

Online response

Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies – Preferred Housing Sites

Respondent no: **1143249**

Respondent		Agent details (where applicable)
Mr Robert Galij	Name	
Barratt Homes	Organisation	
1143249	ID number	

Housing Development

Housing Land Supply

Question 1: Do you agree with the Council's proposal that Local Plan Part 2 should identify enough land for around 2,550 new homes?

Answer

Yes

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

This figure should be treated as a 'minimum' new level of housing provision with all efforts made to ensure delivery during the period covered by the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2 (2011 - 2028).

Housing Sites within the Main Urban Area

Question 2: Do you agree with the Council's proposed allocation of the Abbey Road Depot (site WB01) for the development of around 50 new homes?

Answer

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

You may like to give your views on what development should look like, in terms of the design, mix and layout of new housing and other uses (for example, open space) on site.

Housing Sites adjacent to the Main Urban Area

Question 3: Do you agree with the Council's proposal that no sites adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham (within Rushcliffe) should be allocated for housing development through Local Plan Part 2?

Answer

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

Housing Development at the 'Key Settlements'

Bingham

Question 4: Do you agree with the Council's proposal that no sites adjacent to Bingham should be allocated for housing development through Local Plan Part 2?

Answer

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

Cotgrave

Question 5: Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for housing development at Cotgrave for around 350 homes in total?

Answer

No

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

Additional provision should be made for housing in Cotgrave given its preeminent position as a "key settlement" - reflecting its size, and provision of facilities and services - and for the purposes of regeneration. The latter has, of course, commenced with the redevelopment of the former Cotgrave Colliery which should be capitalised upon further through additional housing with its wider economic, social and environmental benefits for the settlement as a whole. Against the above, a minimum of 700 dwellings should be provided in Cotgrave through the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2.

Question 6: Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following sites at Cotgrave:

	Answer
Site COT01 – Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park (estimated capacity around 170 homes)	Yes
Sites COT09 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (1); COT10 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (2); and COT11a – Land south of Hollygate Lane (3a) (estimated capacity around 180 homes)	Yes

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

For each of the proposed housing sites, you may like to give your views on what development should look like, in terms of the design, mix and layout of new housing and other uses (for example, open space) on site.

Site COT1 - Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park : The proposed allocation of this site for housing is endorsed. It is well contained and represents a sustainable location. The site is both suitable and available for development as well as being developable and deliverable within the next five years of the remaining period covered by the Local Plan Part 2 (up to 2028). A comprehensive approach can be adopted towards site development and implementation via Masterplanning with a focus on residential development and associated recreational uses, both formal and informal, on site. Access/Egress can be achieved directly from Hollygate Lane with due regard being given to adjoining land uses through design and layout, alongside wider connectivity to/from existing and planned recreational provision in the vicinity and the town centre. The site also benefits from planned connectivity with the adjoining Hollygate Park Development (former Cotgrave Colliery) - which is currently under construction - and associated highway infrastructure on Hollygate Lane itself arising from the redevelopment of the former Cotgrave Colliery which has been undertaken. However, concern is expressed over the ..." (estimated capacity around 170 homes)"... given its size and the application of average densities per hectare pointing towards 350+ dwellings. Clarification is sought over the derivation of ..."around 170 homes"... which does not represent an efficient use of (greenfield) land at this location. Provision should be made for a minimum of 350 dwellings on COT1 accordingly.

Site COT11a - Land south of Hollygate Lane (3a) - The proposed allocation of this site for housing is endorsed. it is well defined and represents a sustainable location. The site benefits from planned infrastructure in the vicinity and enjoys wider connectivity to/from existing and planned recreational provision and the town centre. Due regard can be given to adjoining and surrounding land uses through the planning process (Design and Layout) in due course. The site is both suitable and available for development as well as being developable and deliverable within the remaining period covered by the Local Plan Part 2 (up to 2028). Its inclusion alongside Sites COT09 and COT10 is noted, as indeed is, the desire for all three sites (COT09, COT10 and COT11a) to be planned comprehensively and delivered accordingly. However, concern is expressed over the omission of Site Reference : COT11b south of Hollygate Lane which represents a logical extension of COT11a and its associated sustainability credentials highlighted above. Consideration should be given to identifying Site COT11b as a housing land allocation to meet the (higher) level of housing provision proposed in Cotgrave through Question 5 above ie increase from "around 350 homes" to 'a minimum 700 dwellings'.

