



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) |
|---|---------|----------------------------------|
| Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group (RNCSIG) | Name | Click here to enter text. |
| Gordon Dyne (Chair) 6 Lyons Close Ruddington Notts NG11 6BQ | Address | Click here to enter text. |
| | E-mail | Click here to enter text. |

Housing Development

Housing Land Supply

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

| | | |
|------------|-------|----|
| Yes | | |
| No | | No |
| Don't know | | |

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

RNCSIG is very concerned that the original large sites were chosen after much debate and that delays in building on them are distorting the process. We are very concerned that these less sustainable village sites *will get delivered first, followed by the delayed major sites with the result that more land is taken than is strictly necessary.*

RNCSIG is responding on the basis that the Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy *emphasizes the importance of avoiding any further loss or damage to our remaining critical wildlife capital and to maintain the network of green infrastructure.*

RNCSIG therefore feel that greenfield site allocation must be kept to an absolute minimum and any collateral damage or loss to our local wildlife capital (Local Wildlife Sites, Nature Reserves and Green Corridors) must be avoided.

However if such sites are allocated any buffering or mitigation will need to be be significant. But such mitigation is always second best, as once valuable sites are damaged or lost mitigation cannot guarantee fully replacing the lost biodiversity.

(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

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.

Essentially a brownfield site

(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

Yes

No

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

RNCSIG feel that greenfield site allocation must be kept to an absolute minimum and damage or loss to our local wildlife capital should be avoided.

(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

Yes

No

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

RNCSIG feel that greenfield site allocation must be kept to an absolute minimum and damage or loss to our local wildlife capital should be avoided.

(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

 No

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

RNCSIG feel that greenfield site allocation must be kept to an absolute minimum and damage or loss to our local wildlife capital should be avoided.

(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"/> | No |
| 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"/> | 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.

COT1 – there should be adequate buffering of woodland to the north.

COT9/10/11a – there must be adequate buffering to protect the wildlife value of the Grantham Canal as this is both an important Local Wildlife Site and a key piece of green infrastructure because of its importance as a wildlife corridor running through the Borough.

Any buffering or mitigation will need to be significant. But such mitigation is always second best, as once valuable sites are damaged or lost mitigation cannot guarantee fully replacing the lost biodiversity.

(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.

RNCSIG feel that greenfield site allocation must be kept to an absolute minimum and damage or loss to our local wildlife capital should be avoided.

(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.

RNCSIG feel that greenfield site allocation must be kept to an absolute minimum and damage or loss to our local wildlife capital should be avoided.

(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) | |  No |
| 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) | |  No |
| 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.

Key4a is unsuitable as it is adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site and RNCSIG have a general policy that any good wildlife habitat in Rushcliffe is sufficiently rare that it must be buffered from the effects of development.

Key 10 includes an area of historical ridge & furrow + areas of woodland which should be conserved and these therefore require adequate buffering.

Any buffering or mitigation will need to be significant. But such mitigation is always second best, as once valuable sites are damaged or lost mitigation cannot guarantee fully replacing the lost biodiversity.

(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

No

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

RNCSIG feel that greenfield site allocation must be kept to an absolute minimum and damage or loss to our local wildlife capital should be avoided.

(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"/> | No No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Site RAD02 – Land adjacent Grooms Cottage (estimated capacity around 50 homes) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Site RAD03 – Land off Shelford Road (estimated capacity around 400 homes) | Yes <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"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Site RAD06 – 72 Main Road (estimated capacity around 5 homes) | | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Site RAD13 – The Paddock, Nottingham Road (estimated capacity around 75 homes) | <input type="checkbox"/> 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.

RAD01 – regard as one site and represents a major development out to the Cotgrave ex Railway corridor which forms part of the Cotgrave Forest Focus Area for targeted nature conservation activity (see Rushcliffe Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Report and subsequent notes from the RNCSIG BOM Action sub group) and we would not favour such a development. It also moves development nearer the Skylarks Nature Reserve and would restrict opportunities for habitat work in that whole enclave between the A52 and the river.

We would object to development on RAD6 (open recreational land with some wildlife value)

(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

| |
|----|
| |
| No |

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

RNCSIG feel that greenfield site allocation must be kept to an absolute minimum and damage or loss to our local wildlife capital should be avoided. Major intrusions into the wider countryside should be avoided .

(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) | | No |
| Site RUD05 – Land south of Flawforth Lane (estimated capacity around 50 homes) | | No |
| 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) | | 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.

RUD05/RUD13 represent an intrusion into the wider countryside.

RUDD01/05/13 – These sites represent a significant intrusion into the wider countryside..

(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

| |
|----|
| |
| No |

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

RNCSIG feel that greenfield site allocation must be kept to an absolute minimum and damage or loss to our local wildlife capital should be avoided. Major intrusions into the wider countryside should be avoided.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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

| | Yes | No |
|--|-----|----|
| | | |

| | Yes | No |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Site CBI02 – Land north of Memorial Hall(1) (estimated capacity around 90 homes) | <input type="checkbox"/> | No |
| Site CBI05 – Land east of Church Street (estimated capacity around 70 homes) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> no |

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

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

CB102 is adjacent to the Grantham Canal (an important Local Wildlife Site and green corridor – therefore an important piece of wildlife capital running across the Borough) and must be adequately buffered. *Any buffering or mitigation will need to be significant. But such mitigation is always second best, as once valuable sites are damaged or lost mitigation cannot guarantee fully replacing the lost biodiversity.*

CB105 – is a significant intrusion into the wider landscape.
(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 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| No | No |

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

RNCSIG feel that greenfield site allocation must be kept to an absolute minimum and damage or loss to our local wildlife capital should be avoided. Major intrusions into the wider countryside should be avoided. Such sites should not be developed.

(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) | Yes | |
| Site EBR07 – Closes Side Lane (east) (estimated capacity around 20 homes) | Yes | |
| Site EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane (estimated capacity around 15 homes) | Yes | |
| 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.

EBR10 – is adjacent to the Springdale Wood nature reserve, an important community wildlife site, which must be adequately buffered. Part of the development is also adjacent to a lovely species rich wildflower meadow that contains a range of unusual species for Rushcliffe. Again this must be buffered from any development. *Any buffering or mitigation will need to be significant. But such mitigation is always second best, as once valuable sites are damaged or lost mitigation cannot guarantee fully replacing the lost biodiversity.*

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

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

RNCSIG feel that greenfield site allocation must be kept to an absolute minimum and

damage or loss to our local wildlife capital should be avoided. Major intrusions into the wider countryside should be avoided .

(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 checked="" 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.

GOT5a – represents a significant intrusion into the wider countryside, and we would also wish to ensure that the nearby Local Wildlife Site is buffered. *Any buffering or mitigation will need to be significant. But such mitigation is always second best, as once valuable sites are damaged or lost mitigation cannot guarantee fully replacing the lost biodiversity.*

(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?

Ye
s ..

No

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.

BUN01 – we would expect protection and buffering for the woodland area and also the road verge area beyond the brickworks bund that supports *species such as Cowslip*.

(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.

As we understand it this site already has planning permission, so any comments are irrelevant.

(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 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.