts to allocate or build large developments in the parish. Our aim is *to campaign against developments which would alter the rural nature of Tollerton as a village.*

We are independent of the Parish Council. We have an ever-growing membership and expressions of support from the majority of households in Tollerton. With the Parish Council, we have held a number of events over the years at which representatives of Rushcliffe Borough Council, TABU and others have been invited to speak, and answer questions on the proposals then current. These meetings have all filled the space in the Parish Rooms and have overflowed on to the street, with attendances of up to 150.

Our response should be treated as representing the majority of Tollerton residents, and while we have publicised the current consultation to enable

Chair: Sue Ball  
202 Tollerton Lane,  
Tollerton  
Nottingham  
NG12 4FW  
Tel: 0

Secretary: Hazel Salisbury  
165 Tollerton Lane,  
Tollerton  
Nottingham  
NG12 4FT  
Tel:



# TABU

TOLLERTON AGAINST BACKDOOR URBANISATION

residents to respond personally if they wish to do so, we have gathered views from the community and our comments are a reflection of residents' opinions.

We wish to express our immense disappointment that additional houses are being proposed for our village, having just had 4000 houses allocated in Tollerton.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Sue Ball

Chair of TABU

Chair: Sue Ball  
202 Tollerton Lane,  
Tollerton  
Nottingham  
NG12 4FW  
T

Secretary: Hazel Salisbury  
165 Tollerton Lane,  
Tollerton  
Nottingham  
NG12 4FT  
T



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

## Response Form

Please return by **5pm on Friday 31 March 2017** to:  
 Planning Policy, Rushcliffe Borough Council  
 Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road  
 Nottingham. NG2 7YG  
 Or to: [localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk](mailto:localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk)

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

Your Details		Agent details (where applicable)
<b>Tollerton Against Backdoor Urbanisation (TABU):</b> <b>TABU is a campaign group working to preserve the rural nature of Tollerton as a village.</b> <b>TABU represents a large membership of Tollerton people.</b> <b>This document is submitted on their behalf.</b>	<b>Name</b>	Click here to enter text.
<b>Secretary: Hazel Salisbury</b> <b>165 Tollerton Lane</b> <b>Tollerton</b> <b>Nottingham</b>	<b>Address</b>	Click here to enter text.
	<b>E-mail</b>	Click here to enter text.

### Housing Development

#### Housing Land Supply

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

**Yes** .....

No .....



Don't know .....

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

*The proposed housing numbers are based out of date evidence provided for the compilation of the now repealed East Midlands Regional Plan. We do not believe that evidence is any longer appropriate or credible, and we therefore do not believe it to be relevant to the new Rushcliffe plan. In response to a FOI request, Rushcliffe Borough Council has stated:*

*“There are currently no studies/analyses to which Rushcliffe Borough Council has access to or it is preparing regarding the impact of Brexit on the number of new homes required in (a) Rushcliffe or (b) Greater Nottingham. The main determining factor for the number of new homes planned for is the household projections that are released by Government. The latest projections were released in July 2016 and are based on sub-national population projections, published by the Office for National Statistics in May 2016. These projections therefore take no account of the outcome of the referendum on 23 June 2016 or the events since that day.”*

*It is widely considered that net migration rates into the UK will reduce as a result of Brexit. Indeed, recent statistics (to September 2016) demonstrate a significant fall in such net migration. We consider that it is inappropriate to build on additional green field sites when insufficient work has been done regarding future population estimates.*

*Rushcliffe Borough Council has applied the 20% buffer to both the 1000 per year housing requirement and the 882 home shortfall. It is not clear why this buffer has been applied to the shortfall when, in February 2015, the Inspector at the Oadby and Wigston appeal (APP/L2440/A/14/2216085) preferred to do the calculation in reverse order by considering the buffer then the backlog. Such an approach would reduce the requirement by 176 homes.*

*Moreover, there is a good argument that the under delivery is not “persistent” since the under delivery relates to large strategic allocations, some of which have been allocated less than three years ago, and the anticipated allocations in Part 2 have not yet been decided. Three years is a far shorter period than the Practice Guidance suggests should be considered in deciding the percentage to apply for the buffer since a longer view should be taken in order to have regard to economic cycles and market conditions. Development at the Edwalton allocation is clearly gaining momentum. Given the strong argument that the under delivery is not “persistent”, rather it is due to slow starts at some larger sites, Rushcliffe Borough Council should apply a 5% buffer, despite having a shortfall, as per Kettering and Rother. It certainly seems perverse that the applied buffer is 1,176 homes when the projected shortfall is only 882. A buffer of 5% would represent only 17 additional homes, rather than 899.*

*The Local Plan Part 2 contains no justification of the decision to consider the 5 year supply for Rushcliffe alone, rather than considering the whole of Greater Nottingham, in line with the approach endorsed by the Inspector in the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy examination.*

### 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?

<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 current shortfall is as a result of the apparent failure at this time to secure the delivery of sufficient housing on strategic allocations within 5 years. Therefore, it appears that expanding the strategic allocations would not resolve this shortfall. Rather, more pressure should be applied to developers at those sites.*

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

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

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers. This could include comments on the services and facilities required to support

development and the design, mix and layout of development.

