

Comment

Consultee	Ms Ann Biddle (971364)
Email Address	
Address	21 Clifton Road Ruddington Nottingham NG11 6DD
Event Name	Local Plan Part 2: LAPP Issues and Options
Comment by	Ms Ann Biddle
Comment ID	2
Response Date	2/7/16 4:53 PM
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

Housing sites adjacent to the Main Urban Area

Beyond the allocation of these three major sites, however, we concluded in preparing the Core Strategy that there are no other locations around the main urban area of Nottingham (within Rushcliffe) which are suitable to be removed from Green Belt and then developed for housing or any other use. It is our view that this conclusion remains the right one at the present time.

If, however, you do not agree we would be interested to know which sites should be identified as suitable for development. It may be useful to refer to our Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) which identifies all those sites that have been put forward by developers and others as potentially suitable for housing development – please see

<http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy/localplan/supportingstudies/strategiclandavailabilityassessment>

Do you agree with the Council's view that no other sites on the edge of West Bridgford or Clifton should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development. Yes

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered NO, please could you identify which site (s) on the edge of West Bridgford or Clifton should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development and why.

It is important to maintain the separation from the main urban area of the villages of Ruddington and Tollerton by maintenance of the green belt in between.

Which sites within West Bridgford should be allocated for housing development in the LAPP?

WB1 Abbey Road Depot (c.50 homes) Yes

WB2 Central College (c.90 homes)	Yes
WB3 South of Wilford Lane (c.200 homes)	Yes
WB4 Land between Lady Bay Bridge and Radcliffe Road (c.25 homes)	Yes
At any other location (please specify which in the box below)	No

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers. For any of the sites, this could include comments on the services and facilities required to support development and the design, mix and layout of development.

All of these areas fall within the existing boundary of West Bridgford and are relatively small compared to the existing developments. Given the existing facilities and transport links, it should be possible to address any issues arising with these. WB2 and WB3 are also within easy reach of the new tram line, which could reduce the impact on road traffic.

Bingham

Do you agree that the LAPP should not allocate further greenfield land for housing development at Bingham in the plan period (up to 2028)? Yes

Cotgrave

Do you agree that the LAPP should not allocate further greenfield land for housing development at Cotgrave in the plan period (up to 2028)? No

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

Areas of low greenbelt significance should be considered, these being COT1, COT3 and COT4. These would not significantly decrease the area between Cotgrave and other settlements and development could be well boundaried.

East Leake

The Core Strategy sets a minimum target of 400 new homes that need to be built on new greenfield sites at East Leake up to 2028.

Planning permission has recently been granted on eight greenfield sites around the village that will deliver around 800 new homes in total. The sites and details of their planning permissions are shown on Figure 3 below. All of the homes on these eight sites count against the minimum 400 minimum home target, which means therefore that the target has already been exceeded by around 300 homes.

In our view, other than allocating these eight sites that already have planning permission, there is no need to identify any further land at East Leake for housing development over the plan period (up to 2028). To do so would put at risk the Core Strategy's focus to locate development within or adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham. There are also concerns over East Leake's capacity to support further development at this time and the affect that any further development would have on the character of the village.

Do you agree that, apart from those eight sites that already have planning permission for housing development (as shown on the plan above), further greenfield land should not be allocated for housing development at East Leake? Yes

Keyworth

The Core Strategy sets a target of a minimum of 450 new homes that need to be built on greenfield sites at Keyworth up to 2028. There are, as yet, no sites with planning permission which would count against this target.

The draft Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan, which was prepared by Keyworth Parish Council and consulted on between December 2014 and January 2015, includes proposals to allocate the following three sites to meet the 450 minimum housing target:

- . Land north of Bunny Lane, Keyworth (site KEY A)
- . Land off Nicker Hill, Keyworth (site KEY B)
- . Land off Platt Lane, Keyworth (site KEY C)

These sites are shown on Figure 4 below. Further details on these proposals are contained within the draft Neighbourhood Plan, which is available to view at:

- . <http://www.keyworthparishcouncil.org/neighbourhood-plan-documents/>

These proposals have been the subject of extensive local consultation already. However, work on the draft Neighbourhood Plan has not been taken much further forward since it was consulted on between December 2014 and January 2015. This is because of complications that have arisen in respect of whether or not neighbourhood plans can alter Green Belt boundaries in order to then enable land to be allocated for development. It would appear that neighbourhood plans cannot alter the Green Belt and, therefore, because of this, we also need to consider in preparing the LAPP which greenfield sites should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for development at Keyworth.

