

## Comment

<b>Consultee</b>	Ms Mary Butler (980453)
<b>Email Address</b>	
<b>Address</b>	9 Roseland Close Keyworth Nottingham NG12 5LQ
<b>Event Name</b>	Local Plan Part 2: LAPP Issues and Options
<b>Comment by</b>	Ms Mary Butler
<b>Comment ID</b>	18
<b>Response Date</b>	3/24/16 3:36 PM
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	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.**

I principle I am not in favour of Green belt land being allocate for development untill much better use has been made of all brownfield sites even if in other boroughs / areas. land allocation needs a higher level overview. However until there is political will to do so and we are required to provide numbers that may or may not relate to "local" need then these seem as good as any.

**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.**

N/A to me as I have insufficient local knowledge to effectively comment

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

N/A to me as I have insufficient local knowledge to effectively comment

### ***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.**

Although the existing development on the old colliery is going to bring some regeneration etc it feels a little disjointed in its location. I think that Cotgrave given its location close to the dualled A46 might present the opportunity for RBC to do something bold and properly plan a much larger settlement, / small town (as it did with Keyworth in the 70's) with the necessary investment in schools infrastructure etc. Maybe even Park and ride Tram line? north of Cotgrave on A52. Don't discount the difficulty in bringing it all together. Incomers into a relatively affordable area could also have the effect of raising aspirations / opportunities of the existing whole village.

### ***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

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

I think that the existing "mess" developer led demand has created in East Leake needs a serious review to see how they ensure that corresponding infrastructure also happens whether that requires some additional land allocation I cannot comment and. No idea how you do this overview, Hopefully their neighbourhood plan will have some impact..

### ***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

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

The extensive work and consultations over many years done to produce the draft Neighbourhood plan has produced a reasonable outcome and a "least worst" option. That work alone should be reason to go with the recommendations in the local plan. I would suggest that going with the local plan and not reopening a can of worms with its inevitable detrimental effect on the public good of the people of Keyworth as a whole is probably a good planning reason!

Given Keyworth's location and the apparently unarguable fact that 450 homes is the figure we require to satisfy externally imposed demand (as opposed to the amount required to ensure Keyworth's sustainability - which is considerably lower) there is no good option.

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

N/A to me as I have insufficient local knowledge to effectively comment.

**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.**

N/A to me as I have insufficient local knowledge to effectively comment. Be great if you could find a magic way of making the A60 go underground so both sides could join up!!

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

I have insufficient local knowledge to effectively comment, however I am absolutely certain that no large scale development should happen in Ruddington that would impact on where the local roads are already unable to cope with existing traffic. So either improvements in roads needed (difficult for some areas) or direct access to main A60 / Wilford Road Clifton lane(maybe?)

**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.**

N/A unable to comment due to lack of local knowledge - except in as much as my comments about traffic and access to main roads

**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.**

not applicable in any great sense in Keyworth as apart from the school site - southwolds. (which certainly needs redeveloping) - but this should remain as a school and in the centre of the village.

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

**Please provide any comments in support of your response. If you answered NO, please could you identify which site(s) should be allocated for housing development.**

Clearly in favour of small allocations for affordable housing as already allowed. However I think that we should take a look at some of the smaller villages, eg Kinoulton (mentioned simply because I know it) that because of A46 are now accessible but because of shortage of reasonable amount of market houses at all levels are not likely to remain viable & sustainable as houses only become affordable to very affluent. So maybe a bit more of my bold masterplanning to create additional Key settlements for future.

**Please provide any comments in support of your response. If you answered YES, it would be helpful if you are able to identify which site(s) should be allocated for purely affordable housing development.**

Insufficient local knowledge.

**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

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

Absolutely. I have no idea why other than lobbying from vested interests that we seem to have relaxed building regs that would have eventually gone some way to creating the more readily availability and normalisation of "lifetime" homes that this county needs, but that many people don't appreciate until they individually need. Anything Rushcliffe can do to counteract this should be supported.

**Should the LAPP allocate any specific sites for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation?** Yes

**Please provide any comments in support of your response. If you answered YES, it would be helpful if you are able to identify which site(s) should be allocated.**

We are obliged to so we should and although I don't know the site but I assume that it will have been chosen to go some way to balancing the often polar opposite needs and views of the settled and traveller communities. The current mess of dealing with situations caused by lack of sites is not a good way forward.