Click here to enter text.

## Housing Development at the 'Key Settlements'

### **Bingham**

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

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

**Don't know** .....

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

*Having a train station and significantly more services and facilities (including schools) than the smaller villages also being considered for development at this time, Bingham appears to be more suitable for development. However, if no sites have been put forward that can deliver within the required five years, then we recognise that it would not be possible to allocate further sites for housing at Bingham at this stage. There should be further exploration of appropriate land in Bingham to determine whether any additional site can be included in the SHLAA.*

### **Cotgrave**

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

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

**Don't** .....  
**know** .....



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

*Cotgrave is one of the larger settlements in Rushcliffe and has significantly more services and facilities (including schools) than the smaller villages also being considered for development at this time. Although some development has already taken place in Cotgrave, the increase in currently planned housing is nowhere near of the same scale as that proposed in Tollerton, relative to the sizes of the settlements.*

**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.

*Cotgrave is one of the larger settlements in Rushcliffe. Cotgrave should expect to be required to provide a proportion of Rushcliffe's requirement for 13,150 houses that is proportional to its size and population. As a settlement, a large number of additional houses would cause less impact than if that same number of houses was built in a smaller village.*

**Question 7:** Do you support housing development at:

	Yes – all of site	Yes – but only part of site	No
Site COT1 – Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park (potential capacity around 240 homes)			
Site COT2 – Land at Main Road (potential capacity around 50 homes)			
Site COT3 – Land rear of and to the west of Main Road (potential capacity around 125 homes)			
Site COT4 Land off Woodgate Lane (potential capacity around 80 homes)			✓


	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site COT5 – Bakers Hollow (potential capacity around 60 homes)</i>			
<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>			✓
<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.*

*It is important that new development should not lead to the merging of Cotgrave and Clipston and there would be a danger of this happening if COT12 was used for housing.*

*Similarly, COT4 is fairly near to the strategic allocation “East of Gamston/North of Tollerton”. Whilst it is difficult to tell, given the current lack of plans for the strategic allocation, development on COT4 may be very visible from the strategic allocation and may increase the perception of merging of those settlements.*

*Development to the north and east of Cotgrave would be most appropriate, both to avoid merging of settlements and in terms of access to the A46.*



**East Leake**

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

**Yes** .....

**No** .....

**Don't know** .....

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

We do not agree with the reasons put forward in Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies for not developing further in East Leake for the following reasons:

- Whilst we recognise that East Leake has planning permission on sites that will deliver around 800 new homes, this is a relatively small number in relation to the size of East Leake in comparison with the planned 4000 new homes in the much smaller Tollerton (currently 850 households). Therefore, this argument can only be held valid if the same principle is also applied to areas like Tollerton which have even more houses planned.
- East Leake is not in the Green Belt.
- The location of East Leake is such that residents can access Nottingham via the upgraded A453 and have access to trams from Clifton and to East Midlands Parkway station. The A60 is less congested than the A606 and less congested than the A52 from the Wheatcroft Island to the Nottingham Knight Island. These factors make East Leake sites more suitable for development than the more easterly sites for which travel to Nottingham requires use of the congested A606 or Radcliffe Road.
- East Leake has better services and facilities (including schools) than the smaller villages that are also being considered for housing at this time.

**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>
<i>Site EL9 – Land south of West Leake Road (potential capacity around 50 homes)</i>			
<i>Site EL10 – Land north of West Leake Road (potential capacity around 75 homes)</i>			
<i>Site EL11 – Brook Furlong Farm (potential capacity around 70 homes)</i>			
<i>Site EL12 – Land off Rempstone Road (north) (potential capacity around 235 homes)</i>			
<i>Site EL13 – Land off Rempstone Road (south) (potential capacity around 120 homes)</i>			
<i>Site EL14 – Land north of Lantern Lane (2) (potential capacity around 360 homes)</i>			
<i>Any other location (please specify which)</i>			

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

### **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.*

*Keyworth is one of the larger settlements in Rushcliffe and has significantly more services and facilities (including schools) than the smaller villages also being considered for development at this time.*

*Keyworth should expect to be required to provide a proportion of Rushcliffe's requirement for 13,150 houses that is proportional to its size and population. As a*

settlement, a large number of additional houses would cause less impact than if that same number of houses was built in a smaller village.

