

Mr Richard Mapletoft  
Planning Policy  
Rushcliffe Borough Council  
Rushcliffe Arena  
Rugby Road  
West Bridgford  
Nottingham, NG2 7YG

27<sup>th</sup> November, 2017

Dear Mr Mapletoft,

**Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2 Preferred Housing Sites Consultation: Representation by Featherstones PDD Ltd**

Please find attached completed forms and supporting statements in relation to the Local Plan Part 2 Preferred Housing Sites Consultation.

Featherstones are promoting a number of sites around Rushcliffe on behalf of landowners. Different forms have therefore been completed for different client's interest and whilst some matters repeat what has been said elsewhere, each form is unique in the information and detail provided regarding particular sites.

Featherstones overarching concern is the Borough Council's approach to its housing requirements and current housing land supply shortfall. The current approach seeks to downplay the shortfall and ignores the need to plan appropriately for a contingency. Given recent experience in the Borough and having regard to National Policy and recent proposals set out by the Local Plans Experts Group and in the White Paper, this approach is not sound.

The emerging plan is also too narrow in its approach to site allocations and housing delivery. It fails to grasp the need (as now demanded by Government) to increase the range of sites, the form of development proposed and to support the growth of villages. A greater number of sites (or outlets) will help increase housing supply. Sites should also be allocated for specific purposes, in particular to meet the need for self and custom house building and the need to provide specific accommodation for the elderly. The increase in the variety of forms of new housing will help serve different market and help increase housing supply.

A more positive and proactive approach to housing supply must be embraced, taking full account of the thrust of emerging Government Policy as set out in the housing White paper.

Featherstones would welcome further discussions with the Council about these issues and the specific sites it is promoting.

Yours sincerely

John Holmes



# 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](mailto: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)
Mr Ruzicka	Name	Featherstones PDD Ltd
C/O Agent	Address	The Elms Main street West Leake Loughborough Leicestershire LE12 5RF
Click here to enter text.	E-mail	fcom

### 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 type="checkbox"/>
No .....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Don't know .....	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

See attached Statement

(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.

In part, but it is unclear how the site could be brought forward because the Council have not identified a suitable site for the relocation of its depot service.

(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.

All land should be reviewed to ensure the housing requirement is met in full.

(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.

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### Cotgrave

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

**Yes** .....

**No** .....



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

Cotgrave can accommodate additional development.

Please see attached Statement.

(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)	✓	
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.

There are better, more appropriate sites elsewhere around the village.

Please see attached Statement.

(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 .....

No .....

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

This question is now out of date given recent appeal decision.

### 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?

<b>Yes</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>No</b> .....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Keyworth is capable of accommodating a greater number of dwellings.

**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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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.

These sites have a greater impact on the landscape and character of the area than other potential sites. Key13 is not, and has never been, a preferred site in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and as such has limited community support.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Radcliffe on Trent

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

**Yes** .....



**No** .....

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

Click here to enter text.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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

	Yes	No
Site RAD01 – Land north of Nottingham Road (estimated capacity around 150 homes), with employment development to the west of the powerlines that separate the site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site RAD02 – Land adjacent Grooms Cottage (estimated capacity around 50 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site RAD03 – Land off Shelford Road (estimated capacity around 400 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



	Yes	No
Site RAD05a – Land north of Grantham Road to south of railway line (1a) (estimated capacity around 140 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site RAD06 – 72 Main Road (estimated capacity around 5 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Site RAD13 – The Paddock, Nottingham Road (estimated capacity around 75 homes)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

[Click here to enter text.](#)

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Ruddington

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

**Yes** .....



**No** .....

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

[Click here to enter text.](#)

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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

	Yes	No
Site RUD01 – Land to the west of Wilford Road (south) (estimated capacity around 180 homes)	✓	
Site RUD05 – Land south of Flawforth Lane (estimated capacity around 50 homes)	✓	
Site RUD11 – Old Loughborough Road (estimated capacity around 10 self and custom-build homes)	✓	
Site RUD13 – Land opposite Mere Way (estimated capacity around 170 homes)		

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

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

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 checked="" 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?

<b>Yes</b> .....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>No</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Click here to enter text.

