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Introduction


2. The timeline of the main production stages for the plan is set out in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation</th>
<th>Stage/Document</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of local and national policy, including Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy housing targets and distribution, and identification of main policy issues and site options. Consideration of supporting evidence.</td>
<td>Local Plan Part 2: Issues and Options Paper January 2016 (between 29/1/16 and 24/3/16)</td>
<td>Paper which set out issues for Part 2 of the Local Plan to address and a range of options along with questions on those options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As above and consideration of consultation responses, review of housing delivery and preparation of Further Options consultation.</td>
<td>Local Plan Part 2: Further Options February 2017 (between 17/2/17 and 31/3/17)</td>
<td>Paper outlined additional settlements where new homes may be suitable - in order to meet housing needs (as set out in the Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As above and consideration of responses to Further Options consultation and identification of preferred housing sites.</td>
<td>Local Plan Part 2: Preferred Housing Sites October 2017 (between 9/10/17 and 27/11/17)</td>
<td>Paper identified the Council’s preferred housing sites at the time of the consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As above and consideration of responses to Preferred Housing Sites consultation.</td>
<td>Local Plan Part 2 Publication Version Due May 2018</td>
<td>Draft Local Plan Part 2 identifies: 1. sites on the edge of a number of Rushcliffe’s settlements which are required to help deliver the Local Plan Part 1:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Preparation | Stage/Document | Content
--- | --- | ---
 |  | Core Strategy’s housing target; and 2. development management policies. |
Submission of Local Plan Part 2 (publication draft) for public examination, along with all representations received objecting to or supporting the plan and all supporting evidence (including this document). | **Local Plan Part 2 Submission**  
Due Summer 2019 | Draft Local Plan Part 2 identifies:  
1. sites on the edge of a number of Rushcliffe’s settlements which are required to help deliver the Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy’s housing target; and 2. development management policies. |

3. As required by regulation 22 (c)(i-iv) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended), this report outlines how: consultation was undertaken; the main issues raised, the Council’s response to these issues and changes made to the plan (Appendix B); and the bodies and persons that were invited to make representations during the consultation periods (Appendix A).

4. In addition to publicising all three consultations within the local media, making the document available at Council offices and libraries and informing all consultees whose details are held within the Local Plan consultation database, Rushcliffe Borough Council also held public exhibitions within those settlements where development was proposed. In order to encourage public involvement and gain a clearer understanding of public opinion, these exhibitions included participation exercises.

5. This report contains detailed summarises of the responses made during these exhibitions and those submitted in writing by email, letter or through the Council’s consultation website (see Appendix C, D, E, F, G and H).

### Issues and Options consultation – January to March 2016

6. In total, 397 individual and organisations responded to the Issues and Options and the associated Green Belt Review consultations. These representations
were received online, by email, by post and through comments on exhibition leaflets.

7. We received representations from the following town and parish councils/meetings: Aslockton, Barton in Fabis, Bunny, Bingham, Bradmore, East Leake, Elton, Flintham, Kinoulton, Orston, Gotham, Radcliffe on Trent, Ruddington, and Tollerton.

8. Representations were also received from Keyworth and Radcliffe on Trent Neighbourhood Plan Steering Groups.


10. In addition to statutory consultees, representations were received from a variety of local interest groups, and representatives from the development industry (including House Builders Federations, landowners and their agents).

11. A significant number of residents made representations, particularly those who live within East Leake, Keyworth, Radcliffe on Trent, and Ruddington. These are Key Settlements where additional development is required to deliver targets in the adopted Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy. The holding of public exhibitions within these settlements and the use of leaflet responses increased the representations within these settlements.

12. A complete summary of all responses submitted to the Council can be found within Appendix C and a summary of exhibition responses can be found within Appendix D. The list of bodies and persons who were invited to make representations is in Appendix A.

Further Options consultation – February/March 2017

13. In total, 1,322 individuals and organisations responded to the Further Options and associated Green Belt Review consultations. These representations were received online, by email, by post and through comments on exhibition leaflets.

14. The Council received representations from the following town and parish councils/meetings: Aslockton; Barton in Fabis; Bradmore; Bunny; Costock; Cropwell Bishop; Cropwell Butler; East Bridgford; East Leake Parish Council; Elton; Gotham; Holme Pierrepont and Gamston; Keyworth; Normanton on Soar;
Normanton on the Wolds; Orston; Radcliffe on Trent; Rempston; Ruddington; Shelford; Sutton Bonington; Tithby and Wiverton; and Tollerton


16. In addition to statutory consultees, representations were received from a variety of local and national interest groups, and representatives from the development industry (including House Builders Federations, landowners and their agents).

