



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

Bridge S 1092790
agent Planning
Design Group
776369

Response Form

Please return by **5pm on Monday 27 November 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)
Mr S Bridge	Name	Bob Woollard Planning and Design Group
Willowbrook Farm Radcliffe Road Nottingham	Address	Pure Offices, Lake View Drive, Sherwood Business Park, NG15 0DT
Click here to enter text.	E-mail	

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?

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

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

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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?

Yes

No

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.

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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?

Yes

No

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

The existing strategic allocations adjoin the MBA have been slow to deliver, in part due to the necessary upfront infrastructure works associated with mitigating the impact of large scale development next to a congested urban area. Allocating more

housing numbers adjoining the MBA will only bring more risk to the plan and uncertainty over timescales. Furthermore, the issue of urban sprawl will be a serious concern given the scale of the existing allocations with will also put extra pressure on local services and facilities whilst adequate infrastructure is put in place where it is feasible, an approach that is not considered sustainable. It is clear that the main urban allocations have already been fully explored through the examination and Local Plan process and it was concluded that the allocations and urban area are at development capacity and would represent unsustainable development if further development is directed to the MBA. As such we strongly agree that the Council should direct growth additional growth to sustainable settlements lower down the settlement hierarchy and locations where development would be capable of delivering sustainable development in accordance with Core Strategy and the NPPF.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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?*

Yes



No

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

Bingham is the subject of a large strategic allocation to the north of the settlement which will provide around 1000 additional dwellings alongside employment development. It is understood that a national volume housebuilder has committed to the delivery of the housing element of the extension, but there is no current commitment to the delivery of the employment elements. While the housing delivery will make appropriate contributions to local infrastructure, the delivery of the supportive infrastructure is likely to take some time and there will undoubtedly be some additional burden on highway, educational and healthcare facilities. It is further noted that Bingham has been the subject of significant growth and housing development of the past 2 decades, in part, due to its position just beyond the Nottingham Green Belt, which development has 'leapfrogged' to to the restrictions on 'inappropriate development. To this extent, Bingham has been the subject of heightened development pressure which risks its ability to support its community as a sustainable settlement. Bingham is effectively a very large village, that is comparatively isolated, requiring travel to higher order centres to access main retail,

service and employment facilities. Further development of any significant scale would undermine the Spatial Strategy and risks being unsustainable

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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?

Yes

No

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

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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

	Yes	No
Site COT01 – Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park (estimated capacity around 170 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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.

[Click here to enter text.](#)

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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?

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

[Click here to enter text.](#)

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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?

Yes

No

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

[Click here to enter text.](#)

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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

	Yes	No
Site KEY4a – Land off Nicker Hill (1) (estimated capacity around 150 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site KEY8 – Land between Platt Lane and Station Road (estimated capacity around 190 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site KEY10 – Land south of Debdale Lane (1) (estimated capacity around 190 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site KEY13 – Hillside Farm (estimated capacity around 50 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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.

[Click here to enter text.](#)

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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?

Yes

No

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

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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

	Yes	No
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site RAD02 – Land adjacent Grooms Cottage (estimated capacity around 50 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site RAD03 – Land off Shelford Road (estimated capacity around 400 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site RAD05a – Land north of Grantham Road to south of railway line (1a) (estimated capacity around 140 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Yes	No
Site RAD06 – 72 Main Road (estimated capacity around 5 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site RAD13 – The Paddock, Nottingham Road (estimated capacity around 75 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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.

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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?

Yes

No

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

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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

	Yes	No
Site RUD01 – Land to the west of Wilford Road (south) (estimated capacity around 180 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site RUD05 – Land south of Flawforth Lane (estimated capacity around 50 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site RUD11 – Old Loughborough Road (estimated capacity around 10 self and custom-build homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site RUD13 – Land opposite Mere Way (estimated capacity around 170 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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.

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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?

Yes

No

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

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Question 15: Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following sites at Cropwell Bishop.

	Yes	No
Site CBI02 – Land north of Memorial Hall(1) (estimated capacity around 90 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site CBI05 – Land east of Church Street (estimated capacity around 70 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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.

[Click here to enter text.](#)

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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?

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

[Click here to enter text.](#)

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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

	Yes	No
Site EBR06 – Closes Side Lane (west) (estimated capacity around 20 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site EBR07 – Closes Side Lane (east) (estimated capacity around 20 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane (estimated capacity around 15 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site EBR10 – Land south of Butt Lane (estimated capacity around 45 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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.

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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?

Yes

No

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

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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

	Yes	No
Site GOT5a – Land east of Gypsum Way/The Orchards (1) (estimated capacity around 100 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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.

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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?

Yes

No

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.

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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?

Yes

No

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

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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.

This prominent site is well known to the Council sitting adjacent to the A52 (Radcliffe Road) one of the main arterial roads through the Borough. It warrants a positive planning approach to avoid further dereliction. The land owner has recently repeated to Officers of Rushcliffe Borough Council a willingness to work with them to achieve a solution acceptable to all. At a meeting with senior Officers the landowner confirmed he would be willing to restrict development to 7-8 dwellings, a similar scale to the houses located along Radcliffe Road close to the junction with Bassingfield Lane. The scheme is significantly less than the potential of a 1.2 Ha site of 20+ houses. This willingness has also been demonstrated over time when the Abbey Park development in West Bridgford brought housing right up to the boundary of the owners pig farm, the original site of the Willowbrook Farm activity when it was located in the area now known as Gamston. This residential encroachment resulted in environmental issues which were overcome by the transfer of activities to Willowbrook Farm.