We are, therefore, asking at this Issues and Options stage whether the proposals for new housing set out in the draft Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan, with some subsequent amendments, are the right ones for meeting the village's minimum target for 450 new homes to be built on greenfield sites around the village?

If you do not agree with the proposed sites identified in the Neighbourhood Plan, we would be interested to know which greenfield site(s) should be identified instead. Further potential sites are set out in our SHLAA or you may wish to suggest a site(s) not included in the SHLAA.

Do you agree that the draft Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan's proposals to allocate land north of Bunny Lane (site KEY A), land off Nicker Hill (site KEY B) and land off Platt Lane (site KEY C) (as shown on the plan above) are appropriate in meeting the minimum target for 450 new homes at Keyworth over the plan period (up to 2028)? Yes

With respect to general directions around the village, do you support housing development:

To the east of the village Yes

To the south of the village Yes

To the west of the village Yes

We would also like to know what you think about the suitability of each of those individual sites shown on the plan below and whether, in each case, the site should or should not be allocated for housing development. For any one site, it should be noted that there may be the option to develop only part of the site rather than its whole.

The development of any one of these sites would be likely to result in impacts which require mitigation and also opportunities to improve the local area. We would need to consider the facilities and services required, the type and design of housing, and how the site would be accessed by car and public transport, amongst a number of other issues.

Do you support housing development at:

Site RAD1 – land north of Nottingham Road (potential capacity around 300 homes) Yes - all of the site

Site RAD2 – land adjacent Grooms Cottage (potential capacity around 50 homes)	Yes - all of the site
Site RAD3 – land off Shelford Road (potential capacity around 400 homes)	Yes - all of the site
Site RAD4 – land north of Grantham Road to north of railway line (potential capacity around 900 homes)	Yes - but only part of the site
Site RAD5 – land north of Grantham Road to south of railway line (1) (potential capacity around 200 homes)	Yes - all of the site
Site RAD6 – 72 Main Road (potential capacity around 7 homes)	Yes - all of the site
Site RAD7 – land north of Grantham Road to south of railway line (2) (potential capacity around 180 homes)	Yes - all of the site
Site RAD8 – land south of Grantham Road (potential capacity around 20 homes)	Yes - all of the site
Site RAD9 – land at Radcliffe on Trent Golf Course (west) (potential capacity around 10 homes)	No
Site RAD10 – land at Radcliffe on Trent Golf Course (east) (potential capacity around 10 homes)	No
Any other location (please specify which)	No

With respect to general directions around the village, do you support housing development:

To the north of the village	No
To the north east of the village	No
To the east of the village	Yes
To the south of the village	Yes
To the west of the village	No

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

Development of land north, north east and west of the village would damage the separation of Ruddington from the main urban area. Development to the west would result in no separation between Ruddington and Clifton.

The village is much closer to the main urban area than other areas under consideration for development and is at greater risk of losing it's identity and village character, which makes this separation even more important.

We would also like to know what you think about the suitability of each of those individual sites shown on Figure 6 and whether, in each case, the site should or should not be allocated by the LAPP for housing development. For any one site, it should be noted that there may be the option to develop only part of the site rather than its whole.

The development of any one of these sites would be likely result in impacts which require mitigation and also opportunities to improve the local area. We would need to consider the facilities and services required, the

type and design of housing, and how the site would be accessed by car and public transport, amongst a number of other issues.