17. A significant number of residents made representations, particularly those who live within Adbolton/West Bridgford (85), Cotgrave (115), Cropwell Bishop (125), East Bridgford (75), Gotham (85), East Leake (300), Keyworth (75) and Tollerton (225). The holding of public exhibitions within these settlements and the use of leaflet responses increased the representations within these settlements. East Leake Parish Council held an independent public event and produced its own leaflet.

18. A complete summary of all responses submitted to the Council can be found within Appendix E and summary of exhibition responses can be found within Appendix F. The list of bodies and persons who were invited to make representations is in Appendix A.

Preferred Housing Sites consultation – October/November 2017

19. In total, 1,584 individuals and organisations responded to the Preferred Housing Sites Consultation. These comments were received online, by email, by post and through comments on exhibition leaflets.

20. The Council received comments from the following town and parish councils/meetings: Aslockton; Bradmore; Bunny; Costock; Cropwell Bishop; East Bridgford; East Leake; Elton; Gotham; Hawksworth; Holme Pierrepont and Gamston; Keyworth; Langar cum Barnstone; Normanton on the Wolds; Plumtree; Radcliffe on Trent; Rempston; Ruddington; and Sutton Bonington.

21. Comments were also received from the following statutory consultees: Environment Agency, Highways England, Historic England, Natural England, Rushcliffe Borough Council (as a landowner of a preferred allocation), Nottinghamshire County Council, Melton Borough Council, and Sports England.
22. In addition to statutory consultees, comments were received from a variety of local and national interest groups, and representatives from the development industry (including landowners, house builders and their agents).

23. A significant number of residents made representations, particularly those who live within Cotgrave (95), Cropwell Bishop (68), East Bridgford (68), Gotham (49), East Leake (20), Keyworth (195), Radcliffe-on-Trent (101) and Ruddington (833). The holding of public exhibitions within these settlements and the use of leaflet responses (with the exception of East Leake) increased the representations within these settlements. Representations from residents within Ruddington were significantly increased by two pro-forma letters, one which objected to the scale of development and another specifically opposing the allocation of site RUD11 (Old Loughborough Road, Ruddington).

24. A complete summary of all responses submitted to the Council can be found within Appendix G and summary of exhibition responses can be found within Appendix H. The list of bodies and persons who were invited to make representations is in Appendix A.

**Main issues raised and the Borough Council’s responses**

25. In accordance with Regulation 22 (c)(iii) of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended), this document also contains a summary of the main issues raised during the consultations, the Council’s response and subsequent changes to the plan.

26. These issues and the Council’s response are set out in Appendix B.
Appendix A: Bodies and individuals invited to make representations

Specific consultation/duty to co-operate bodies

Adjoining and nearby Local Planning Authorities


Town/Parish Councils or Meetings:


Adjacent Town/Parish Councils or Meetings:

National and Local Organisations/Authorities


General consultation bodies

In addition to statutory consultees above, general consultees including the following organisations were consulted:

- Local conservation, heritage, amenity and interest groups (including Canal and River Trust, East Notts Travellers Association, Rushcliffe Business Partnership, Rushcliffe Community Voluntary Service);
- Environmental bodies (including CPRE, RSPB, Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group); and
- Home Builders Federation.