**How should we specifically meet needs for custom and self-build housing across Rushcliffe?**

I think it would be good to see that on any large development site say above 50 homes? then a proportion of the land say 10% should be designated as available to create Self Build plots of the same percentage. so houses built will be in keeping with the average of the development. or could buy 2 if wanted a Grand design! The developer should be obliged to sell these plots off plan with access to services. If after a reasonable period - TBD - there are no takers (which I'm sure they would be - ordinary people and self build co-ops (not just grand designers) would like the choice of personalised homes or benefit of sweat equity.) then the developer could have plots revert to them to develop, Would need to work out some process mechanism to ensure that developers don't just price out interest.

**Please identify any matters related to housing development which are not covered here or elsewhere.**

Apologues for the numerous typos and misspells - I hope you can decipher my intentions. couldn't see a spell / grammar check on the system

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

**Keyworth** Yes

**Please provide any comments in support of your response.**

can only comment on Keyworth which seemed logical to my local knowledge

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

<b>Bradmore</b>	Yes
<b>Bunny</b>	Yes
<b>Cropwell Butler</b>	Yes
<b>Gotham</b>	Yes
<b>Newton</b>	Yes
<b>Plumtree</b>	Yes
<b>Shelford</b>	Yes
<b>Upper Saxondale</b>	Yes

**Please provide any comments in support of your response.**

seem to make objective sense

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

**Please provide comments in support of your response. If you answered YES, please could you identify which site(s) should be identified as 'safeguarded land'.**

I think that this safeguarded land seems like slightly less important greenbelt land! If however it will continue to enjoy all the protection of green belt until a full review with proper consultation of the Local plan then why not include them.

**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.**

We should allocate KeyD for employment and in principle all areas should have some designation so that we create sustainable communities not just dormattries

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

**Sites at Chapel Lane, Bingham** Yes

**Site at Hollygate Lane, Cotgrave** Yes

**Site at Hathern Works, Sutton Bonington** Yes

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

Bingham and cotgrave are both going to grow considerably removing their emoloyment land would be counterproductive to facilitating balanced growth. Sutton Bonnington may be another of those villages (like Kinoulton) that should grow to become a Key future settlement depending on road infrastructure.so dont remve this land till then.

**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

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

If the new Bunny proposals are actually a mixed proosal with some housing then assuming reasonable proportion that might be sensible so that employment comes with local live oportunity

**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

**Please provide comments in support of your response. If you answered NO, it would be helpful to identify what alternative approach you think we should take.**

EMP4 seems like a good way of retaining some control assuming that its test is rigerous not just a tick box than can be got around by craftly developers

**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 and whether any land should be allocated to allow for the expansion of any of the sites.**

dont have suffcient technical knowldge to know if Core policy 4 is good enough. I do know that these centres of excellence should be encouraged and mabe there are more are yet not known about with new technologies in area.They are our future. So I'm supportve of creating whatever policy encourages this.

**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.**

The principle is agreed with, assuming not back door to just more "Rural houses" but no economic activity. but dont know if you need greater detail in policy

**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:**

Keyworth (The Square) Local Centre Yes

Keyworth (Wolds Drive) Local Centre No

**Please provide comments to support your answers. If you answered NO for any one of the centres, we would be interested to know what alternations you think should be made.**

Keyworth Wolds should have existing budgens shop allocated as primary frontage and the pub - Keyworth Tavern - should have some designation - secondary?? if covers pubs to ensure that it remains as community asset.

**Do you have any comments to make on what the approach should be towards the proportion of A1 (shops) uses and non-A1 uses within the primary shopping areas of District and Local Centres?**

probably in favour of local plans deciding local taylored plans, they are likely to have best knowledge assuming not just lov=bied by big business. I think that primary frontages should have less flexibility in allowing non shop - class1

**Please provide any comments you wish to make in support of response. If you answered YES, we would be interested to know which land should be allocated, what for and why?**

not read study - so cannot really comment.

**Should we set a local threshold requiring an impact assessment for all retail proposals with a** Yes

**gross floorspace of 500m2 or more across the whole of Rushcliffe?**

**Please provide any comments you wish to make to support your response. If you answered NO, we would be interested to know what you think the locally set threshold should be.**

500m2 feels about right to have impact on wider area so not unreasonable for developments to have to do such a study.2500 is far too high particularly as shops move towards being "showrooms" for delivery warehouses (sited elsewhere) so will become generally smaller but with the same impact as existing big stock holding shops.

