



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)
Mosaic Group	Name	Andrew Grayson, Planning and Deign Group (UK) Ltd
Click here to enter text.	Address	Pure Offices, Lake View Drive, Sherwood Buisness Park , Nottingham, 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.

We welcome the preferred approach to identify and allocate land for 2,550 dwellings through the Local Plan Part 2. This represents a 550 dwelling uplift from the previous iteration of the document in March 2017 and offers a response to the outstanding issue of delivery against the existing strategic allocations allocated in the Local Plan Part 1.

The preferred allocation option for the accommodation of 2,550 dwellings will begin to provide the necessary flexibility and contingency or 'buffer' in housing market choice. Providing a range of spatially preferable and sustainable housing allocations across Rushcliffe will help 'unlock' the simultaneous delivery of dwellings and therefore help boost supply. This is a pressing issue where delivery against strategic allocations continue to cause delays and do not come forward in the timescale envisaged.

In part, wider allocations will cover the anticipated housing delivery shortfall up to, and very likely beyond, 2019 from the sites such as land north of Bingham, land at former RAF Newton and land south of Clifton. These sites, given their scale and associated complexity are assumed to start on site in or around 2019. As such the preferred approach to allocate a wider distribution of housing sites is considered to be consistent with the principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') and should allow the Council to plan positively for the housing delivery.

Finally, a required boost in housing delivery is made more apparent in light of the latest five-year housing land supply calculation published in 2016. This identifies only a modest 3.43 years' worth of housing land supply when accounting for the necessary addition of a 20% buffer to address historic under delivery. A delivery shortfall of 351 dwellings was identified as of 2016, however there is an identified risk that by early 2019 the shortfall will likely have been extrapolated to 900 dwellings. Therefore, further necessitating a boost in housing delivery across a wider range of allocated sites.

(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.

We support the decision to not extend or make additional strategic allocations in or adjacent to the main built up area of Nottingham (within Rushcliffe). This approach would not only act to exaggerate the issues currently being faced with existing strategic housing sites. There is a clear alternative need to open up the range of site allocations in the in the interest of providing necessary market flexibility and contingency.

An existing heavy reliance on main built up area allocations is already established through Policy 3 *Spatial Strategy* of the adopted 2014 Local Plan Part 1. This policy, outlining the need to deliver a minimum of 13,150 homes by 2028, allocates 58% of the projected housing supply to just three strategic sites. Expanding any of the three existing strategic allocations, or making similar additional allocations, will not assist in the flexible delivery of housing and could bring about considerable risk to the Local Plan Part 2. This is because the current issues of uncertainty and complexity around strategic allocations will only continue.

Furthermore, the issue of 'urban sprawl' will likely become more of a concern where further strategic sites are allocated. Whereas the Council should be looking to direct growth across the settlement hierarchy where development can be delivered flexibly and sustainably in accordance the adopted spatial strategy of the Local Plan Part 1 and 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.

We support the preferred option that no further sites adjacent to Bingham should be allocated for housing. An allocation for 1,000 dwellings, through Policy 21 *Strategic Allocation at Land North of Bingham* in the Local Plan Part 1, is already in place. To make additional allocations would be locally disproportionate and could act to detract from the need to deliver the existing strategic allocation.

It is perhaps understandable that historic growth options have been considered positively in relation to Bingham given that the settlement is not within the Green Belt. However, the scope for site allocations is now correctly being broadened to include a wider range of settlements within Rushcliffe.

(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.

In principle we welcome the uplift in the number of homes allocated for on greenfield sites in Radcliffe on Trent, increasing from a minimum of 400 dwellings to an identified trajectory of 820 dwellings. This will act to enhance both the supply of sustainable housing land and subsequent delivery of dwellings, which is critical in the current context of significant housing under delivery. The Local Plan Part 1 identifies Radcliffe on Trent as a 'Key Settlement', therefore being a sequentially preferable and sustainable area to deliver housing growth. As such we agree that the Council has effectively sought to apply the adopted spatial strategy and utilise the settlement hierarchy to identifying additional housing locations.