Residents or other persons carrying on business in Rushcliffe

All individuals and organisations on Rushcliffe Borough Council’s consultation database (including local residents, landowners and their representatives, and the development industry).
### Appendix B: Main issues raised and the Borough Council’s responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan Matter</th>
<th>Main Issue</th>
<th>Summary of Borough Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Development adjacent to the Main Urban Area</td>
<td>It is important to maintain the separation between the Main Urban Area and outlying settlements.</td>
<td>No additional allocations are identified within Local Plan 2 on the edge of the Main Urban Area as this would comprise extensions to existing strategic allocations which have not delivered housing as expected in the Core Strategy (and resulted in the need to allocate additional sites). Expanding strategic allocations would not lead to more homes being built over the next few years than is already due to be delivered. Any extra homes would be built further into the future at the very end of the development of these sites, thereby having no impact at all on the immediate housing shortfall situation. There are further limitations on the edge of Nottingham due to flood zones, accessibility, and merging (which is contrary to Green Belt policy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development should be focused within and on the edge of the Main Urban Area as these are most sustainable locations and comply with Core Strategy policy 3. This was supported by landowners (promoting their sites on the edge of the MUA) and residents of outlying settlements where development is proposed.</td>
<td>See response above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No further land should be allocated at Sharphill.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Plan 2 does not allocate any additional land at Sharphill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land north of Nottingham Knight Roundabout.</td>
<td>Land should be allocated as a housing site in Local Plan 2</td>
<td>Site cannot be accessed off the A60 or A52. The land is not allocated for housing in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land west of Edwalton Strategic Urban Extension</td>
<td>Land should be allocated as a housing site in Local Plan 2 as it would provide retirement accommodation and meet this housing need.</td>
<td>This would comprise an extension to an existing strategic allocation, which although now delivering homes has been delayed. The allocation of this land and its development would reduce the distance between Nottingham with Ruddington and increase the perception of merging. The removal of this area of land from the Green Belt for the purposes of development was previously considered during preparation of the Core Strategy and rejected at that stage. The land is not allocated for housing in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land south of Gamston/Tollerton Strategic Urban Extension</td>
<td>Land should be allocated for 500 homes in Local Plan 2.</td>
<td>This would comprise an extension to an existing strategic allocation which has not delivered housing as expected in the Core Strategy (and resulted in the need to allocate additional sites). Enlarging this allocation would not contribute to meeting the housing needs within the plan period. It would also further reduce the distance between the urban edge of Nottingham (formed by the strategic allocation) and Tollerton. The removal of this areas of land from the Green Belt for the purposes of development was previously considered during preparation of the Core Strategy and rejected at that stage. The land is not allocated for housing in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land north of Gamston/Tollerton</td>
<td>Land should be allocated for 2,000 to 2,500 homes in Local Plan 2.</td>
<td>This would comprise an extension to an existing strategic allocation which has not delivered housing as expected in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Urban Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td>Core Strategy (and resulted in the need to allocate additional sites). Enlarging this allocation would not contribute to meeting the housing needs within the plan period. It would also merge Nottingham with Bassingfield. The removal of this areas of land from the Green Belt for the purposes of development was previously considered during preparation of the Core Strategy and rejected at that stage. The land is not allocated for housing in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willowbrook Farm, A52</td>
<td>Site warrants a positive planning approach to avoid further dereliction. Provides opportunity for 7-8 dwellings.</td>
<td>Site is isolated within the Green Belt, where removal of individual parcels of land would not comply with Green Belt purposes. The site is also within Flood Zone 2 and 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Sites within the Main Urban Area</td>
<td>Sites at Abbey Road, former Central College, Wilford Lane, and Lady Bay Bridge should be allocated.</td>
<td>As three of these sites have planning permission and are located within the Main Urban Area they do not require allocating for development. The site at Abbey Lane is not allocated as its development would comply with existing planning policies and no further policy guidance is required. Site allocation would need to be supported by a site specific flood risk assessment which is not available at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abbey Road site is within flood zones 2 and 3 and therefore requires a sequential test.</td>
<td>See above. A flood risk sequential test must inform any subsequent planning application decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More brownfield sites should be allocated.</td>
<td>Brownfield sites within the Main Urban Area are policy compliant in principle and do not require allocating. Deliverable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan Matter</th>
<th>Main Issue</th>
<th>Summary of Borough Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>brownfield sites are identified within the brownfield register and where included as part of the Borough’s housing delivery when determining the amount of greenfield land that would also need to be allocated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing Development at Bingham**

**Bingham**

- No further greenfield sites should be allocated on the edge of Bingham.

- School capacity is an issue due to delays in the delivery of the new school within the strategic allocation.

- However good transport links and less flooding issues were highlighted as positives which could enable more housing.

- Bingham is constrained by the A52 and A46 to the west and south, whilst land to the north is already allocated for housing development within the Core Strategy. Expanding the site would not lead to any more homes being built on it over the next few years than are already due to be delivered. Any extra homes would be built further into the future at the very end of the site’s development, thereby having no impact at all on the more immediate housing supply shortfall. Consequently, Local Plan 2 does not identify additional allocations on the edge of Bingham.

**Housing Development at Cotgrave**

**Cotgrave**

- No further greenfield sites should be allocated on the edge of Cotgrave as infrastructure, services and facilities are at capacity (especially the schools and medical centre).

