

Online response

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

Respondent no: **1134198**

Respondent		Agent details (where applicable)
Miss Claire Dorans	Name	
Ruddington Parish Council	Organisation	
1134198	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

No

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

The shortfall is 900 fewer homes over the life of the plan, if 2200 new homes are allocated that would mean that at the end of the plan there will be a total of 14,250 new homes that will have been built against the target of 13,150, an excess of 1,100. Pressure should be put on the developers of the larger sites rather than expecting the Key Settlements to make up the shortfall in the five year supply of deliverable housing sites

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

Yes

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

It is important that the areas of separation are maintained between Ruddington and Clifton & West Bridgford

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)	
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)	

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)	

	Answer
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)	
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
--	---------------

	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.	
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	No
--------	----

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

The Parish Council believes that no more than 250 new homes should be allocated within the greenbelt at Ruddington for the life of the plan. Ruddington is not the solution for the major strategic sites failing to deliver housing in the timeframe expected. All development that takes place in villages and towns such as East Leake, Clifton and West Bridgford impacts upon the already overloaded road infrastructure in Ruddington as the road users use Ruddington as a means to travel to Nottingham, the A60, the A453 and the A606. The A60 is already acknowledged to be over its theoretical capacity, the present development at Sharp Hill Woods will have a detrimental effect on Flawforth Lane and the A60, this will make it more difficult for those living in Ruddington to gain access to the A60. The Borough Council have noted in other publications and consultations that the historical road layout makes it difficult, if not impossible, to make changes that would have a positive effect upon the issues that are already being experienced by residents. Both infant and primary schools are at capacity and James Peacock Infant School would appear to have no ability to extend in its present location. Both of the medical practices within Ruddington are located on restricted sites and would find it difficult to expand, expansion would probably mean moving to a less central area of the village.

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)	No
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)	No

	Answer
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.

Rud01 - The site is not suitable for housing, it contains Zone 2 & 3 Flood Risk areas. It is ridiculous to expect that there will be no impact upon the village infrastructure due to the location, traffic will flow into the village to gain access to the amenities and to travel to other areas. Rud11 -The area is isolated and too far away from the village amenities, there are no longer any retail facilities on Ashworth Avenue.

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

	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)	
<p>Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers.</p> <p>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.</p>	
<input type="text"/>	

East Bridgford

<p>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?</p>	
Answer	<input type="text"/>
<p>Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response.</p>	
<input type="text"/>	

<p>Question 17: Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following sites at East Bridgford</p>	
	Answer
Site EBR06 – Closes Side Lane (west) (estimated capacity around 20 homes)	
Site EBR07 – Closes Side Lane (east) (estimated capacity around 20 homes)	

	Answer
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.

To increase the number of houses from 250 to 410 is particularly unreasonable while a development of 175 houses in excess of the 410 is still under appeal at the Asher Lane site. RUD01 refers to the site including Sellors Playing Field. The playing field is the property of the Parish Council and no agreements have been undertaken into its sale.