Do you support housing development at:

Site RUD1 – land to the west of Wilford Road (south) (potential capacity around 180 homes)	Yes - part of site
Site RUD2 – land to the west of Wilford Road (north) (potential capacity around 440 homes)	No
Site RUD3 – land adjacent to St Peter’s Junior School (potential capacity around 60 homes)	No
Site RUD4 – Easthorpe House and adjacent land (potential capacity around 15 homes)	Yes - part of site
Site RUD5 – land south of Flawforth Lane (potential capacity around 40 homes)	Yes - all of site
Site RUD6 - land at Loughborough Road (potential capacity around 30 homes)	Yes - all of site
Site RUD7 - land north west of Asher Lane (potential capacity around 250 homes)	Yes - part of site
Site RUD8 –land west of Pasture Lane (potential capacity around 370 homes)	No
Site RUD9 –land south of Landmere Lane (potential capacity around 10 homes)	No
Site RUD10 – land adjacent to Landmere Farm (potential capacity around 5 homes)	No
Any other location (please specify which)	Yes - all of site

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your answers. For any of the sites, this could include comments on the services and facilities required to support development and the design, mix and layout of development.

The village has already seen significant development which has put increased pressure on the infrastructure of the village, particularly as much of the development has been to the north west and south west of the village. Traffic is often congested and pressure on parking in the village centre is high, so further development needs to be sympathetic to this and done with a view to minimising further impact where possible. The village has two GP medical practices which are in small, cramped buildings which pre-date any significant expansion of the village and provision of adequate medical facilities in the village also needs to be considered.

Rud 1 is controversial within the village but makes sense, being located on a main road with good access into the village by car, bus and for pedestrians and would avoid adding congestion on surrounding roads. It would add to congestion in the village centre, but less so than Rud7 which could only be accessed via the village. Rud 1 is also nearer to the tram route which could reduce congestion further.

Rud 4, 5 & 6, whilst being of more greenbelt significance can be accessed from the A60/Flawforth Lane and would keep pressure off the centre of the village at peak times. Although on the far side of the A60, this area already has housing development and is a short walk away from the village centre so would not feel disconnected from the village. Any housing here should be developed sympathetically to minimise impact on the environment.

Rud 7, whilst of low greenbelt significance, has the great disadvantage of requiring access through the centre of the village. If this site was developed in full it would cause significant additional congestion

in the village, particularly at peak times, which would be affect many residents. Partial development of the site with around 50 houses would have less impact and would be more acceptable, but my concern is whether this could be contained.

Development of Rud 2, 3 9 & 10 would erode the separation between Ruddington and West Bridgford.

Development of Rud 8 would damage the separation of Ruddington and Clifton and would destroy the village's identity as a separate entity.

The other location is in the centre of Ruddington, being a derelict house or houses on the corner of the Green and High Street. These premises have stood derelict since I have lived in the village (since 1998) and are an eyesore as well as a waste of a prime village location. The situation should be looked at with a view to encouraging the sale of the land and re-development of the site.

I would support the development of Rud1 to give the bulk of the 250 houses, with the shortfall being spread across smaller developments across Rud 4, 5 and 6 in a balanced way to minimise the impact. I would support a variety of housing styles in keeping with the varied character of the village and the provision of some low-cost housing options as these are currently limited.

Should any sites within 'key settlements' be allocated for development in the LAPP? Yes

Please provide any comments in support of your response. If you answered YES, please could you identify which site(s) should be allocated for housing development.

The playing fields in Ruddington at Rud 1.

Do you agree that the LAPP should not allocate any land for housing development at 'other villages' across the Borough? No

Should we allocate any sites for purely 'affordable housing' at 'other villages' across the Borough? No

Should we introduce policy in the LAPP to require a proportion of new homes to meet the enhanced Building Regulation standards for 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' and/or 'wheelchair user dwellings'. Yes

Should the LAPP allocate any specific sites for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation? No

Do you support the alterations recommended by the draft Rushcliffe Green Belt Review (Part 2b) to the Green Belt inset boundaries at:

Cotgrave	Yes
Cropwell Bishop	Yes
East Bridgford	Yes
Keyworth	Yes
Radcliffe on Trent	Yes
Ruddington	Yes

Tollerton Yes

Please provide any comments in support of your response.

These all appear to be minor alterations taking account of existing development and therefore common sense.