However, it is clear that 820 dwellings should not be used as a cap to constrain the capacity of individual sites. Notably, the recent Appeal decision at Rempstone Lane, East Leake was clear that there is nothing in the Core Strategy Spatial Strategy that restricts housing number to key settlements. In the context of the current five year housing land supply and delayed delivery from strategic sites, there should be no artificial cap to delivery from identified sites in sustainable key settlements, subject to their physical and environmental capacity.

The land north of Nottingham Road, Radcliffe on Trent (identified as 'RAD01') is an excellent opportunity to provide up to 300 high quality dwellings in the settlement. This is in a location which is well related both spatially and functionally to the existing settlement, benefits from a clear defensible boundary to the west and, through development, will not detract from the purposes of the Green Belt.

(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.	✓	
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)		
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.

RAD01 - Relationship to the Emerging Local Plan Part 2

The principle of the preferred allocation of land north of Nottingham Road, or RAD01, for housing development is supported. However, the proposed indicative capacity of 150 dwellings appears to be arbitrarily low and based around a broad boundary marked by the north-south powerlines with employment land allocated to the western side of the site.

Whilst we consider that an element of proportional employment provision as a part of RAD01 may be appropriate the apparent reduction in housing capacity is considered to be unjustified and certainly not supported by substantive empirical evidence. The principle capacity of up to 300 dwellings was tested through a previous planning application (reference 13/02498/OUT) and was found to be sustainable, notwithstanding the site's Green Belt location prior to its proposed

removal. Therefore, the proposed indicative site capacity of 150 houses reflects around a 50% drop. This needs far more consideration in the interests of maintaining site viability and deliverability, particularly within the wider context of needing to enhance the supply of housing in Rushcliffe.

Reference is made in the draft Local Plan Part 2 to the, now adopted, Radcliffe on Trent Neighbourhood Plan's '*desire for a balance of new and revitalised employment to support housing growth*'. This general desire does not however translate into clearly evidenced or justified need for local employment provision.

Taking the Radcliffe on Trent Neighbourhood Plan the document makes reference to the aspiration to enhance the provision of small to medium business. Policy 1 *Village Centre First* of the Radcliffe on Trent Neighbourhood Plan promotes a central location for new commercial development, this is as opposed to more dispersed employment opportunities. Policy 13 *Business and Enterprise* reinforces the local desire for small and medium employment uses, '*specifically offices, research, and development, small workshops and starter/incubator units*' with some favour given to an element of mixed use on greenfield development sites. Whilst these local planning policies are recognised, and relate to the provision of suitably located and above all proportionate employment provision, there is no apparent quantifiable need for the substantial release of land for employment allocation. Therefore the 'blanket' provision for employment land at RAD01 appears unsubstantiated, representing a disproportionate and unsound approach to the delivery of employment land locally.

Furthermore, it should be noted the adopted Local Plan Part 1 does not generally identify Radcliffe on Trent as a spatially preferable location for employment provision. Alternatively, Policy 5 *Employment Provision and Economic Development* outlines that the focus for '*significant*' economic growth will be around five key locations. This includes land at the urban extensions east of Gamston/North Tollerton and south of Clifton. Also at land north of Bingham, the former Cotgrave Colliery and the former RAF Newton site. These locations make provision for well in excess of the defined minimum target of 20ha of new employment land in Rushcliffe. As such we consider that there is little strategic benefit to allocating significant land for employment at site RAD01, indeed it is contrary to the spatial strategy of the Local Plan Part 1.

We would note that any employment provision on RAD01 would need to be accessed from the same single residential access point, with vehicles routed through residential areas. Not only would this risk the marketability and delivery of the housing allocation, but could result in nuisance for residential occupiers. As such, any substantial employment allocation as is suggested would not be conducive to a quality residential scheme.

In light of the above we ask that further site-specific consideration is undertaken and subsequent appropriate discussions had prior to the publication draft of the Local Plan Part 2. Whilst we recognise that there may be merit in some modest, proportionate employment provision on site RAD01 the current approach is considered disproportionate and we consider that the level of housing capacity must be increased.