**Question 11: Do you support housing development at:**

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site KEY1 – Land east of Willow Brook (potential capacity around 40 homes)</i>			
<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>			

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
Site KEY12 – Land north of Debdale Lane (2) (potential capacity around 160 homes)			
Site KEY13 – Hillside Farm (potential capacity around 60 homes)			
Site KEY14 – Land south of Bunny Lane (potential capacity around 410 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.*

*There is considerable congestion on the A606 towards the Wheatcroft roundabout and this needs to be taken into account in allocating sites for development.*

*The distance between nearby settlements would be reduced if the sites to the north-east (e.g. KEY7) are allocated due to the close proximity of Normanton-on-the-Wolds, albeit the two settlements are separated by the railway line and A606. There are no settlements close to the sites to the west of Keyworth and, if these sites were allocated, it would be easier for residents on such sites to access Nottingham via the relatively less congested A60.*

### **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.*

*Radcliffe on Trent is one of the larger settlements in Rushcliffe and has significantly more services and facilities (including schools) than the smaller villages also being considered for development at this time. Importantly, Radcliffe on Trent has a train station which makes it more suitable for additional housing than many other settlements.*

*Radcliffe on Trent should provide a proportion of Rushcliffe's requirement for 13,150*

*houses that is proportional to its size and population. As a settlement, a large number of additional houses would cause less impact than if that same number of houses was built in a smaller village.*

**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)	<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"/>	<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.

## **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.

*Ruddington is one of the larger settlements in Rushcliffe and has significantly more services and facilities than the smaller villages also being considered for development at this time. Residents in Ruddington can access Nottingham via the A60 which is much less congested (especially from Ruddington to the Nottingham Knight roundabout) at peak times than the A606 or the Radcliffe Road. Ruddington residents also have easier access to the tram from Clifton to Nottingham.*

*Ruddington should provide a proportion of Rushcliffe's requirement for 13,150 houses that is proportional to its size and population. As a settlement, a large number of additional houses would cause less impact than if that same number of houses was built in a smaller village.*

**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)	✓		
Site RUD12 – Land to the east side of Loughborough Road (potential capacity around 60 homes)	✓		
Site RUD13 – Land opposite Mere Way (potential capacity around 170 homes)	✓		
Site RUD14 – Croft House (potential capacity around 25 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.*

*Sites with easy access to the A60 will have less congested road access to Nottingham than sites elsewhere in Rushcliffe.*

### 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)?*

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

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

Click here to enter text.

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

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

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

*The strategic allocation of 4000 houses has already been planned for Tollerton and this is already a disproportionately high number of houses for the parish. The Green Belt scores for sites TOL1 and TOL2 in Tollerton are particularly high and these sites should therefore be discounted. Travel to Nottingham from Tollerton is fraught with significant congestion and public transport is poor, particularly from the north end of the village.*

*Residents in Gotham and Sutton Bonington would be able to access East Midlands Parkway train station and the tram from Clifton. They would also have convenient access to the upgraded A453 and the M1.*

### **Cropwell Bishop**

**Question 18:** *If greenfield land is allocated for housing development at Cropwell Bishop, do you have a view on the total number of new homes that should be built up to 2028? If possible, please give reasons for your answer.*

Click here to enter text.

**Question 19:** *Do you support housing development at:*

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

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site CBI4 – Land north of Fern Road (2) (potential capacity around 30 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site CBI5 – Land north of Fern Road (1) (potential capacity around 250 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site CBI6 – Land to the north of Fern Road (3) (potential capacity around 70 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Any other location (please specify which)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Click here to enter text.

### **East Bridgford**

**Question 20:** *If greenfield land is allocated for housing development at East Bridgford, do you have a view on the total number of new homes that should be built up to 2028? If possible, please give reasons for your answer.*

Click here to enter text.

**Question 21:** *Do you support housing development at:*

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site EBR1 – Land behind Kirk Hill (east) (potential capacity around 15 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Click here to enter text.

## **Gotham**

**Question 22:** *If greenfield land is allocated for housing development at Gotham, do you have a view on the total number of new homes that should be built up to 2028? If possible, please give reasons for your answer.*

Click here to enter text.

**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>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site GOT2 – Land north of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (west) (potential capacity around 50 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site GOT3 – Land north of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (east) (potential capacity around 20 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site GOT4 – The Orchards, Leake Road (potential capacity around 50 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site GOT5 – Land east of Gypsum Way/The Orchards (potential capacity around 200 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site GOT6 – East of Leake Road (potential capacity around 45 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site GOT7 – Land east of Hill Road (potential capacity around 160 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Site GOT8 – Land south of Moor Lane (potential capacity around 15 homes)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Any other location (please specify which)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

*The location of Gotham is such that residents can access Nottingham via the upgraded A453 and have access to trams at Clifton and to East Midlands Parkway train station. These factors make Gotham sites more suitable for development than the more easterly sites for which travel to Nottingham requires use of the congested*

A606 or Radcliffe Road.

### **Sutton Bonington**

**Question 24:** *If greenfield land is allocated for housing development at Sutton Bonington, do you have a view on the total number of new homes that should be built up to 2028? If possible, please give reasons for your answer.*

Click here to enter text.

