

From: [David Newborough](#)
To: [Localdevelopment](#)
Subject: Opposition to RUD01 - development of Sellors' playing field
Date: 11 November 2017 12:56:20

I would like to submit my comments by way of objection to the proposed development of Sellor's playing field, RUD01

1. Children's playing field

- I understand this field was donated to the village in the 1940's and has a covenant on it. For this to be overturned appears to show a terrible lack of respect for the donor and their family.
- Children's playing field – My adopted children have spent many happy hours playing in that field, but is a real asset to the village adding to the health, wellbeing and enjoyment of residents in the village

2. Access and traffic

- Traffic in the village is already a massive problem that brings the village centre to gridlock on an everyday basis. As a resident in the village I already consider driving out of the village to avoid having to contend with the traffic and terrible lack of parking in the centre. An additional 180 houses with an average of 2 cars per house would bring an additional 360 cars to the village on a daily basis.
- Not only will there be all these new cars, but delivery vehicles associated with them, which are now significant with internet shopping for delivery to the door. 180 new houses that have new people, probably mainly families moving in will generate massive delivery traffic as they furnish their new homes and gardens and tradesman as they set up their homes as they want them.
- Parking in the village is impossible during daytime hours. I don't believe additional housing should be considered in any respect unless or until road networks have been significantly changed and parking facilities are enhanced significantly. For example the main roads through the village should have no parking allowed anywhere on them to allow flow of vehicles rather than gridlock, but then parking facilities would be required elsewhere for the vehicles that currently use that parking.
- The danger to residents from the congestion, traffic and parking issues is significant and again I stress that as a resident with a young family I already sometimes consider heading out the village for shopping facilities due to these problems. Surely a village should keep a feeling that residents can enjoy the village shops, café's, library and other facilities without such dangers.
- Buses frequently cannot navigate the narrow roads and sharp turns in the village centre so bringing more people with a need for greater bus traffic is not wise.
- Indeed, will an additional bus stop be needed near to Sellor's field, and if so that will add to the dangers already present on that B road, which is unlit as it leaves the village and already a fast heavily used road.

3. Local facilities

- I would like to know what additional facilities are proposed for such an influx of residents. Schools do not appear to have spare capacity and the dangers for children around Manor Park are worrying given the traffic and parking problems.
- Are additional doctors surgeries proposed, dentists, opticians and other necessary facilities for an influx of so many people.

- I have already mentioned above the transport facilities in terms of bus stops, parking etc. that are lacking.
4. The edge of the village with a rural feel and wildlife
- There is currently a clear line for the edge of the village and entry to the countryside, with open rural views and greenbelt.
 - This is to the enhancement of the village and for the enjoyment of residents. Having space to enjoy is valuable for residents health and wellbeing. This field is a valuable place for children to play for dogs to be exercised, for residents to walk and breathe the fresh air and to enjoy local wildlife
 - The area is prone to flooding and developing significant further area of open fields into housing will add to the dangers for the village
 - There is wildlife in this area and the development would mean there is a loss of their natural habitat.
 - It is important that the village does not join up with Wilford and West Bridgford. Development onto this site will mean there is a loss of the village feel, a loss of any green and pleasant land between urban developments and the area will ultimately merge into the surrounding built up areas of Wilford and West Bridgford. That is not what residents in a village expect or chose when they selected the area to live.

I hope these comments will be taken into account.

Kind regards,

David Newborough

This e-mail is confidential and for use by the addressee only. If you have received this message in error, please delete the message from your computer and notify support@ashgatesit.co.uk immediately. Any views or opinions presented are only those of the author and not necessarily those of Ashgates. Whilst all reasonable care has been taken to avoid the transmission of viruses, it is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure that the onward transmission, opening or use of this message and any attachments will not adversely affect its systems or data. No responsibility is accepted by Ashgates in this regard and the recipient should carry out such virus and other checks as it considers appropriate.

"Ashgates" means: Ashgates LLP (Registered in England No: OC414594), Ashgates Corporate Services Ltd (Registered in England No. 4550749), which is regulated by The Association of Chartered Certified Accountants, Ashgates Auto Enrolment Ltd (Registered in England No. 09622917 or Ashgates Corporate Finance Ltd (Registered in England No. 06857699), which is regulated for a range of investment business activities by the Association of Chartered Certified Accountants, as appropriate or Ashgates IT Ltd (Registered in England No. 10647697).