RAD01 – Site History and Deliverability

We note that the RAD01 site has recently been considered within the 2017 Housing Selection Interim Report which underlines a range of positives associated with the site. Specifically noting the site's relative containment, defensible boundary to the east, good proximity to local services and relative lack of function against the purposes of the Green Belt.

The Local Plan Part 2: Issues and Options and Further Options (Summary of Consultation) document highlights that the RAD01 site received considerable positive support during public consultation. In all 66 positive 'yes' responses were received against 29 'no' responses. When compared to the larger proposed allocations in Radcliffe on Trent, namely RAD03 and RAD05, the RAD01 site received a higher proportion of positive support at consultation stage. Also during public exhibitions, the RAD01 site was identified as the 'most appropriate site' for development in Radcliffe on Trent.

The site has also been proposed for development as a part of a previous planning application (reference 13/02498/OUT). The application was recommended for approval by the Council's planning officers, who noted that there were no objections from statutory consultees.

The relevant officer's report to concludes:

'It is considered that the harm to the Green Belt arising from development would not be significant and that the railway embankment would very much form a strong defensible and permanent boundary against future countryside encroachment. The characteristics of the site are such that development would be well contained. Given these particular strengths in the context of land surrounding the village as a whole, officers are confident that from a Green Belt impact perspective, the site would be chosen for removal from the Green Belt and allocated for development through part 2 of the Local Plan.'

Specifically, in relation to defensible boundary the railway embankment to the west will act as a clear and identifiable physical feature, which encloses and constrains the site, and provides delineation between the urban area of the settlement and wider countryside. In addition, the embankment serves as a flood defence, further distinguishing the site from undevelopable land between Radcliffe on Trent and Nottingham. In this way, the site has the potential to serve as a more suitable limit to the western edge of Radcliffe on Trent, with the opportunity to consolidate the open and development free area between the urban areas. The ability to identify a clear and defensible boundary in the railway embankment will ensure that the settlement remains contained to the west and will prevent coalescence with neighbouring settlements.

The relevant planning application also established a wider range of technical principles that support the delivery of the site for residential development. In relation to sustainability, the site is within easy walking distance of an existing bus stop, with intentions to extend the bus service into the site and a railway station within 1.3km of the site. Radcliffe on Trent's centre is also within easy walking distance and a traffic-free cycle route runs alongside the A52 ensuring numerous

alternatives to the use of the private car. Notably, it is recognised that the majority of car journeys from the site will turn right, travelling west towards the main urban area. As such, peak vehicle movement will be away from the centre of the village and the development would not lead to large numbers of additional vehicles travelling through the centre of Radcliffe.

Ecological surveys concluded the site provided suitable habitats for a number of notable and protected species, and as a result, a range of further surveys were carried out. Mitigation measures have been identified for implementation and the badger sett found present on the edge of the site has been incorporated into the developments design offering a green buffer to secure the protection of the badger sett. The development and wider community will benefit from a network of informal and formal open spaces consisting of a wide green corridor, village greens, allotments, community orchards, enhanced existing hedgerows and tree belts, together with a sustainable flood alleviation scheme comprising wetlands, water meadows, ponds and swales.

There were no objections to the application proposals from the Wildlife Trust or Natural England and as such previous concerns regarding the level of ecological impact have been satisfactorily addressed.

Nottinghamshire County Council's Principal Landscape Architect reviewed the submitted Landscape and Visual Impacts assessment and agreed with the conclusions that the impacts range from moderate adverse to beneficial depending on location. For a greenfield development this level of impact is considered to be good. The site is visually well contained by existing border trees and the height of the railway embankment and has a limited visual envelope.

In relation to highway matters the site can readily be accessed from two major/minor priority T-junctions onto Nottingham Road with provision of ghost island right turn lanes on Nottingham Road to assist vehicles turning right into the proposed development.

The identified site access junction layout would also include for appropriate pedestrian crossing facilities to enable residents of the proposed development to access a new bus stop facility to the south of Nottingham Road.

The provision of a pedestrian and cycle only access onto Holme Lane directly connects the site to the Trent Valley Way, and puts the site within easy walking distance of the settlement centre. Within the site, shared surface streets, and dedicated cycle lanes will make cycle use easier and more attractive. There was no objection to the planning application from Nottinghamshire County Council or Highways England on highway grounds.