**Question 25:** *Do you support housing development at:*

	<b>Yes – all of site</b>	<b>Yes – but only part of site</b>	<b>No</b>
<i>Site SUT1 – Land north of Park Lane (potential capacity around 140 homes)</i>			
<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.*

*The location of Sutton Bonington is such that residents can access Nottingham via the upgraded A453 and have easy access to a tram station and to East Midlands Parkway station. These factors make this site more suitable for development than the more easterly sites for which travel to Nottingham requires use of the congested A606 or Radcliffe Road.*

## 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.*

*Mostly greenfield land has already been allocated for a housing development of 4000 houses in the parish of Tollerton. This is already a disproportionately high number, given the size of the existing community in Tollerton. No further greenfield land should be allocated. No further new homes should be built.*

**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.*

**TOL1, TOL2 and TOL3**

- We do not support development on any of these sites for the following reasons:*
- *At busy times, there is significant congestion on the A606 towards the Wheatcroft roundabout and on the Lings Bar Road approaching both the Wheatcroft roundabout and the Gamston roundabout. This situation will get considerably worse as the strategic allocation north of Tollerton is developed.*

*Any additional houses in Tollerton would add to the delays. Please see the TASCforce consultation submission for further details of traffic matters arising.*

- *There is already too much traffic through Tollerton village. Tollerton Lane has a dangerous s-bend and is not designed for this level of traffic. School parking is a problem and safety is a real concern. Any additional houses in Tollerton would further increase the level of traffic and exacerbate the problems. Indeed, in the Local Plan Part 1: Rushcliffe Core Strategy, Inspector's Report (December 2014), the Inspector said "I recognise the deep concern about any increase in traffic on Tollerton Lane, as it is narrow with bends and undulations which limit forward visibility. It gives access to the local school for pedestrians and motor vehicles and is already badly congested in the peak hour."*
- *Significant numbers of additional houses would require another access out of the village and traffic to and from them should not be channelled down Tollerton Lane and residential roads.*
- *Within the next month or two, the volume of traffic in Tollerton is expected to increase significantly as the new hospital at the airport site opens. This hospital has 300 parking places. Over 120 employees, many contractors, in-patients and visitors, and day-patients will all travel to the hospital by car, since there is no public transport provision in that part of Tollerton. The impact of all this additional traffic is not understood and expected to cause considerable problems in the village. Adding more houses would exacerbate the traffic problems.*
- *Already residents living on Tollerton Lane find it very difficult to exit their drives at busy times. The lane is regularly grid-locked in the vicinity of the school.*
- *There is no provision for safe cycling in the area.*
- *There are no options in the area for non-road-based transport as there are no trains or trams in Tollerton. There has been a failure to provide footpaths, cycle paths and public transport for existing residents.*
- *Tollerton Primary School is already over-subscribed and class sizes exceed 30. This means that there would be insufficient school places in Tollerton for even a very small number of additional houses.*
- *There is already a shortage of secondary school places in this part of the borough.*

#### **TOL1 – Land at Burnside Grove**

*We do not support development on this site for the following reasons:*

- *This open countryside contributes to the rurality of Tollerton and, due to the slope of the land, any development would be visible over quite a distance to the north.*
- *TOL1 should remain in the Green Belt. It is contained within Zone 5.1 in the 2013 Green Belt Review which stated that Zone 5.1 "should ideally remain as Green Belt".*
- *The boundary to the north is not a defensible boundary since it is a weak hedgerow. It is important to have a defensible boundary to prevent future merging of Tollerton with Edwalton or with the new strategic allocation to the north.*
- *It appears that it would be difficult to access this site without demolishing existing houses.*
- *The number of houses proposed for this site is excessive due to the undulations in that area.*
- *Additional houses at this site would be likely to significantly increase traffic in the centre of the village and around the school.*