- The regeneration of the town centre has been scaled back and is not sufficient to meet the needs Cotgrave is a Key Settlement within the Core Strategy with a range of services and facilities. It is considered that Cotgrave’s educational and medical facilities, and local highway network could, with financial contributions towards their improvements, accommodate around 370 homes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan Matter</th>
<th>Main Issue</th>
<th>Summary of Borough Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of existing and additional residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Green Belt Review has informed site selection and the allocations within Local Plan 2 are all considered low or low/medium Green Belt importance. The need to deliver the Core Strategy’s housing target and the absence of more sustainable alternatives (either brownfield or greenfield beyond the Green Belt) are exceptional circumstances for the release of Green Belt on the edge of Cotgrave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT01 (Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park)</td>
<td>Sustainably located, close to the centre of the village. However possible archaeological remains, surface water run-off, overlooking of neighbours, rotation slip of colliery waste, and proximity to the Canal (flood zone 3, heritage, recreational and ecological asset) and Country Park (recreational and ecological asset) are issues.</td>
<td>COT01 is allocated within Policy 2.1 of Local Plan 2 for 180 new homes. Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria. Due to likely archaeological remains sufficient open spaces free of development are likely to be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site could deliver more than 170 homes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT02 (Land at Main Road)</td>
<td>Within walking distance of the town centre, however site extends ribbon development into open countryside on Main Road.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable. COT02 has not been allocated within Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT03 (Land rear west of Main Road)</td>
<td>Sustainably located close to the centre of the village. However development would affect the setting of the historic core of the village which contains listed and local interest buildings.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable. COT03 has not been allocated within Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT04 (Land of Woodgate Lane)</td>
<td>Site is only accessible by an unadopted private road, and therefore its delivery is uncertain. It extends into the open countryside.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable. COT04 has not been allocated within Local Plan 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT05 (Bakers Hollow)</td>
<td>Site is well contained by development.</td>
<td>COT05 has not been allocated as it is not as well located as those either side of Hollygate Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT06 (The Brickyard)</td>
<td>Site is further from the centre of the village than other potential allocations. Brick Kilns and shooting range are locally important heritage assets.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable. COT06 has not been allocated within Local Plan 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT07 (Land behind Firdale(2))</td>
<td>Site extends into the Green Belt countryside. However the landowner suggests that it could provide land for a new school.</td>
<td>COT07 is not as well contained as allocations off Hollygate Lane and development would extend along Colston Gate into open countryside. Landscape and visual impacts increased due to sloping topography. Consequently it has not been allocated within Local Plan 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT08 (Land behind Firdale)</td>
<td>Site extends into the Green Belt countryside.</td>
<td>COT08 is not as well contained as allocations off Hollygate Lane and has not been allocated within Local Plan 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT09 (Land South of Hollygate Lane (1))</td>
<td>Although the site is well contained by development and close to the village centre, the junctions of Hollygate Lane and Colston Gate, and Hollygate Park and Stragglethorpe Road are congested. Accidents have also been recorded at the Stragglethorpe Road junction. Archaeological remains may be present.</td>
<td>COT09 has been allocated within Policy 2.2 of Local Plan 2. Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria. Allocation with neighbouring sites offers opportunity to improve the local highway network and increase safety through the creation of a link road between Hollygate Lane and Colston Gate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT10 (Land)</td>
<td>Although the site is well contained by development</td>
<td>COT10 has been allocated within Policy 2.2 of Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Hollygate Lane (2))</td>
<td>and close to the village centre, the junctions of Hollygate Lane and Colston Gate, and Hollygate Park and Stragglethorpe Road are congested. Accidents have also been recorded at latter junction. Archaeological remains may be present.</td>
<td>Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria. The allocation of this land with COT09 and CO911a offers opportunity to improve the local highway network and increase safety through the creation of a link road between Hollygate Lane and Colston Gate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT11a (Land South of Hollygate Lane (3))</td>
<td>Similar to COT09 and COT10 however surface water flooding, proximity to the Canal and the site’s extensions further into the Green Belt Countryside are the main issues.</td>
<td>COT11a has been allocated within Policy 2.2 of the Local Plan 2. Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria. Land adjacent to the Canal has not been allocated as it extends into the Green Belt Countryside and it would impact on the setting of the Canal which provides recreational, biodiversity and heritage benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT11b (Land South of Hollygate Lane (3a))</td>