Ashgates' Registered Office: 5 Prospect Place, Millennium Way, Pride Park, Derby, DE24 8HG

Online response

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

Respondent no: **1136026**

Respondent		Agent details (where applicable)
Mr Richard Nicholls	Name	
	Organisation	
1136026	ID number	

Housing Development

Housing Land Supply

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

Answer

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

Housing Sites within the Main Urban Area

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

Answer

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

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

Housing Sites adjacent to the Main Urban Area

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

Answer

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

Housing Development at the 'Key Settlements'

Bingham

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

Answer

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

Cotgrave

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

Answer

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

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

	Answer
Site COT01 – Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park (estimated capacity around 170 homes)	<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 70px;"></div>
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)	<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 70px;"></div>

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.

East Leake

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

Answer

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

Keyworth

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

Answer

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

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

Answer

Site KEY4a – Land off Nicker Hill (1)
(estimated capacity around 150 homes)

Site KEY8 – Land between Platt Lane and Station Road
(estimated capacity around 190 homes)

Site KEY10 – Land south of Debdale Lane (1)
(estimated capacity around 190 homes)

	Answer
Site KEY13 – Hillside Farm (estimated capacity around 50 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.

Radcliffe on Trent

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

Answer	

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

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

	Answer
Site RAD01 – Land north of Nottingham Road (estimated capacity around 150 homes), with employment development to the west of the powerlines that separate the site.	

	Answer
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.

Ruddington

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

Answer

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

--

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

	Answer
Site RUD01 – Land to the west of Wilford Road (south) (estimated capacity around 180 homes)	
Site RUD05 – Land south of Flawforth Lane (estimated capacity around 50 homes)	
Site RUD11 – Old Loughborough Road (estimated capacity around 10 self and custom-build homes)	
Site RUD13 – Land opposite Mere Way (estimated capacity around 170 homes)	

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

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

--

Housing Development at the 'Other Villages'

Cropwell Bishop

--

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

Answer

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

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

Answer

Site CBI02 – Land north of Memorial Hall(1)
(estimated capacity around 90 homes)

Site CBI05 – Land east of Church Street
(estimated capacity around 70 homes)

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

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

East Bridgford

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

Answer

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

--

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

	Answer
Site EBR06 – Closes Side Lane (west) (estimated capacity around 20 homes)	
Site EBR07 – Closes Side Lane (east) (estimated capacity around 20 homes)	
Site EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane (estimated capacity around 15 homes)	
Site EBR10 – Land south of Butt Lane (estimated capacity around 45 homes)	

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

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

--

Gotham

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

Answer	
--------	--

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

--

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

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

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

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

Bunny Brickworks

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

Answer	

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

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

Flintham – Former Islamic Institute

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

Answer

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

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.

Online response

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

Respondent no: **1142091**

Respondent		Agent details (where applicable)
Miss Jayne Nightingale	Name	
	Organisation	
1142091	ID number	

Housing Development

Housing Land Supply

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

Answer

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

Housing Sites within the Main Urban Area

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

Answer

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

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

Housing Sites adjacent to the Main Urban Area

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

Answer

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

Housing Development at the 'Key Settlements'

Bingham

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

Answer

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

Cotgrave

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

Answer

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

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

	Answer
Site COT01 – Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park (estimated capacity around 170 homes)	<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 70px;"></div>
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)	<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 70px;"></div>

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.

East Leake

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

Answer

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

Keyworth

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

Answer

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

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

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

	Answer
Site KEY13 – Hillside Farm (estimated capacity around 50 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.

Radcliffe on Trent

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

Answer	

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

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

	Answer
Site RAD01 – Land north of Nottingham Road (estimated capacity around 150 homes), with employment development to the west of the powerlines that separate the site.	

	Answer
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.

Ruddington

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

Answer

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

--

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

	Answer
Site RUD01 – Land to the west of Wilford Road (south) (estimated capacity around 180 homes)	
Site RUD05 – Land south of Flawforth Lane (estimated capacity around 50 homes)	
Site RUD11 – Old Loughborough Road (estimated capacity around 10 self and custom-build homes)	
Site RUD13 – Land opposite Mere Way (estimated capacity around 170 homes)	

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

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

--

Housing Development at the 'Other Villages'

Cropwell Bishop

--

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

Answer

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

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

Answer

Site CBI02 – Land north of Memorial Hall(1)
(estimated capacity around 90 homes)

Site CBI05 – Land east of Church Street
(estimated capacity around 70 homes)

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

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

East Bridgford

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

Answer

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

--

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

	Answer
Site EBR06 – Closes Side Lane (west) (estimated capacity around 20 homes)	
Site EBR07 – Closes Side Lane (east) (estimated capacity around 20 homes)	
Site EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane (estimated capacity around 15 homes)	
Site EBR10 – Land south of Butt Lane (estimated capacity around 45 homes)	

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

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

--

Gotham

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

Answer	
--------	--

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

--

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

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

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

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

Bunny Brickworks

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

Answer	

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

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

Flintham – Former Islamic Institute

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

Answer

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

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.