## *TOL2 – West of Tollerton Lane and North of Medina Drive*

*We do not support development on this site for the following reasons:*

- *This site has higher Green Belt scores than any other of the additional key settlement sites or other villages sites. TOL2 is contained within Zone 5.1 in the 2013 Green Belt Review which stated that Zone 5.1 “should ideally remain as Green Belt”.*
- *Development on this site would reduce the distance between Tollerton village and the new settlement to be built in the Strategic Allocation just north of this site, causing the two to almost merge contrary to the Inspector’s recommendations.*
- *This is valuable open countryside that is an important characteristic of Tollerton old village.*
- *The land on this site rises such that it is visible from a significant distance away.*
- *Tollerton old village has a rich history and the setting and special character of this part of Tollerton would be spoilt by development on TOL2. In the immediate vicinity, in the old village, are Tollerton Hall and 6 listed buildings including the Church (with current foundations dating back to the 12<sup>th</sup> century), the Old Rectory (rebuilt between 1697 and 1702) and Bassingfield House, and 8 local interest buildings. The northern lodge (1824) to the Hall is on Cotgrave Lane, and the edge of the built village includes North End Cottages, built between 1833 and 1847 by Pendock Barry Barry, the then squire of the village, as accommodation for villagers with a further building used as a school. Those buildings retain distinctive features of the estate design at that time and an architectural coherence on the edge of the village. The history of Tollerton is an important focus of the Tollerton community, which has a thriving History Group.*
- *Evidence (Pendock map, Throsby’s drawing, Potter’s nineteenth century plan and field names and the current position of rights of way) all strongly suggest that the Tollerton mill, certainly from 1683 and possibly from the twelfth century was sited in TOL2 on the slope of the hill on which Jubilee Wood now stands. The site is at or close to National Grid Reference SK 6125 3504. There are few identifiable mediaeval or early modern archaeological sites in Tollerton, so this monument is clearly of considerable importance to the village. Mill sites, close to mediaeval communities, but not now built over are rare. Together with the fact of its final burning, its remains should be identifiable by geophysical examination and would certainly merit archaeological excavation. An application has been made to have this included in the Historic Environment Record.*
- *The older parts of the village (adjacent to TOL2) retain the church, the village war memorial and social activities in the parish rooms including parent and toddler groups, which are used by all the village. The site of the village pinfold has recently been marked by a rebuilding. Tollerton has its own unique identity which would be lost if development went ahead on TOL2.*
- *As the Inspector recommended as recently as December 2014, TOL2 should not be removed from the Green Belt. Much of the western boundary and part of the eastern boundary consist of weak hedgerows, which would not form defensible Green Belt boundaries.*
- *The southern part of TOL2 provides a visual gap between the old village and the new village. Development of this part of TOL2 would spoil the setting of the old village by merging it with the newer part of Tollerton village.*
- *There is a possibility that development on this site could cause flooding issues in Tollerton old village, given the proximity of the flood plain to the east of the*

*old village. This would need investigation.*

- *TOL2 is next to the old village which is very poorly served by public transport. Buses are unreliable and run no more than once an hour, with the latest bus leaving Tollerton before 5.30pm and with no buses on Sundays.*
- *There is no provision for safe cycling from TOL2 and pavements from the old village to the new village are very poor in places. There are no pavements going north from TOL2 to Gamston.*
- *There are no shops and very few facilities or services in the old village.*
- *TOL2 is in close proximity to Jubilee Wood which is home to a variety of wildlife, including bats, and it would not be appropriate to build on this site since this would jeopardise an island of natural habitat of which there are very few so close to the city.*
- *TOL2 contains part of a footpath giving access to countryside walking and such access should not be lost.*

*In the Rushcliffe Core Strategy, Inspector's Report (December 2014), the Inspector stated: "I have concerns about the potential effects of bringing development closer to Tollerton", "With provision for 4,000 new homes altogether up to 2034, I see no need for safeguarding additional land and removing it from the Green Belt in this part of the Borough". So development on TOL2 would not be consistent with the Inspector's views.*

#### *TOL3 – Land east of Tollerton Lane*

*We do not support development on this site for the following reasons:*

- *Open countryside is an important characteristic of Tollerton as a rural village. Building on this site would remove the extensive views of open countryside from a relatively long stretch of Tollerton Lane for the gain of relatively few houses.*
- *The fields to the east of this site are visible over a wide area in several directions.*
- *This site does not have defensible boundaries and so should not be removed from the Green Belt.*
- *It would be difficult and would be out of character with existing building to build houses other than as a single row. This reduces the number of houses possible.*
- *Part of this site is owned by a landowner who has not been consulted as to whether he wants development on his land. If not, the land available for housing reduces further.*
- *Part of this site is required to remain as an access to the field to the east of the site. This reduces the land available for housing.*
- *This site contains part of a footpath giving walking access to the countryside and such access should not be lost.*
- *Whilst we do not support housing development on TOL3, if any such development was to go ahead, it should be a single row of affordable eco-homes, in keeping with neighbouring properties.*

## Other issues

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

1. Residents have been misled regarding process and consultation.

EX41 –Local Plan Part 1: Rushcliffe Core Strategy, Schedule of Proposed Modifications (Version 2) to the Publication Rushcliffe Core Strategy, February 2014, Policy 3.3.1.3.6 stated that “The strategic review recommends where a more detailed review of the Green Belt should be undertaken. A more detailed review has been produced around the main built up area of Nottingham within Rushcliffe. A more detailed review around other settlements, in accordance with the approach identified in parts 3 to 6 of Policy 3, will take place in support of the Local Plan Part 2 (Land and Planning Policies).”

Thus we were told that the more detailed review would be around OTHER settlements and we responded to consultations under the assumption that the Green Belt status of settlements that had already been reviewed would not be reviewed again for Part 2. To now review the same area (Zone 5.1 of the 2013 Green Belt Review) a second time is inappropriate since this is not consistent with the approach that Rushcliffe Borough Council said would be taken. Thus residents were misled at previous consultations, namely for Local Plan Part 1 (2013/14) and Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies (January 2016).