Do you support the Green Belt inset boundaries recommended by the draft Rushcliffe Green Belt Review (Part 2b) for:

Bradmore	Yes
Bunny	Yes
Cropwell Butler	Yes
Gotham	Yes
Newton	Yes
Plumtree	Yes
Shelford	Yes
Upper Saxondale	Yes

Should we designate any further 'safeguarded land' within Rushcliffe? No

Should we allocate any new sites for employment development in Rushcliffe? Yes

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, please could you identify which site(s) should be allocated for employment development.

Only if these have already been proposed, such as the Keyworth site mentioned.

Should the following sites (as shown on Figures 8 to 10) continue to be allocated for employment development?

Sites at Chapel Lane, Bingham	No
Site at Hollygate Lane, Cotgrave	No
Site at Hathern Works, Sutton Bonington	No

Should the following sites (as shown on Figures 11 and 12) continue to be identified as suitable for employment redevelopment?

Bunny Brickworks	Yes
British Gypsum Works, Gotham	Yes

Should the LAPP allow for employment development to take place on the three areas at Langar, as defined on Figure 13? Yes

Should we continue to protect viable employment sites through the inclusion within the LAPP of a criteria based policy similar to Policy EMP4 of the Rushcliffe Non-Statutory Replacement Local Plan?

Yes

Should the LAPP include further policy in relation to the Centres of Excellence?

No - there is sufficient policy already within Core Strategy Policy 5

Should the LAPP include further policy in relation to rural diversification?

No - there is sufficient policy already (e.g. Core Strategy Policy 5)

Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know what policy should be included in the LAPP.

I would have appreciated another option to select, other than "Yes" or "No", along the lines of "I don't feel sufficiently qualified to express an opinion on this matter".

Should the following sites be identified as suitable for regeneration and be allocated as such through the LAPP?

Bunny Brickworks

Yes

Former Islamic Institute, Flintham

Yes

Do you support the suggested centre boundaries, primary shopping areas, primary frontages and secondary frontages, as defined at Appendix C of the LAPP (and shown above), for:

Ruddington Local Centre

Yes

Should we allocate land for new retail or other commercial development in or around any of Rushcliffe's district or local centres, or elsewhere in the Borough?

No

Should we set a local threshold requiring an impact assessment for all retail proposals with a gross floorspace of 500m² or more across the whole of Rushcliffe?

Yes

Should the LAPP include more detailed policy in relation to the design of new development?

No - there is sufficient policy already (e.g. Core Strategy Policy 10)

Should we identify a local list of heritage assets within Rushcliffe Borough?

Yes.

Should we include within the LAPP policies on development affecting designated assets?

No - they have sufficient policy protection already (e.g. within the NPPF)

Should we identify areas of the Borough as suitable for renewable and low carbon energy generation?

Yes

Should we introduce further policy in the LAPP on how development should contribute to reducing carbon dioxide emissions? No

Should we introduce further policy in the LAPP to require the lower optional Building Regulations standard of 110 litres per person per day water use. Yes

There is a requirement in Core Strategy Policy 2 of the NPPF that development should not increase flood risk elsewhere by reducing surface water run-off through the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (known as SUDS).

Is there a need for any further policy on managing flood risk and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems? No

Which types of land use should also be incorporated into the Green Infrastructure network?

Parks and Country Parks Yes

School playing fields Yes

Allotments Yes

Sports pitches Yes

Amenity space (e.g. open space) Yes

Golf courses Yes

Designated and non-designated nature conservation sites Yes

Flood alleviation areas Yes

Should the LAPP include further policy to protect parks and open space? No - there is sufficient policy already (e.g. Core Strategy Policy 16)

Should we include more detailed policy in the LAPP in relation to light pollution: No - there is sufficient policy already (e.g. within the NPPF)

Should we include more detailed policy in the LAPP in relation to the air pollution: No - there is sufficient policy already (e.g. within the NPPF)

Do you agree that no further local transport policy is required in the LAPP? Yes - additional local policy is not needed

Should we (please choose one option) Continue to use the guidance in the 6Cs Highway Design Code?

Should we include more detailed policy in the LAPP in relation to telecommunications: No - there is sufficient policy already (e.g. within the NPPF)