**Please make any comments you have about what should be included in the LAPP in respect of the landscape character, including whether there are any areas of locally valued landscape requiring additional protection.**

Long Views, River trent. not sure named need to be in LAAP but the method and policy for creting a "register" should be.

**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

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

If it were possible to objectively identify them yes.Otherwise I thnk we should leave it to individual planning applications.

**Should we introduce further policy in the LAPP on how development should contribute to reducing carbon dioxide emissions?**

Yes

**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.**

anythingng you can do to reintroduce building standards that were gradually improving the energy effency of home shuld be included.

**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?** Yes

**Please provide any information in support of your response.**

would be good to see anything in plan that would put pressure on Severn trent etc in existing areas to look at introducing ponds etc by road ditches to reduce existing quantities of water going to drains.

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

<b>Parks and Country Parks</b>	Yes
<b>School playing fields</b>	Yes
<b>Allotments</b>	Yes
<b>Sports pitches</b>	Yes
<b>Amenity space (e.g. open space)</b>	Yes
<b>Golf courses</b>	Yes
<b>Designated and non-designated nature conservation sites</b>	Yes
<b>Flood alleviation areas</b>	Yes
<b>Other (please specify which)</b>	Yes

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

They all seem sensible principles. Ideally inclusion of some of the unofficial snow recreation sites such as "bunker hill" in keyworth. although as private land on which trespass is tolerated no idea how you would do this but they are definately commuity green (or white) assets

**Please make any comments you have about what the LAPP should include in respect of open space, sports or recreation space standards.**

Whatever the test it needs to be very high to ensure that the maximum protection of sports and recreation land exists.

**Other issues**

**Please identify any matters related to Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity and recreation space which are not covered here or elsewhere.**

We need to include policies that recognise the value of village hedgerows as important biodiversity corridors and encourage their retention development.

**Should we allocate any new sites for cultural, tourism or sports 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 development.**

The areas of open spaces / community parks that developers have proposed in Keyworth Neighbourhood plan development sites that will benefit the village as a whole need to be formally identified as such and not left to the vagaries of the developers for their management and future.

**Should the LAPP also include policy to safeguard the following locations from development which would prejudice the ecological, recreational, tourism and commercial potential?**

the River Trent	Yes
the River Soar	Yes
the Grantham Canal	Yes
the Great Central Railway	Yes
any other location (please specify which)	Yes

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

too technical for me!

<b>Should we include more detailed policy in the LAPP in relation to the noise pollution:</b>	Yes - further detailed policy is required
---	---

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

I think we need to include something in plan about East Mids Airport the approaches to which cover large areas of Rushcliffe. Their activities are tolerable at present but as one of the few airports with no night time flying restrictions this is a potential future issue.

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

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

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

**Other issues**

**Please identify any matters related to telecommunications which are not covered here or elsewhere.**

anything that encourages cooperation between suppliers not proliferation of equipment supported.

**Please identify any topics or issues which you consider need to be covered by the LAPP which are not addressed elsewhere in this document.**

sorry not answered all questions and apologizing typos etc. good luck in creating

## Comment

<b>Consultee</b>	Ms Mary Butler (980453)
<b>Email Address</b>	
<b>Address</b>	9 Roseland Close Keyworth Nottingham NG12 5LQ
<b>Event Name</b>	Draft Part 2 (b) Green Belt Review
<b>Comment by</b>	Ms Mary Butler
<b>Comment ID</b>	8
<b>Response Date</b>	3/24/16 3:55 PM
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.1
<b>Files</b>	Ditch To Eastern Edge of Key 10.jpg 2016-02-29 10.51.03.jpg

**6. Green Belt Review Part 2 (b): Key Settlement Review. Do you agree or disagree with the assessment of Green Belt land around Rushcliffe's Key Settlements against the purposes for including land within the Green Belt (pages 44 to 148 of the review)? If you disagree, state why the assessment is incorrect and provide your Green Belt score and conclusions on Green Belt importance. Your comment should focus on the land's performance against Green Belt purposes.**

Disagree with assesment on Key 10. score should be 17 as Key 9.as considered as one.

As per my discussions with youseves at the Keyworth Exebition this area should be considered jointly with Key 9 and not as a seperate entity. They are fields with the Buildings of Hillside Farm at their centre where they meet and and the " main and substantial adjoining Barns" are aparently devideable one being located in Key 9 and one in Key 10. This farm shoould ideally be encouraged to be reunited by this sgreenbelt review. The farmhouse of Hillside farm (located in Key 10 having had its agricultural restriction nappropriatly removed) and not further devided.