<td>Site extends into the Green Belt countryside and would affect the rural setting of the canal a heritage and nature conservation asset.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable. COT11b has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT12 (Land South of Plumtree Lane)</td>
<td>Distance from the village, congestion on Plumtree Road and the open aspect of the land are highlighted as issues.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable. COT12 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT13 (Land South of Gozen Lodge)</td>
<td>No consultation responses (site submitted at Further Issues and Options and not selected as preferred option)</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable. COT13 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT14 (Land East of Hollygate Lane)</td>
<td>No consultation responses (site submitted at Further Issues and Options and not selected as preferred option)</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable. COT14 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Development at East Leake</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Leake</strong></td>
<td>No further greenfield sites should be allocated on the edge of East Leake due to infrastructure constraints (schools, medical centre, roads, drainage and sewage) and its unsustainable location compared to settlements closer to Nottingham (whose need is being met with Local Plan 2).</td>
<td>East Leake has nine sites with planning permission and these total more than 1000 homes. This is 600 dwellings more than the Local Plan minimum target. Therefore Local Plan 2 does not identify additional allocations on the edge of East Leake apart from one site (allocated within Policy 3 of Local Plan 2) which has outline planning permission for 235 homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conversely, East Leake’s designation as a Key Settlement with a minimum target which is unconstrained by Green Belt should facilitate more development.</td>
<td>Whilst the target is a minimum, the exceedance of the target by more than 100% and the unsustainable distribution of development resulting from development jumping the Green Belt mean no further allocations (beyond those with planning permission outside the settlement) are allocated. Further allocations would put at risk the Local Plan’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 and assimilate additional housing at this time and the affect that any further development would have on the character of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Development at Keyworth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Keyworth</strong></td>
<td>As identified within the Core Strategy, allocations should deliver no more than 450 homes. Village is constrained by inadequate road infrastructure and the capacity of local services and facilities.</td>
<td>Core Strategy sets a minimum target of 450. In order to address the slower than expected delivery of the strategic allocations and meet the Boroughs housing target for the plan period, Local Plan 2 has identified sites that will deliver around 600 homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Keyworth is a Key Settlement with a range of services and facilities (school capacity should not be a constraint as pupils could attend schools elsewhere) and bus services. Therefore Local Plan 2 should allocate sites for more than 450 homes. It should have similar growth to Bingham and East Leake which have/will increase by 30%.</td>
<td>Keyworth is a Key Settlement within the Core Strategy with a range of services and facilities. It is expected that Local Plan 2 will allocate a reasonable level of new housing development at this Key Settlement. It is considered that Keyworth’s educational and medical facilities, and local highway network could, with financial contributions towards their improvements where necessary, accommodate around 600 homes. NHS England advises that the medical centre could accommodate this number of new residents. It is also judged that, given the existing size of the town which has around 3,000 dwellings, 600 new homes should be able to be assimilated as part of Keyworth without unduly affecting the town’s character or local amenity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The preferred Neighbourhood Plan housing sites should be allocated within Local Plan 2.</td>
<td>The housing allocations promoted within the Neighbourhood Plan (plus an addition site adjacent to Hillside Farm off Bunny Lane (KEY13)) have been allocated within Local Plan 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY01 (Land East of Willow Brook)</td>
<td>Increased merging of Stanton on the Wolds and Keyworth, congestion during school drop off and pick up and surface water flooding were identified as the main issues.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable. KEY01 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY02 (Land off Selby Land and Willow Brook)</td>
<td>Increased merging of Stanton on the Wolds and Keyworth was the main issue highlighted.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable. KEY02 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY03 (Land south of Selby Lane)</td>
<td>Increased merging of Stanton on the Wolds and Keyworth was highlighted as the main concern.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable. KEY02 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2 due to landscape and Green Belt concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY04a (Land off Nicker Hill (1))</td>
<td>Main issues regarding this site comprised the site’s distance from the village centre, loss of Green Belt countryside, poor public transport services, and impacts on the landscape and neighbouring local wildlife site. Nearby residential occupation should not restrict the activities of the British Geological Survey.</td>
<td>KEY04a has been allocated within Policy 4.1 of Local Plan 2. Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria. Site is within walking distance of Wold’s Drive shopping area and the village centre. Mitigation includes a landscape buffer to reduce disturbance of residents by the British Geological Site’s activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY04b (Land of Nicker Hill (2))</td>