For over 40 years Willowbrook Farm operated as an intensive pig farm, housing around 3000 pigs with attendant vehicle movements involving the removal of slurry, import of food and relocation of animals. In addition the site operated as a licensed HGV operating centre for up to 16 HGVs (articulated tankers) involved in the distribution and supply of foodstuffs. In recent years much of the operation has relocated and the site is surplus to the business operation. These traffic movements included turning right out of the site across the busy A52 dual

carriageway, often stopping in the central reservation area with trailers overhanging the central refuge.

Today the site (See accompanying photos) comprises a house and a number of sheds, agro-industrial buildings, and silos. These buildings excluding the water tanks have an area of 2,651 sq m. Hard paving accounts for a further 2,395 sq m. Willowbrook Farm is now in serious decline, both in appearance and economically. The site's prominent location on the 'gateway' to Rushcliffe / Nottingham means its continuing deterioration detracts from the attractiveness of the area. The buildings are old and in disrepair and without the investment to maintain them they will continue to diminish the sites visual and environmental value.

A positive approach to the site allowing a limited residential scheme would offer benefits including:

1. Removing what could become one of the most unsafe highway crossings in the Borough
2. Creating a more attractive environment thus avoiding a prominent gateway site becoming more derelict.
3. Providing a high quality low density individual design not achieved by the mass house builders.
4. Providing a unique low density residential scheme which could help to persuade some occupiers to downsize.
5. Reducing the existing floorspace on site by over 50%
6. Reducing the current hard paving on site by circa 45%
7. Creating a scheme that sits comfortably and gently in the environment
8. Helping to meet the Councils Housing target.
9. Creating a positive contribution to the openness of the area.

Its location within the Green Belt is the only constraint to early development and deliverability of a scheme to meet Council targets.

A highway solution has been agreed with Highways England for limited development of 7 – 8 houses. An alternative scheme could be 5 or 6 houses and 2 or 3 live / work units helping towards meeting employment floorspace requirements.

The site is not isolated being within walking distance of Gamston centre. A bus stop served by the Trent Barton Rushcliffe Main Line Nottingham to Bingham service (every 10 minutes Monday – Saturday) is located within 600m of the site is accessible by walking or cycling. The site is very well connected to the local road network with Nottingham, Gamston, Radcliffe-on-Trent and Bingham all easily accessed off the A52.

Whilst the site is identified as within flood zone 2 and 3 on the Environment Agency flood maps, a review of the SFRA shows the site is not at risk of flooding except for a very small area in the north west corner which is shown as a 1 in 1000 annual chance flood outline (see appendix 2). The site does not comprise of any listed or locally listed buildings, nor would the development effect any setting of a heritage asset. The site is not within a Conservation Area.

In terms of impact upon the local road network the agricultural use of the site was intensive with numerous slow moving vehicles accessing the site. It is considered the existing access would provide a safe and adequate ingress into the site and the proposed number of vehicles generated by the development would not have a

detrimental impact on the road network. In our view this would be a significant improvement to highway safety, removing a safety hazard and reducing potential traffic movements to and from the site.

Whilst we acknowledge the site is not defined as 'Previously Developed', by the NPPFs rather narrow definition, any realistic view would accept that the site is brownfield in nature and character.

Given the nature of the site, any contribution that it might make to the openness of the Green Belt has already been removed, with the majority of the site comprising of sheds and outbuildings. There is an increasing need to find an effective and viable long term use for the site as acknowledged by RBC. While the development of the site would be notionally inappropriate given its 'agricultural' history, it is certainly not a greenfield site, and it would be entirely possible to develop the site in a way that reduces built form within the site in its spread and extent. As such, its redevelopment offers an opportunity to have a positive benefit on the openness of the Green Belt. Notably, paragraph 81 of the NPPF encourages local planning authorities to 'plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities.....to improve damaged and derelict land'. To this extent, Green Belt policy should be an enabling policy, and it is not sufficient to allow a site such as this to succumb to its own fate.

We do not believe the proposal is contrary to policy as recent reforms to the planning system ensure that it supports the delivery of housing, including homes on previously developed land. The NPPF makes clear planning should encourage the effective re-use of land and support sustainable housing to deliver a sufficient amount of housing to meet local needs. The February 2017 Housing White Paper expressly identifies that the Government is changing the NPPF to allow 'development on brownfield land in the Green Belt.....where it contributes to the delivery of starter homes and there is no substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.'

The Council are seeking to allocate a significant number of sites to deliver at least 1,100 dwellings plus an identified shortfall from the strategic allocations in the Local Plan Part 1, and it is incumbent on the Council to seriously consider all opportunities to re-use degraded land.

We trust the above gives sufficient grounds to look at this site with a degree of flexibility to enable a solution to be delivered for all. The Part 2 Local Plan offers the only realistic opportunity to recognise the 'exceptional circumstances' that relate to this site, with its allocation as a modest housing / employment site being the opportunity to 'improve damaged and derelict land' specifically encouraged by the NPPF. It would also recognise the 'fall back' position that would allow the conversion of the existing agricultural buildings to a residential use. Green Belt protection could be retained across the site, preventing further development, with the wording of policy specifying the nature and form of acceptable development. We would be happy to discuss the precise wording of an allocation policy with officers in order to ensure that development has a positive impact on this degraded site and the wider Green Belt.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Please return by **5pm on Monday 27 November 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 plan making process and may be in use for the lifetime of the Local Plan and associated processes in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. 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. By sending the Council your details you will automatically be informed of future consultations on planning policy documents unless you indicate otherwise.