First of all, an appology. I indicated on the evening that there was no hedging at the western Boundary to Key 10. Subsequently I took a walk down and was incorrect - time has flown and some areas towards the south of the devide between the two does have some single planting hawthorn growth. What the actual purpose of this planing is one can only speculate! since its apearence the field (Key 10) has not been used for grazing livestock and the meadow grass that was there before has been ploughed up and despite being a slopeing site has been used to grow a maize crop.

However the idea that this devision between Key 9 & 10 constitutes a defensible boundary " to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment" is very weak and in any case insubstantial as a defensible when compared to the existing Western boundary to Keyworth (Eastern Boundary to Key 10) As explained on Feb 15th it is one of the few remaining substantial runs of enclosure hedging, running alongside as it does a wide and deep water ditch (up to 6/8 feet below the level of adjoining

gardens alongside a post and rail fence and a second recently planted hawthorn hedge (inside Key10) Incidentally the ditch in question carries a large amount of surface water from Bunny lane and above (as well as drainage system overflow at times of heavy rain) For these reasons Severn Trent will not allow the ditch to be piped so its presence is permanent. This structure also acts a wildlife home and corridor being the route of Bats, foxes grass snakes interesting newts and numerous small vertebrates and invertebrates. so is of immense value in ecological terms as well as safeguarding against encroachment. - see photos

The reasons that the areas Key 9 & 10 should be considered as 1 are:-

When one looks closely at the boundary a substantial amount of it is not the post and rail fence / new hedge but runs directly through farm buildings that are essentially attached to each other.

The previously mentioned barns. One substantial corrugated steel barn (side on) will occupy a large area of the boundary, being a bad neighbour in itself (as used as it is for cows and grain drying) it will be difficult to resist its future development and incorporation)

The field of Key 9 which is also currently not well kept - farmed by owner of Key 11. whose existing very bad neighbour buildings- GreenHays farm on Bunny lane will disappear so even more bad neighbour activity will appear in Key 9 and so encourage willingness to allow development.

Bad neighbour - The existing buildings off Greenhays farm - Bunny lane Key 11 farm will disappear under the designations in Draft Neighbourhood plan. So hard to defend against further development of housing on Key 9 to provide farmhouse etc for occupant. It has already been subject of applications for creation of new farm house for Mr N. Daville (who farms Key 8,9,11,15, and others)

Hope this makes sense and sufficient reason why these two sites Key 9 & 10 should be considered together. and that pictures are understandable do come back if need more explanation. I think there may be an erroneous picture there but can't seem to find way to edit them!

**8. If you wish to upload any supporting information, image, maps or diagrams you can do so here.**

Ditch To Eastern Edge of Key 10.jpg





MARY BUTLER. mary-butler@  
 9 ROSELAND CLOSE lineone.net  
 NG12 5LQ 9374377 GB 980453  
 - Also Limehouse self service submission

Site Name	Hillside Farm, Bunny Lane	
Green Belt Site Reference	KEY10	
SHLAA Reference	434	
Strategic Green Belt Area	Keyworth West	
Green Belt Purpose	Score	Justification
Check unrestricted sprawl of settlements	3	The site shares one boundary with Keyworth but is well contained between Hillside Farm and Keyworth. Hedgerows to the south provide strong boundaries to the south and west. <u>No strong boundary to west.</u>
Prevent merging of settlements	1	The removal of this land would result in only a minor reduction in the distance between Keyworth and Bunny.
Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment	3	Whilst inappropriate development has not encroached, the proximity and visibility of Keyworth's settlement edge is an overriding feature within the site.
Preserve setting and special character of historic settlement	1	The site does not contain or form the setting of a heritage feature. <u>Existing boundaries and few remaining hedges to outlay</u>
Assist in urban regeneration	3	There are no specific urban regeneration projects within Keyworth.
<b>Green Belt Score</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>Low-medium</b>
Strategic Green Belt Assessment (score/importance)	14 Low-Medium	

### Conclusions

- 4.143 Located between KEY9 and the edge of Keyworth, overall this site scored less than its neighbouring Green Belt site due to its physical connection to Keyworth, its smaller size, the minor merging with Bunny, and robust boundaries which would contain development.
- 4.144 As with KEY8, the site's topography would increase its prominence when viewed from the west and the perception of settlement intruding beyond the ridge on which Keyworth is located.
- 4.145 The site scored 11 against Green Belt purposes, this reflects the overall conclusion that the site is of **low-medium Green Belt importance**.