**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 checked="" 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?

<b>Yes</b> .....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>No</b> .....	<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)

**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 .....	<input type="checkbox"/>
No .....	<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.

It is unclear how development at Bunny Brickworks could be made to be sustainable

given the sites remoteness from the village and services and facilities.

There are a wide range of more suitable and sustainable sites located on the immediate edge of other villages (some lie outside the Green Belt). Development of these site would result in a more sustainable form of development. The nature of the Bunny Brickworks site does not provide sufficient justification to depart from core sustainable development principles.

(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.*

It is a committed site and should not be allocated. It is relevant to note that it is wholly inconsistent of the Council to conclude that development is acceptable and sustainable at Flintham for 95 dwellings, whilst concluding that other equally or more sustainable locations are not considered suitable for development.

(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.*

See attached statement

(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](mailto: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.

## FEATHERSTONES PDD - REPRESENTATIONS TO RUSHCLIFFE LOCAL PLAN PART 2 PREFERRED HOUSING SITES CONSULTATION

### Statement in response to Question One:

We strongly disagree with the Council's assessment of its housing supply and more generally to its approach to delivering its housing requirement.

The Borough has a very serious housing land supply issue. It has failed to bring forward enough land in the right place, at the right time. This is due in part to the lack of delivery on almost all of the Borough's Strategic sites but also due to the significant delays in the preparation and adoption of the Local Plan Part 2.

It is essential that the Borough adopt a pragmatic approach to planning for the delivery of its minimum housing requirement together with realistic assumptions in relation to delivery on existing and proposed sites.

It is critical that the Council's assumptions about the deliverability of sites is realistic and robust. In particular, and especially given past and recent experience, the assumptions should not be, individually and collectively, overly optimistic, such that the housing shortfall is down played and future delivery issues are inevitable.

Having regard to the recommendation of the Local Plans Expert Group, the Council's assessment of five year land supply should include lapse rates. This should be applied to all sites and given the lack of specific local evidence this should be set at 10% as recommended by the Experts Group.

The Local Plans Expert Group (LPEG) Report also recommended that;

*'the NPPF makes clear that local plans should be required not only to demonstrate a five year land supply but also focus on ensuring a more effective supply of developable land for medium to long term (over the whole plan period), plus make provision for, and provide a mechanism for the release of, developable Reserve Sites equivalent to 20% of their housing requirement, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the NPPF' (para 11.4 of the LPEG Report).*

Whilst the Council has now acknowledged the need for a buffer it is considered that this is inadequate given the complexity of sites and history of under delivery. A much greater buffer is required to take account of inevitable delays and non-implementation. The realities of the housing market (as experienced in Rushcliffe) are that some allocations and permissions are not implemented and others are delayed or delivered at slower rates than what might have been reasonably assumed. A contingency for this is essential, which means the need to plan for more permissions (more land for housing) than the minimum housing requirement.

Whilst there have been, and continue to be, major delays to the delivery of most of the Borough's strategic sites, experience at Cotgrave and East Leake demonstrates that delivery on sites can be consistently high if suitable sites are brought forward. Experience at East Leake in particular has shown how new houses can be brought forward quickly, when there are significant permissions granted on different sites.

There is no reason to believe that this experience could not be replicated in other villages across the Borough, provided sufficient sites are made available. Rushcliffe is a very strong housing market area and demand is unlikely to constrain delivery rates.



Having regard to the growth of East Leake, more houses than indicated in the Preferred Housing Sites document could be accommodated in the larger villages of Keyworth and Cotgrave

The Borough Council's recognition that growth is both necessary and sustainable at East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop and Gotham is welcomed. However, given the housing requirements, development in other villages should be identified too. The reason for the Council's approach, as set out in the Housing Site Selection Interim Report, is not sound. Other villages are also capable of accommodating development and making a meaningful and sustainable contribution to meeting the Borough's challenging housing requirements and current supply shortfall. In particular, Aslockton and Sutton Bonington which have a wide range of services and facilities, and Costock which, also has good access to services and facilities as a result of close proximity to and direct relationship with East Leake are suitable villages where additional development can be accommodated. All these villages are outside the Green Belt and have suitable sites available for development.

