

## Comment

<b>Consultee</b>	Mr Rich Dury (973135)
<b>Email Address</b>	
<b>Address</b>	68 Churchill drive Ruddington Nottingham NG11 6DG
<b>Event Name</b>	Local Plan Part 2: LAPP Issues and Options
<b>Comment by</b>	Mr Rich Dury
<b>Comment ID</b>	12
<b>Response Date</b>	3/22/16 10:55 PM
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.1

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

**To the east of the village** Yes

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 RUD4 – Easthorpe House and adjacent land (potential capacity around 15 homes)** Yes - all 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

**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.**

Development to the west Rud8 would have even more impact on the Clifton Road which is already seeing major developments over the last few years. This road and residents are already suffering major congestion and the idea of building potentially 350 houses even though our allocation is 250 is ludicrous. Surely East of the village on Flawforth would make sense as it would bypass village traffic congestion?

**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:**

**Ruddington** No

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

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