East Leake

Question 7: Do you agree with our proposal that only sites EL01, EL02, EL04, EL05 and EL08 (as shown at Figure 4) should be allocated for housing development at East Leake?

Answer

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

Keyworth

Question 8: Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for housing development at Keyworth for around 580 homes in total?

Answer

Yes

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

This revised housing figure is welcomed and represents a 'minimum'. As such, it should be seen in the context of the need to significantly boost the supply of new housing - as advocated by The Framework (NPPF) - and to deliver additional housing sooner rather than later given the acknowledged delays in bringing forward the named Strategic Sites/Sustainable Urban Extensions in the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1, with the notable exceptions of Melton Road, Edwalton and the former Cotgrave Colliery, both of which are currently underway. Against the above, it is important to ensure a 'minimum' of 580 dwellings are actually delivered in Keyworth during the remaining period covered by the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2 (up to 2028). Very little new residential development has occurred since the base date of the Local Plan (2011) and it is vitally important to expedite the Local Plan process and ensure Housing Land Allocations deliver housing numbers swiftly ie within the next few years ! On this basis, a flexible approach ought to be applied through the definitive number of new houses materialising in Keyworth in the Local Plan period which will only become apparent when Planning Permissions are Granted and sites implemented in due course. For example, it may well be that 620 dwellings are completed against a policy base of (minimum) 580 dwellings.

Question 9: Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following sites at Keyworth.

Answer

	Answer
Site KEY4a – Land off Nicker Hill (1) (estimated capacity around 150 homes)	
Site KEY8 – Land between Platt Lane and Station Road (estimated capacity around 190 homes)	
Site KEY10 – Land south of Debdale Lane (1) (estimated capacity around 190 homes)	
Site KEY13 – Hillside Farm (estimated capacity around 50 homes)	Yes

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

For each of the proposed housing sites, you may like to give your views on what development should look like, in terms of the design, mix and layout of new housing and other uses (for example, open space) on site.

Site KEY13 - Hillside Farm, Keywoth : The proposed release of this site from the Statutory Green Belt and its identification as a proposed Housing Land Allocation are both welcomed. This particular site is suitable and available for development. It benefits from close proximity to the centre of Keywoth and is both developable and deliverable within the next five years. However, concern is expressed and clarification sought over two particular items : (1) Western Site Boundary; (2) Estimated Capacity; (1) Western Site Boundary : - It is unclear why the proposed Green Belt Boundary has been drawn around the Farmhouse and curtilage at Hill Side Farm in the north west corner rather than including the Farmhouse, its curtilage and associated Farm Yard and Barn, - all of which are recognisable on the ground; (2) Estimated Capacity : - It is unclear how ..."around 50 homes"... has been derived at this location given the size of the site and the application of average densities per hectare which point towards ...'around 90 dwellings'...; The latter not only represents an efficient use of (green field) land for residential development but would narrow the gap between the east and west of Keywoth (numerically) , where 340 dwellings and 240 dwellings are currently proposed respectively. A more efficient use of land generating additional numbers at Hillside Farm would 'tilt' the east - west balance of new housing as follows : 'around 340 homes' - in the east - and 'around 280 homes' - in the west - ALL in the context of a (policy) base of 'minimum' 580 dwellings.

Radcliffe on Trent

Question 10: Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for housing development at Radcliffe on Trent for around 820 homes in total?

Answer

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

Question 11: Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following sites at Radcliffe on Trent.