It is inconsistent to conclude that development on land at Bunny Brickworks, Bunny and the former Islamic Institute at Flintham (for 100 and 95 houses respectively) is sustainable, whilst development in villages with a better range of services and facilities on sites better related to those villages and those services and facilities, is not sustainable. Both sites are remote from the village centres, in settlements with limited access to services and facilities. The fact that these isolated sites have been previously used does not in itself justify the allocation of these sites before, or instead of, better located, more sustainable, green field sites.

When allocating sites the Council should maximise housing supply via the widest possible range of sites, location and by size of site. A greater range of sites, by type and size, will improve the rate of delivery of new homes. Increasing sales outlets will increase overall delivery of housing. In general increasing the number of sales outlets available means increasing the number of housing sites. The maximum delivery is achieved not just because there are more sales outlets but because the widest possible range of products and locations are available to meet the widest possible range of demand.

This approach is also advocated in the Housing White Paper. The White Paper, 'Fixing Our Broken Housing Market' presents a range of measures to increase delivery and ensure housing requirements are met. A Key emphasis of the White Paper is to encourage development in villages and to support the development of small and medium sized sites. Under the Heading 'Supporting small and medium sized sites, and thriving rural communities' it states that changes are proposed to the NPPF to:

*'Expect local planning authorities to identify opportunities for villages to thrive, especially where this would support services...'*

As well as recognising the importance of development within villages to support local communities and contribute to housing delivery, the White Paper seeks to encourage greater variety in the form of housing local planning authorities plan for. In particular it emphasises the need to plan for more self and custom build housing and for specific sites to meet the needs of an ageing population.

The Local Plan Part 2 should respond positively to these requirements, both in terms of allocations within smaller villages, but also specific allocations for custom build schemes and retirement housing. Suitable sites are being promoted specifically for this purpose. The Borough Council should adopt a positive and innovative policy approach (as sought by Government) rather than ignoring these issues. As the White Paper recognises, an increase in the choice of sites, both in terms of size and locationally, together with policies and allocations which encourage different forms of housing, will greatly assist with improving the rate of delivery of new homes. These are important measures, made essential in Rushcliffe as a result of its supply issues

## RUSHCLIFFE LOCAL PLAN PART 2: PREFERRED HOUSING SITES CONSULTATION










### REPRESENTATIONS ON BEHALF OF MR RUZICKA

#### Questions 5 and 6: Land off Baker's Hollow, Cotgrave (ref COT5)

- 1.0 The Council's approach to site allocations in Cotgrave is flawed, both in terms of the capacity of the village to accommodate growth and the choice of sites.
- 2.0 The justification for limiting the amount of additional development in Cotgrave as set out in the Housing Sites Selection Interim Report is not sound. There is no clear evidence from the Education Authority to demonstrate that school capacity is constrained and cannot be addressed. There is therefore no sound basis for the decision to restrict development to 350 units.
- 3.0 Further the site selection process does not appropriately follow a clear assessment of sites. There is no evidence given for not allocating land for Bakers Hollow (ref COT5)
- 4.0 Land off Baker's Hollow (ref COT5) is a suitable location for development and should be allocated in the Local Plan.
- 5.0 The site is well located in terms of access to the services and facilities within Cotgrave and there are not considered to be any physical or environmental constraints to the development of the site.
- 6.0 The site is extremely well contained. It relates directly to the existing extent of built development in the village, with existing housing on 3 sides. Unlike almost all other potential development sites and in particular COT9, COT10 and COT11a the site would not extend the village's outer edge further than its current extent and in this regard would result in a simple rounding off of the settlement. Development would therefore relate extremely well to the existing built form, and to the pattern and character of development in the area. There would be minimal encroachment into the countryside and limited impact on the Green Belt. These factors weigh strongly in favour of the allocation of the site.
- 7.0 An illustrative masterplan has been prepared to illustrate how the site might be developed. This shows that development could take place in a form which would follow and respect existing buildings lines, rounding off the existing settlement and creating a new landscaped edge to the village. In this way the effects on the character of the area, the incursion into the countryside and effect on the Green Belt can be minimised.
- 8.0 This initial work concludes that the site could deliver in the order of 60 dwellings.
- 9.0 Work has also been undertaken which demonstrates that a suitable and safe access into the site can be provided from Baker's Hollow. Indeed the work that can be undertaken as part of forming a new access into the site can also deliver significant traffic calming benefits. Two options have been drawn up. These are attached at Appendix One.
- 10.0 Option One shows a chicane and traffic coming in to the village must give way to traffic leaving the village. The access Junction is retained onto Baker's Hollow. All features are to standard. There are similar features on the entry to other villages in Rushcliffe, for example on the Kegworth Road entry to Gotham.