Under the approach that Rushcliffe Borough Council laid out, which was a basis for the process that was the subject of consultation, sites within zones reviewed in the 2013 Green Belt Review which were not removed from the Green Belt as a result of that review should not now be considered for new housing within Part 2.

2. The approach and consultation treatment of sites is inconsistent.

The piecemeal fashion in which sites have been put forward for consultation has resulted in residents not being properly consulted on certain sites and has also resulted in inconsistencies. The consultation documents for the Local Plan Part 2 (January 2016) requested responses for particular sites for new housing on the edge of the key settlements of East Leake, Keyworth, Radcliffe on Trent and Ruddington in relation to the need for 1,100 new homes. The responses, and decisions as to whether to respond, were based on this number and not on the new figure of 2,000 new homes. Given that the figure has now increased, it is inconsistent not to consult on reviews of all these sites again (both for housing development and Green Belt status) while consulting on Zone 5.1 for a second time.

3. Safeguarded sites have not all been re-considered in Part 2.

It is inconsistent that Zone 5.1 which remained in the Green Belt following the 2013 Green Belt Review has been put forward as an option for development in Local Plan Part 2 (Further Options) (February 2017) whereas Edwalton Golf Course which was designated as safeguarded land, removed from the Green Belt for development in the future (to “aid the ‘permanence’ of the Green Belt, and prevent the need for further early review of its boundaries” (EX41)) has not been considered in Part 2 (Further Options). We are aware that the 10 year management contract with Glendale Managed Services Limited was extended until 30 November 2017. It should be possible to build on this site within 5 years, even if a buyout is required in relation to any further extension.

*In relation to this safeguarded land, EX41 stated: “While the land is not required for development at the present time, should this situation change it may be brought forward through a future review of the Local Plan”.*

*Alternative golfing provision could be provided in the Green Belt, since golf courses are an acceptable Green Belt development*

*4. Identification of additional settlements did not take proper account of the Tribal Study.*

*Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies, Identification of Additional Settlements Background Paper (February 2017) “examines the sustainability of the other villages beyond those key settlements that are part of the settlement hierarchy contained within the Core Strategy. It seeks to identify those villages where additional houses could be accommodated. This is based on: the conclusions of the Greater Nottingham Accessibility Study (2010) and the Greater Nottingham Sustainable Locations for Growth Study (2010); and a further assessment of existing community services and facilities as at 2017.”*

*In terms of identifying further sites for additional houses, paragraphs 49 and 50 are flawed in that they state that “The Tribal Study concludes that overall, Tollerton potentially is suitable for low-medium levels of growth ...”.*

*However, these Tribal Study conclusions do not relate to the areas of Tollerton being considered in Part 2. Rather, they relate to the larger area RM01 considered in the 2010 Tribal Study. Furthermore, that Tribal Study stated that the “potential direction of growth” was “Northeast”. Whilst the maps in that study are poor, this might relate to the area of the strategic allocation North of Tollerton. It certainly does not relate to the areas of Tollerton considered in Part 2 since the Tribal Study goes on to state “Avoid northwest, west, southeast and south”.*

*This conclusion of the Tribal Study was understood in the 2013 Green Belt Review which stated “None of this zone identified as potentially suitable for development by Tribal Study” in relation to Zone 5.1 of that review which contains sites TOL1 and TOL2. Therefore it was wrong and misleading to make mention of the Tribal Study conclusions “suitable for low-medium levels of growth” when the areas of Tollerton to be considered for additional housing were not those being referred to by that part of the Tribal Study.*

*The Identification of Additional Settlements Background Paper (February 2017) should have ruled out Tollerton.*

*5. Councillor Debbie Mason misled Tollerton residents during the Local Plan (Part 1) process.*

*Before the Public Inquiry, Cllr Mason (December 2013) told Tollerton residents that it was important for the strategic allocation north of Tollerton to be approved as part of the Local Plan because this would provide “a defence against uncontrolled and unwanted applications around the edges of Tollerton” and that then “the rest of Tollerton is protected”. It seems now that the strategic allocation has been approved and yet the rest of Tollerton is not protected. Cllr Mason’s comments can now be seen as misleading and may have affected how/whether residents responded to the “Matters, Issues and Questions” for the Examination.*

*6. The total housing requirement is 13,150 and sites are now being identified for 1,100 of these houses around Key Settlements plus an additional 899 houses around Key Settlements and elsewhere. There are 98 different sites being considered and these sites could, in theory, accommodate 12,186 new houses. Given that the total housing requirement for Rushcliffe is 13,150 and Tollerton is a settlement of just 850 households and has already been allocated 4000 new houses, it would be unjust to allocate any further houses in Tollerton, especially given the*

availability of sites in and around other settlements.