	Answer
Site RAD01 – Land north of Nottingham Road (estimated capacity around 150 homes), with employment development to the west of the powerlines that separate the site.	
Site RAD02 – Land adjacent Grooms Cottage (estimated capacity around 50 homes)	
Site RAD03 – Land off Shelford Road (estimated capacity around 400 homes)	
Site RAD05a – Land north of Grantham Road to south of railway line (1a) (estimated capacity around 140 homes)	
Site RAD06 – 72 Main Road (estimated capacity around 5 homes)	

	Answer
Site RAD13 – The Paddock, Nottingham Road (estimated capacity around 75 homes)	

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

For each of the proposed housing sites, you may like to give your views on what development should look like, in terms of the design, mix and layout of new housing and other uses (for example, open space) on site.

Ruddington

Question 12: Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for housing development at Ruddington for around 410 homes in total?

Answer	

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

Question 13: Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following sites at Ruddington.

	Answer
Site RUD01 – Land to the west of Wilford Road (south) (estimated capacity around 180 homes)	

	Answer
Site RUD05 – Land south of Flawforth Lane (estimated capacity around 50 homes)	
Site RUD11 – Old Loughborough Road (estimated capacity around 10 self and custom-build homes)	
Site RUD13 – Land opposite Mere Way (estimated capacity around 170 homes)	

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

For each of the proposed housing sites, you may like to give your views on what development should look like, in terms of the design, mix and layout of new housing and other uses (for example, open space) on site.

Housing Development at the 'Other Villages'

Cropwell Bishop

Question 14: Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for housing development at Cropwell Bishop for around 160 homes in total?

Answer

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

Question 15: Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of

the following sites at Cropwell Bishop.

	Answer
Site CBI02 – Land north of Memorial Hall(1) (estimated capacity around 90 homes)	
Site CBI05 – Land east of Church Street (estimated capacity around 70 homes)	

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

For both of the proposed housing sites, you may like to give your views on what development should look like, in terms of the design, mix and layout of new housing and other uses (for example, open space) on site.

East Bridgford

Question 16: Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for housing development at East Bridgford for around 100 homes in total?

Answer	
--------	--

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

Question 17: Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following sites at East Bridgford

	Answer
Site EBR06 – Closes Side Lane (west) (estimated capacity around 20 homes)	

	Answer
Site EBR07 – Closes Side Lane (east) (estimated capacity around 20 homes)	
Site EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane (estimated capacity around 15 homes)	
Site EBR10 – Land south of Butt Lane (estimated capacity around 45 homes)	

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

For each of the proposed housing sites, you may like to give your views on what development should look like, in terms of the design, mix and layout of new housing and other uses (for example, open space) on site.

Gotham

Question 18: Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for housing development at Gotham for around 100 homes in total?

Answer

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

Question 19: Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following site at Gotham:

	Answer
--	---------------

	Answer
Site GOT5a – Land east of Gypsum Way/The Orchards (1) (estimated capacity around 100 homes)	

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

You may like to give your views on what development should look like, in terms of the design, mix and layout of new housing and other uses (for example, open space) on site.

Bunny Brickworks

Question 20: Do you support the proposed allocation of the former Bunny Brickworks (site BUN01) for a mixed development of around 100 new homes and employment development?

Answer	

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

You may like to give your views on what development should look like, in terms of the design, mix and layout of new housing and other uses (for example, open space) on site.

Flintham – Former Islamic Institute

Question 21: Do you support the proposed allocation of the former Islamic Institute at Flintham for the development of up to 95 new homes?

Answer	

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

Consideration should be given to the designation of 'Safeguarding' of land to meet development needs in the future ie beyond the current end date of the Local plan Part 2 (2028). Such an approach is encouraged by The Framework (NPPF) in reviewing existing Green Belt Boundaries through Local Plans/Local Plan Reviews. The Borough Council has already (successfully) adopted such an approach through the Local Plan Part 1/Core Strategy on the edge of the West Bridgford/Edwalton Urban Area and, for consistency, should adopt a similar approach through the Local Plan Part 2. In the first instance, 'Safeguarded Land' should be assessed and designated in those 'Key Settlements' surrounded by Green Belt which are most likely to accommodate future housing growth over and above the West Bridgford/Edwalton Urban Area. Concern is expressed over the omission of 'Safeguarded Land' from the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2 and clarification sought over why it has been discounted.

Other Issues

Question 22: Please identify any matters related to housing development which are not covered here or elsewhere and which you wish to raise.