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

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.

The only areas of our village where we can build 250 green belt homes and not push our boundaries perilously close to the Nottingham conurbation is to the South or East. These should be the only areas considered.

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)   No
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)   No
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 - all 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)   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.

New housing on RUD1 and/or RUD2 would have a devastating visual impact at an attractive, green village gateway, totally blotting out the current "line of sight" rural view along the full length of Wilford Road from Dutton’s Hill north. It should be noted Wilford Road veers slightly to the right at this point, giving residents and visitors the lovely aspect of rising fields. Building here would completely eliminate any “village” feel at the northern end for virtually everyone.

Rushcliffe Borough Council also accepts that half the RUD1 site is in a flood zone – and we all know what disastrous consequences building on flood plains is having as our climate changes. The majority
of RUD1 was totally underwater for a couple of months just three years ago after heavy rainfall. I cannot even believe you’re considering this location for that reason alone!

Sellors' Recreation Ground should NOT be included in RUD1. Following inappropriate behind-closed-door conversations by Ruddington Parish Council with a speculative property developer about selling it to them, the covenant on Sellors' Playing Field – gifted to the village in perpetuity by Frederick Sellors – has now been upheld by his grandson Roger Sellors. He reiterates that his grandfather did not want this site to be used for any purpose other than recreation – and certainly never for housing. A suggested alternative playing field location by RPC and RBC is therefore not an option - and not wanted by local residents either. The strength of feeling among villagers has been shown by the formation of The Ruddington Community Association – a group of residents which has registered Sellors' playing field as an Asset of Community Value for our village. Therefore RPC selling this field should be taken out of the equation for good! This reduces the potential number of houses by around 30 to 40.

BUT, misleadingly, Rushcliffe Borough Council's recent exhibition document lists as a "strength" that building on RUD1 would “round off” an area of existing residential development. That's clearly most inaccurate. For this to be the case the northern boundary would have to be no further out than the far side of Sellors' Playing Field to match the line of properties at the OTHER side of Wilford Road. The ditch where it passes under the road is very much further along than that and so is NOT a realistic northern boundary - and it should never have been considered as such. You would need to "round off" on a new line from the top of Silk Gardens to the northern tree line of Sellors' Recreation Ground.

With this "acceptable" boundary we’re probably now down to around 60/70 houses on RUD1 – but what about the access? Without building a road over Sellors' Playing Field, any vehicle access would be via Camelot Street and Woodhouse Gardens! Even Wilford Road access would take traffic through a very congested part of Ruddington. Vehicles from the estate heading south would have to do so either through the village centre or along Clifton Road. Those going North would head over a start/stop tram crossing through housing estates on Ruddington Lane or via Compton Acres housing estate going the other way. Wilford Road is NOT a major road – but it DOES have the national speed limit – which is listed as a “weakness” for RUD5! So why not for RUD1?

RUD4 would seem to impact badly on the setting of historic Easthorpe House.

RUD5 is one of the locations closest to the village centre where I would favour housing development - causing minimal impact with good main road access. I believe land bordering it slightly further along Flawforth Lane and behind it should also be considered as there is already housing there which will minimize the visual impact - as it is not simply open green fields.

RUD6 would also seem suitable for the same reasons - being well to the village side of the Country Park/Industrial Estate roundabout and so not breaking the existing boundary.

RUD7 would be the most suitable new housing site of all - if access issues can be sorted to take its traffic on a boundary road rather than through the village centre. I'm sure by 2028 this could easily be solved. Then this area could accommodate all 250 required new homes with the least visual impact on the character of our village of any of the suggested sites. It is also walkable to the village centre and wonderfully located for the Country Park - which will serve as a natural, green boundary to further expansion.

RUD8 would further push village boundaries already stretched too far west by the new estates. It would also effectively join us to Clifton and further exacerbate the Clifton Road traffic nightmare! It should not even be considered.

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

- Ruddington: Yes
- Should we designate any further 'safeguarded land' within Rushcliffe?: No
Doyou 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**

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

**the Grantham Canal**  
Yes

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

**