7. Given the high Green Belt scores in Tollerton and lower scores for sites in other settlements, the number of alternative sites available mean that exceptional circumstances are very unlikely to exist to justify removal of the Tollerton sites from the Green Belt for development.

8. The proposed sites in Tollerton should not be removed from the Green Belt (please see the TABU response to the Green Belt Review 2017):

- The proximity of TOL1 and TOL2 to the approved strategic allocation North of Tollerton makes these sites non-starters for development due to coalescence with that allocation.
- The relatively small number of houses that could be sensibly accommodated on TOL3 for loss of a relatively long area of extensive views of important open countryside makes TOL3 unsuitable for development.
- The open countryside north of Burnside Grove contributes to the rurality of Tollerton and, due to the slope of the land, any development would be visible over quite a distance to the north. Therefore this part of the Green Belt must be retained to prevent unrestricted and conspicuous sprawl.

9. Some SHLAA sites are located beyond the built-up area of the settlement within the Nottingham and Derby Green Belt, in a location where the Core Strategy identifies that growth will be to satisfy local need and this need will be primarily met through infill and rural exception development. The supporting text to policy 3 of the Core strategy states that where small-scale allocations are appropriate to provide further for local needs, these will be included in Local Plan Part 2. It is not clear why some such SHLAA sites (e.g. site ref. 637) are now being considered for additional housing and others (e.g. in Bunny) are not. Bunny has a half hourly bus service, whereas the local bus service near site ref 637 is only hourly and does not run during evenings and Sundays. Like Bunny, Tollerton has no doctor's surgery. Site 637 (near Little Lane) is 25 minutes' walk from a post office. The Identification of Additional Settlements Background Paper (February 2017) states that Tollerton has a primary school, but fails to take into account that it does not have any spare capacity for additional pupils. The Identification of Additional Settlements Background Paper (February 2017) does not give reasoned justification for identifying Tollerton as suitable for further housing, but not Bunny. The reasoning in this paper should be re-examined.

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.

## Response Form

Your Details		Agent details (where applicable)
<p><b>Tollerton Against Backdoor Urbanisation (TABU):</b>  <b>TABU is a campaign group working to preserve the rural nature of Tollerton as a village.</b>  <b>TABU represents a large membership of Tollerton people.</b>  <b>This document is submitted on their behalf.</b></p>	<b>Name</b>	
<p><b>Secretary: Hazel Salisbury</b>  <b>165 Tollerton Lane</b>  <b>Tollerton</b>  <b>Nottingham</b></p>	<b>Address</b>	
<b>T</b>	<b>E-mail</b>	

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

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

**TOL1 has been assessed as having a Green Belt score of 21, indicating high importance to the Green Belt. Indeed, this is the highest score of all land considered in the January 2016 and February 2017 Green Belt Reviews. We agree with this assessment other than that the score for "Preserve setting and special character of historic settlement" should be 5, not 4:**

**Evidence (Pendock map, Throsby's drawing, Potter's nineteenth century plan and field names and the current position of rights of way) all strongly suggest that the Tollerton mill, certainly from 1683 and possibly from the twelfth century was sited in TOL1 on the slope of the hill on which Jubilee Wood now stands. The site is at or close to National Grid Reference SK 6125 3504. There are few identifiable mediaeval or early modern archaeological sites in Tollerton, so this monument is clearly of considerable importance to the village. Mill sites, close to mediaeval communities, but not now built over are rare. Together with the fact of its final burning, its remains should be identifiable by geophysical examination and would certainly merit archaeological excavation. An application has been made to have this included in the Historic Environment Record. This historical site was not taken into account in the Green Belt Review.**

**Certainly, the Green Belt score for "Preserve setting and special character of historic settlement" for TOL1 should be no lower than that for RUD12 (which is 5) since Tollerton Hall, like Easthorpe House, is a Grade II listed building for which the surrounding land forms the setting. Whereas RUD12 has only Easthorpe House in the vicinity, TOL1 has a further 6 listed buildings in close vicinity as well as 8 local interest buildings.**

**TOL2 has been assessed as having a Green Belt score of 18. Out of all sites considered in the January 2016 and February 2017 Green Belt Reviews, only TOL1 has a higher Green Belt score. We agree that this land is**

important to the Green Belt. However, the score for “Prevent merging of settlements” should be 5, not 4, since the site is very close to the new strategic allocations and the northern boundary of the site is neither robust nor defensible.

In addition to being part of an area of arable farmland landscape, the northern end of TOL3 is in close proximity to a wooded area called “The Decoy”, which lies adjacent and to the west of Tollerton Wood. These features are both natural habitats and mark historical boundaries in relation to the Tollerton Estate which contains Tollerton Hall (as documented on the 1928 map from the sale particulars of Tollerton Estate, as well as in much earlier maps). It is important to protect the setting of this natural habitat from development on TOL3. This has not been taken into account in the scoring of “Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment”, suggesting that this score should be increased from 3 to 4 for TOL3. These features also need to be taken into account in the score for “Preserve setting and special character of historic settlement”.