Richard Mapletoft

From: Charles Noblet <jom> 15 October 2017
Sent: 21:04
To: Localdevelopment
Subject: Keyworth Neighbourhood Development Plan

Hillside Farm(KEY13)

Sirs
I remain totally staggered that years of hard work by keyworth Parish Council has been completely ignored by the Borough Council.

When I spoke with a planning official at the last consultation meeting in keyworth Village Hall he stated that fact that the land owner of Hillside Farm had attempted to dispose of the land on approximately nine occasions and therefore it was a prime site for development.

What utter rubbish.

What it means is that the land owner has attempted to make a huge profit from attempting to sell the land to developers. This was the only plot left in the land owners former large portfolio of land.

You are well aware of why the knowledgeable local Councillor's decision not to select this plot. I urge you to amend your decision.

Kind regards
Charles & Janet Noblet

13 Roseland Close
Keyworth
NG12 5LQ

Online response

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

Respondent no: **1143554**

Respondent		Agent details (where applicable)
Miss Emma Nye	Name	
	Organisation	
1143554	ID number	

Housing Development

Housing Land Supply

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

Answer

Don't Know

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

Housing Sites within the Main Urban Area

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

Answer

Yes

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

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

Housing Sites adjacent to the Main Urban Area

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

Answer

No

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

Housing Development at the 'Key Settlements'

Bingham

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

Answer

Yes

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

Bingham already feels like it has reached its capacity and requires additional facilities to continue to support its expansion. Increasing expansion even further just continues to put greater pressure on the community and facilities there at present.

Cotgrave

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

Answer

Yes

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

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

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

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

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

East Leake

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

Answer

No

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

Consideration needs to be given to the additional volume of traffic travelling in and out of East Leake with this number of houses if it hasn't already. Being a commuter round this area, I believe this would have a negative impact on me daily.

Keyworth

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

Answer

Yes

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

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

Answer

Site KEY4a – Land off Nicker Hill (1)
(estimated capacity around 150 homes)

Yes

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

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

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

Radcliffe on Trent

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

Answer

No

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

The volume of traffic on the A52 in Radcliffe is already unacceptable. This would make it worse!

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

	Answer
Site RAD01 – Land north of Nottingham Road (estimated capacity around 150 homes), with employment development to the west of the powerlines that separate the site.	No
Site RAD02 – Land adjacent Grooms Cottage (estimated capacity around 50 homes)	Yes
Site RAD03 – Land off Shelford Road (estimated capacity around 400 homes)	No
Site RAD05a – Land north of Grantham Road to south of railway line (1a) (estimated capacity around 140 homes)	No
Site RAD06 – 72 Main Road (estimated capacity around 5 homes)	Yes
Site RAD13 – The Paddock, Nottingham Road (estimated capacity around 75 homes)	Yes

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

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

These larger sites closer to the A52 will make this road an even bigger nightmare to travel on

Ruddington

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

Answer

Yes

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

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

Answer

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

Yes

Site RUD05 – Land south of Flawforth Lane
(estimated capacity around 50 homes)

Yes

Site RUD11 – Old Loughborough Road
(estimated capacity around 10 self and custom-build homes)

Yes

Site RUD13 – Land opposite Mere Way (estimated capacity around 170 homes)

Yes

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

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

Housing Development at the 'Other Villages'

Cropwell Bishop

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

Answer

Yes

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

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

Answer

Site CBI02 – Land north of Memorial Hall(1)
(estimated capacity around 90 homes)

Yes

Site CBI05 – Land east of Church Street
(estimated capacity around 70 homes)

Yes

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

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

East Bridgford

Question 16: Do you agree that Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for

housing development at East Bridgford for around 100 homes in total?

Answer

No

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

I am a resident of East Bridgford and can already see that we do not have enough facilities to cope with additional residents. Increase the facilities e.g use some of this land for convenience, increase our transport networks and then this plan might be sustainable. I also feel that the 2 sites on Closes Side Lane will affect the value of my home and may homes around me, as well as potentially changing what is currently a lovely peaceful area!

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

	Answer
Site EBR06 – Closes Side Lane (west) (estimated capacity around 20 homes)	No
Site EBR07 – Closes Side Lane (east) (estimated capacity around 20 homes)	No
Site EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane (estimated capacity around 15 homes)	No
Site EBR10 – Land south of Butt Lane (estimated capacity around 45 homes)	No

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.

See above

Gotham

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

Answer

Yes

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

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

Answer

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

Yes

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

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

Bunny Brickworks

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

Yes

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

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

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

Flintham – Former Islamic Institute

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

Answer	Yes
---------------	------------

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

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.