

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

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)
Rosamund Worrall	Name	Click here to enter text.
Historic England 2 nd Floor, Windsor House Cliftonville Northampton NN1 5BE	Address	Click here to enter text.
d.org.uk	E-mail	Click here to enter text.

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.

Yes, subject to consideration of impact on the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. The supporting Housing Site Options Heritage Assets Assessment paper is noted and welcomed.

(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.

Yes, subject to consideration of the retention of the sewage pumping station building (non-designated heritage asset) which is on the site, and incorporation of this into the wider scheme. This could be achieved via a site specific policy or set out clearly in any justification text if sites are being taken forward as a list of allocation sites within the Part 2 Plan.

(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.

Neither agree or disagree. The situation with development windows on these larger strategic sites is noted however.

(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.

It is acknowledged that Bingham will already be taking up some of the housing requirement through Core Strategy allocations.

(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.

Neither agree or disagree – Preferred sites should consider the impact on the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting and noting impact on Green Belt sensitivity.

(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 checked="" 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.

COT01 – There is the possibility for buried archaeology at this site. This, and any significance associated with any such finds, is not known at this stage and it is recommended that further evaluation be undertaken prior to taking this site forward for allocation in order to determine whether the site is capable of being developed or not, and/or what mitigation may be required. As such, it is not clear at this stage whether the preferred site as part of a Local Plan would meet the requirements of Paras 7, 17, 126 and 135 of the NPPF.

COT09, 10 and 11a – Neither agree or disagree - It is acknowledged that much of the ridge and furrow has been lost as a result of intensive arable farming. However, it is recommended that archaeological investigations/evaluation are required as part of any development proposal should the sited be taken forward for allocation.

(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

No

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

It is noted that these all have planning permission. Development proposals will need to consider impacts on views to and from Listed Buildings (e.g. EL02 GII Baptist Church and EL04/EL05 GI Church of St Mary and ensure that any key vistas are incorporated into the masterplan/layout for the site.

(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.

Neither agree or disagree – Preferred sites should consider the impact on the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting and noting impact on Green Belt sensitivity.

(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"/>

	Yes	No
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.

It is noted that the majority of ridge and furrow previously evident on Keyworth greenfield sites has been lost over time to intensive arable farming. Sites would need to demonstrate they meet the requirements of Para 135 of the NPPF and it is recommended that advice is sought from the local archaeological curator in respect of any particular criteria that may be required for individual sites.

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

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

Neither agree or disagree – Preferred sites should consider the impact on the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting and noting impact on Green Belt sensitivity.

(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"/>
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.

It is noted that the majority of ridge and furrow previously evident on Radcliffe on Trent greenfield sites has been lost over time to intensive arable farming. Sites would need to demonstrate they meet the requirements of Para 135 of the NPPF and it is recommended that advice is sought from the local archaeological curator in respect of any particular criteria that may be required for individual sites.

(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.

Neither agree or disagree – Preferred sites should consider the impact on the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting and noting impact on Green Belt sensitivity.

(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.

RUD05 – It is recommended that provisions be made within any specific site criteria and supporting text justification to ensure that any development proposal for the site considers the Conservation Area to the west and GII Listed Easthorpe House and associated listed buildings to the north, including any enhancement opportunities for views and/or mitigation measures that may be required.

RUD13 - It is recommended that provisions be made within any specific site criteria and supporting text justification to ensure that any development proposal for the site considers the Conservation Area to the west including any enhancement opportunities for views and/or mitigation measures that may be required.

(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.

Neither agree or disagree – Preferred sites should consider the impact on the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting and noting impact on Green Belt sensitivity.

(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

	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.

CB102 – If taken forward, development of the site could offer opportunity to better reveal and enhance the former Grantham Canal heritage asset and incorporate it into open space as part of green infrastructure as well as cultural heritage.

CB105 – The Part 2 Plan would need to demonstrate it meets the requirements of Para 135 of the NPPF and it is recommended that advice is sought from the local archaeological curator in respect of any particular criteria that may be required for this sites. There could be opportunity to better reveal and enhance understanding of this site through further investigations at any development stage.

(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

No

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

Neither agree or disagree – Preferred sites should consider the impact on the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting and noting impact on Green Belt sensitivity.

(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.

EBR8 – It is noted that the ridge and furrow previously evident has been lost to intensive arable farming. It is recommended that any site specific criteria encourages the design, layout and landscaping of any scheme to take into account views in and out of the Conservation Area to preserve its character and appearance.

EBR10 – It is noted that the ridge and furrow previously evident has been lost to intensive arable farming. It is recommended that any site specific criteria encourages the design, layout and landscaping of any scheme to take into account views in and out of the Conservation Area to preserve its character and appearance.

(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.

Neither agree or disagree – Preferred sites should consider the impact on the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting and noting impact on Green Belt sensitivity.

(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.

Yes, subject to consideration of the retention of the listed building on the site, and incorporation of this into the wider scheme. This could be achieved via a site specific policy or set out clearly in any justification text if sites are being taken forward as a list of allocation sites within the Part 2 Plan. This would offer opportunities for enhancing the heritage asset and forming a key element of any site entrance.

(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.

Neither agree or disagree – Preferred sites should consider the impact on the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting and noting impact on Green Belt sensitivity.

(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.

Neither agree or disagree – Preferred sites should consider the impact on the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting and noting impact on Green Belt sensitivity. It is noted that the site already has planning permission for 95 dwellings.

(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.*

Historic England would be happy to discuss any queries arising as a result of this consultation in order to assist the Borough Council with the progress of the Part 2 Local Plan. As set out at the start of the consultation response, the heritage assessment information is welcomed and, notwithstanding our comments on some of the sites, it is evident that the Council is taking a positive approach to the historic environment as part of the plan process.

(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.