The gap between TOL3 and the historic core of Tollerton, including St Peter’s Church (with current foundations dating back to the 12<sup>th</sup> century), the Old Rectory (approx. 1700) and Tollerton Hall and the lake, is important to preserve the setting and character of that historic core. Therefore it is important to prevent development that causes the older and newer parts of Tollerton to merge. The score for “Preserve setting and special character of historic settlement” should be increased from 1 to 5, particularly in light of the fact that TOL3 has no defensible boundary to the north. This would be consistent with the equivalent score for RUD12 which is adjacent to Easthorpe House and which, like Tollerton Hall, is a Grade II listed building for which the surrounding land forms the setting.

The current boundary of TOL4 prevents urban sprawl due to the topography of the site. Therefore the score for “Check unrestricted sprawl of settlements” should be 4, not 3.

Paragraph 85 of the NPPF states that when defining boundaries, local planning authorities should “define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent”.

- TOL1 has weak hedgerows to the southern and eastern boundaries. Only half of the western boundary is robust.
- TOL2 has weak hedgerows to the north and west.
- TOL3 has no physical feature for its external southeast boundary and has a weak post and wire fence for its northern boundary.
- TOL4 has weak hedgerow as its external boundary to the north-west.

So none of these sites have boundaries that are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. Replacing Tollerton Lane as a boundary with weak hedgerows or no recognisable physical features is not consistent with paragraph 85 of the NPPF.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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

1. Within our 2014 consultation response and at the Core Strategy Examination, TABU objected to the piecemeal review of the Green Belt. This continues to cause problems and inconsistencies.

The Green Belt Review (February 2017) reviews sites TOL1, TOL2 and TOL4 which are all contained in Zone 5.1 which was reviewed in the Green Belt Review (2013). This zone is also within the area reviewed in the Green Belt Review (2006).

- In each case, the Green Belt has been divided into different sizes and shapes of land – this is not a consistent approach in terms of consideration of the relative importance of different parts of the Green Belt. Those sites that are reviewed more times are more likely to be removed from the Green Belt, especially if they are reviewed differently each time.
- The frequency of review of the same parcels of land is not consistent with paragraph 83 of the NPPF that states “authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period”. It is inconsistent with this to alter the Green Belt boundaries within Zone 5 of the Green Belt Review 2013 in December 2014 and then to review and possibly seek to alter them again in 2017.
- The 2013 Green Belt Review stated that Zone 5.1 “should ideally remain as Green Belt”. It would be perverse to remove land within that zone from the Green Belt so soon after deciding to retain it as Green Belt.

2. Residents have been misled regarding process and consultation.

The Rushcliffe Green Belt Review – Part 1 and 2a (November 2013) explained the process of review and which areas would be considered at each stage of the process. It stated that “More detailed changes around Key Settlements in or adjacent to the Green Belt (Bingham, Cotgrave, Keyworth, Ruddington and Radcliffe on Trent) and a review of possible minor adjustments around other villages inset from the Green Belt will take place at a later date in support of the second part of the Local Plan”. Similarly, Local Plan Part 1: Rushcliffe Core Strategy – Green Belt Background Paper (EX34, February 2014) stated that Part 2(b) “will focus upon other settlements with Rushcliffe”. So it was made very clear that Part 2(b) would focus on different areas from the 2013 Green Belt Review. Tollerton is being treated differently from other areas in that Zone 5.1 was reviewed in 2013 and it is being reviewed again in 2017 with a new consultation in the light of increased housing requirements. Other sites (e.g. those considered in 2016) are not being subjected to a second consultation in the light of these changes. We contend that sites previously consulted upon as a result of their inclusion in the 2013 Green Belt Review should not be consulted on again unless all previously reviewed sites (from 2013 and 2016 reviews) which still have available housing land are also consulted upon again.

3. In the Rushcliffe Core Strategy, Inspector’s Report (December 2014), the Inspector stated: “I have concerns about the potential effects of bringing development closer to Tollerton”, “With provision for 4,000 new homes altogether up to 2034, I see no need for safeguarding additional land and removing it from the Green Belt in this part of the Borough”. So removal of further Green Belt in Tollerton would not be consistent with the Inspector’s views.
4. The proposed sites in Tollerton should not be removed from the Green Belt:
  - The proximity of TOL1 and TOL2 to the approved strategic allocation North of Tollerton makes these sites non-starters for development due to coalescence with that allocation.
  - The relatively small number of houses that could be sensibly accommodated on TOL3 for loss of a relatively long area of extensive views of important open countryside makes TOL3 unsuitable for development.
  - The open countryside north of Burnside Grove contributes to the rurality of Tollerton and, due to the slope of the land, any development would be visible over quite a distance to the north. Therefore this part of the Green Belt must be retained to prevent unrestricted and conspicuous sprawl.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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

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

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

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

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