- 11.0** Option Two shows a roundabout, which doubles as both an access to the development and a traffic calming device. The roundabout has 28m diameter, the smallest for a normal roundabout with a kerbed central island. It places the roundabout within the 30mph zone, and east of the existing gateway feature, but it will have the effect of slowing vehicles coming in to the village.
- 12.0** Both options could be delivered as part of the development of the site. Both would provide a suitable site access whilst also providing a mechanism for controlling the speed of traffic entering the village and thereby addressing an existing local issue which may otherwise persist. The delivery of one or other of the options could be required as part of a policy allocating the site for development. The landowners would support such a policy requirement.

The drawings in the property of fpcr Environment and Design Ltd and is issued on the condition it is not reproduced, retained or disclosed to any unauthorised person, either wholly or in part without written consent of fpcr Environment and Design Ltd.  
 Ordnance Survey Mastermap - Crown Copyright. All rights reserved.  
 Licence Number: 100019680 (Crownenspatia.com)

-  Application Boundary 2.10 Ha
-  Proposed Residential Area Approx. 60 Units 1.75 Ha
-  Proposed Open Space 0.35 Ha
-  Proposed Structural Landscaping
-  Proposed Play Area
-  Proposed Vehicular Access Point
-  Proposed Pedestrian Links
-  Extended Rear Gardens
-  Existing Public Rights of Way



S:\TOWN\OTGRAVE\PLANS\DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK\_OTGRAVE\_REV A.rvt

Oxalis Planning  
 Land south of Bakers Hollow  
 Colgrave

**DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

1:3000@A3 / 1:1000@A1  
 December 2016 TCM  
**PR - A**

fpcr  
 fpcr Environment and Design Ltd  
 100019680  
 01223 222222  
 01223 222222  
 01223 222222

This drawing is the property of FPCR Environment and Design Ltd and any unauthorised person, either wholly or in part without written consent of FPCR Environment and Design Ltd.  
 Ordnance Survey Mastermap - Crown Copyright. All rights reserved.  
 License Number: 10010960 (Centrensative.com)

-  Application Boundary 2.10 Ha
-  Proposed Residential Area Approx. 60 Units 1.75 Ha
-  Proposed Open Space 0.35 Ha
-  Proposed Structural Landscaping
-  Proposed Vehicular Access Point
-  Proposed Pedestrian Lines
-  Extended Rear Gardens



S:\TGM\COTGRAVE\PLANS\DEV FRAMEWORK\_VILLAGE CONTEXT\_COTGRAVE.rvt


Oxalis Planning  
 Land south of Batters Hollow  
 Cotgrave

**DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**


1:5000@A3 / 1:2000@A1  
 December 2016  
 TGM

**PR - A**

  
 FPCR Environment and Design Ltd  
 10010960  
 10010960  
 10010960  
 10010960  
 10010960  
 10010960



<b>ADC</b> INFRASTRUCTURE		Date: 26/06/2017 Scale: 1:500 Dig Size: A3	Rev: - Dig No: ADC1553/001
<b>Project:</b> Proposed Residential Development Barkers Hollow, Cotgrave		<b>Client:</b> Oxalis Planning Ltd	
<b>Title:</b> Proposed Access Junction Layout (Option 1)			
Rev	Description	Date	



<b>ADC</b> INFRASTRUCTURE		Date: 27/06/2017 Scale: 1:500	Rev: - Dig No: ADC1553/002
Client: Oxalis Planning Ltd		Project: Proposed Residential Development Barkers Hollow, Cotgrave	
Title: Proposed Access Junction Layout (Option 2)		Description	Date
Rev	Description	Date	Date