The site is located within Flood Zone 1 as defined by the Greater Nottingham Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. The site benefits from flood defences in the form of the railway embankment and the flood defences at Holme Lane. It is emphasised therefore that there is no risk of flooding on the site from the River Trent.

Detailed consideration has been given to the effects of surface water drainage through the site from the wider land drainage catchment. Water flows from the A52 across the site and under the railway bridge out towards the Trent. A detailed assessment has been made of surface water impacts when the Trent is in flood

and water is prevented from passing under the embankment. A detailed mitigation proposal has been designed with a sustainable, simple and natural approach to flood water management which can contain a worst case scenario of surface water. A network of integrated sustainable urban drainage solutions comprising water meadows, ponds, wetlands and swales form a central and key element of the site's green infrastructure.

Modelling has been undertaken on a worst case scenario and the proposal will reduce the risk of flooding to existing properties. The network of swales, ponds, wetlands and water meadows will also form part of the public informal and formal open space and has been carefully designed following natural and simple design principles ensuring water is retained below housing floor level removing any risk to people and surrounding property.

The mitigation proposed takes into account breach analysis and a strengthening of the existing flood defence on Holme Lane is offered by the applicants. It is also noted that the Environment Agency raised no objections to the planning application on these grounds.

The recent application proposal was assessed in detail for the potential impacts of noise from both the RSPCA kennels and from the powerlines that cross the site. The Council's Environmental Health Officer concluded that there are no identified impacts from the powerlines, and that impacts arising from the proximity of the RSPCA can be fully mitigated through the use of 3m high acoustic fencing between the site and the kennels. The mitigation proposed is considered to be sufficient to avoid complaints from new residents and would not inhibit the operation of the kennels themselves.

The presence of the powerlines across the site do not represent any bar to the development proposed on planning grounds. The Health Impact Assessment submitted with the relevant application reviews international findings on the potential health risks associated with powerlines and find no evidence sufficient to represent a material consideration in determining and planning application. The applicant has confirmed that there is active and specific interest in developing the site from two housebuilders and while the presence of the powerlines will have an impact on land value, it does not impact on the deliverability of the site from the housebuilders' perspective.

The site promoter has carried out a geophysical assessment of the site and trial trenching in accordance with the recommendations of the Nottinghamshire County Council Archaeologist. No evidence of important archaeology has been unearthed and no further actions are recommended by the relevant Archaeologist who had no objections.

The Local Plan Part 1 provides for opportunities to secure improvements to infrastructure where there are deficiencies identified by consultees. In respect of the relevant planning application on the site, requests were made to secure improvements to existing community infrastructure from relevant consultation bodies.

In the course of the planning application, the applicant provisionally agreed to support financial contributions towards 63 primary school places as requested. Also, the applicant agreed to a fully policy compliant financial contribution towards improvement and enhancement of Radcliffe on Trent Health Centre.

In conclusion, no other site being considered around Radcliffe on Trent has been through such a thorough and robust assessment of impacts, benefits and deliverability as RAD01. It is clear that the site represents a sustainable location for residential development.

As such we also bring into question Radcliffe on Trent's wider proposed directions for growth to the east of the settlement. The proposed eastern allocations (specifically RAD05a) consists entirely of wide, open countryside with virtually no urban features. Further there are no significant, robust and substantial physical barriers to prevent further encroachment eastwards, representing a 'sprawl' toward settlements such as Newton and Bingham. The existing narrow hedgerows, must be considered to be a relatively weak boundary when compared to a major, physical, engineered boundary such as a railway embankment, trunk road or river.

Further, given the proximity and relationship of the land to the neighbouring St James's Business Park, it would make far more sense to utilise this land for the provision of local employment opportunities instead of RAD01. We consider that enhanced housing delivery at site RAD01 represents a far more sustainable approach to the growth of Radcliffe on Trent as opposed to a gradual move eastward into the open countryside.

We would also comment that given the self contained nature of RAD13, and its proximity to the A52 (potential noise and air quality issue), this site might be more suitable for the provision of local employment opportunities than RAD01

(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

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.