



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)
Field 6909 Consortium	Name	Mike Ibbott
c/o agent	Address	tp bennett LLP One America St London SE1 0NE
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



No

Don't know

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.

Click here to enter text.

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.

Click here to enter text.

(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)		✓
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.

I am concerned about the apparent discrepancies in the way the suitability of our client's site (RUD3 or RUD/C) has been assessed compared with some of those sites above that have been proposed for release from the Green Belt. These comments are based on the Cabinet report of 12 September 2017 and on *Part 2(b) of the Rushcliffe Green Belt Review – Detailed Review of the Nottingham-Derby Green Belt within Rushcliffe – Rural Towns and Villages*.

I note that RUD/C (RUD3) has a Green Belt Score [GBS] of 16 and sits within the Ruddington North area which has a Strategic Green Belt Score [SGBS] of 13.

One of the site's identified for release is RUD11 (or RUD/E). This has a higher GBS (17) and sits within the Ruddington NE area which has a SGBS of 16. This scoring reflects the site's high visibility from the south and west compared with RUD3. The owner has sought to justify the site's release by suggesting a lower GBS of just 7: this is based on a suggestion that "it has established built development on all sides" – which is plainly wrong (see aerial photo below).



In this context, the suggestion is the site would nevertheless be suitable for 10 custom or self-build houses: this is insufficient justification. There are apparently 92 people on the self-build register (which is not publically available). While it is acknowledged that such development is encouraged by Government policy, it would likely avoid any worthwhile contribution by way of planning obligations towards other services or affordable housing. There are no village services nearby. To release this site for just 10 units would be an inefficient use of land, contrary to the advice in the NPPF para 17 (8th bullet point).

RUD1 (RUD/A) also sits within the Ruddington North area which has SGBS of 13 and GBS of 11. The latter is based in part on a score of 2 for the checking unrestricted sprawl purpose: the commentary suggests the site borders the built-up area of Ruddington on two sides, which is something of an exaggeration, and the ditch and trees hardly form a strong defensive boundary in the open landscape (as indicated in the illustrating photograph in the Green Belt Review). The score of 3 for preventing merging of settlements also does not seem to reflect either the commentary or the SGBS of 5 on this issue.

RUD13 (RUD/M) has a SGBS of 17 (Ruddington SE) and a GBS of 14. The latter score reflects the separation of Ruddington from other settlements in that direction and serves to underplay the significance of the site for the setting of the Ruddington Conservation Area, it being “open countryside” and the fact that “Its removal would constitute a significant intrusion beyond the A60, which is a robust and strategic boundary.” Furthermore, the site would require the release of RUD/L (RUD6 and RUD14) without allocating them for housing. This does not appear to meet the relevant tests for a strong and robust GB boundary – it would effectively be an island in the GB – and would place the other sites under considerable development pressure in the future.

By contrast, RUD3 (RUD/C) adjoins the settlement by virtue of St Peter’s Junior School. The site has a capacity of some 70 dwellings, would be readily deliverable, and would make appropriate contribution to the community through planning obligations. It could also make an important contribution to meeting custom/self-build housing demands: it is of sufficient size to enable part of the site to be dedicated to such tenure while also allowing for appropriate provision of conventional housing (including affordable housing).

Education capacity: the *Housing Site Selection Interim Report* (September 2017) assesses the merits of various sites located close to existing built up areas which are potentially suitable for residential development (including those referred to above). The following comment is made in relation to school capacity locally:

There is limited capacity to accommodate additional development within Ruddington with current primary-aged school provision. It has been indicated that there is a

potential solution to accommodate additional development on the St Peters Junior School site.

The release of RUD3 may provide the opportunity for increasing the capacity of the St Peters Junior School site: a new vehicular access might be provided from the A60 (the existing access from Ashworth Avenue is not fit-for purpose), new playing fields provided to the north of the school and land released for housing alongside new school accommodation to the south, adjoining existing housing in Devon Drive.

(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

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 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.

Click here to enter text.

(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.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY RESPONSE ON RUD3

27 February 2018

1. We note that RBC continues to fall short of a five-year housing supply: it is now just 3.1 years.
2. We consider that the criteria for selecting additional proposed housing sites around Ruddington have not been applied consistently, particularly with respect to:
 - RUD11 (Ruddington NE [16]), RUD13 and RUD5 (Ruddington SE [17]) which all have higher Strategic Green Belt Scores than RUD3 (Ruddington North [13])
 - RUD11 [17] also has a higher site-specific Green Belt Score than RUD3 [16]
3. The allocation of RUD13 would not result in a strong and robust Green Belt boundary and would put extreme pressure on other sites in the conservation area that are not proposed to be allocated for housing.
4. We would reiterate the following positive attributes of RUD3 in considering additional housing sites:
 - immediately deliverable
 - capable of being accessed from A60 (refusal of an outline application in 2009 was only on Green Belt grounds, not highways)
 - capacity of approximately 70 dwellings
 - a proportion of the site would provide affordable housing in line with policy requirements
 - any such scheme would also contribute to other services in Ruddington
5. We specifically amend our representation to include an element of self/custom-build housing on this site.

MI/tpb