<td>Main issues regarding this site comprised the site’s distance from the village centre and loss of Green Belt countryside.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable. KEY04b has not been allocated in Local Plan 2 due to landscape and Green Belt concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY05 (Hill Top Farm (1))</td>
<td>Main issues regarding this site comprised the site’s distance from the village centre, visual intrusion and suitability of Platt Lane for additional traffic. Site is identified as a possible employment allocation within the draft neighbourhood plan.</td>
<td>Site is allocated for employment within Local Plan 2. It is agreed that its location makes it less suitable for housing development than sites selected for housing allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY06 (Hill Top Farm (2))</td>
<td>Main issues regarding this site comprised the site’s distance from the village centre, visual intrusion and suitability of Platt Lane for additional traffic.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable. KEY06 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2 due to landscape and Green Belt concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KEY07 (Shelton Farm)</strong></td>
<td>Main issues regarding this site comprised the site’s distance from the village centre, visual intrusion and suitability of Platt Lane for additional traffic.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable. KEY07 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2 due to landscape and Green Belt concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KEY08 (Platt Lane and Station Road)</strong></td>
<td>Main issues regarding this site comprised the proximity of the site to neighbouring sports pitches and prevention of this facilities expansion, its distance from the centre of the village, increased congestion and access onto Station Road and Platt Lane, loss of Green Belt countryside/agricultural land and landscape and visual impacts.</td>
<td>KEY08 has been allocated within Policy 4.2 of Local Plan 2. Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KEY09 (North Of Debdale Lane)</strong></td>
<td>Access along Debdale Lane is too narrow.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable and there is no requirement to allocate KEY09. KEY09 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KEY10 (South of Debdale Lane)</strong></td>
<td>Loss of Green Belt, the elevation of the site and impacts on landscape, increased congestion on Bunny Lane and unsafe access were highlighted as the main issues. Hedgerows and trees should be maintained and connectivity enhanced.</td>
<td>KEY10 has been allocated within Policy 4.3 of Local Plan 2. Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KEY11 (Land south of Debdale Lane (2))</strong></td>
<td>Loss of Green Belt, the elevation of the site and impacts on landscape and unsafe access onto Bunny Lane were highlighted as the main issues.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable and there is no requirement to allocate KEY11. KEY11 intrudes unduly into the Green Belt countryside and has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY12 (North of Debdale Lane (2))</td>
<td>Access along Debdale Lane is too narrow and the site is too far from the centre of the village.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable. KEY12 intrudes into the Green Belt countryside and has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY13 (Hillside Farm)</td>
<td>Increased congestion, loss of Green belt countryside, unsafe access onto Bunny Lane, odour from the farm and sewage treatment works, and landscape issues were highlighted as a main issue. Site is not identified as a possible housing site in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.</td>
<td>Although this site is not identified within the emerging Neighbourhood Plan as a preferred allocation, KEY13 has been allocated within policy 4.4 of Local Plan 2. Main issues of constraint have been ruled out of recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY14 (Land South of Bunny Lane)</td>
<td>Containing land adjacent to Wysall Lane, this larger site may impact on the setting of the Conservation Area. Land on the opposite side is adjacent to a Sewage Treatment Works.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable and there is no requirement to allocate KEY14. KEY14 intrudes significantly into the Green Belt countryside and has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing Development at Radcliffe on Trent**

**Housing target for Radcliffe on Trent**
As identified within the Core Strategy, allocations should deliver no more than 400 homes. This figure was determined according to the levels of existing infrastructure. Additional housing will require a new primary school and medical centre, improved leisure facilities, waste water treatment, roads and public transport.
Core Strategy sets a minimum target of 400. In order to address the slower than expected delivery of the strategic allocations and meet the Borough’s housing target for the plan period, Local Plan 2 has identified sites on the edge of Radcliffe on Trent that will deliver 920 homes. To generate the pupil numbers required to sustain a new primary school and to also generate sufficient developer contributions to cover the costs of a new school will require the delivery of upwards of 1,000 new homes. The allocation of land south of Shelford...
### Local Plan Matter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan Matter</th>
<th>Main Issue</th>
<th>Summary of Borough Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Road</strong> will provide land for a new primary school and medical centre.</td>
<td>Radcliffe on Trent is a Key Settlement with a range of services and facilities, including bus and rail services. Therefore Local Plan 2 should allocate sites for more than 450 homes.</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RAD01 (Land north of Nottingham Road)</strong></td>
<td>RAD01 is within flood zone 2 and a limited area is within flood zone 3. National grid pylons also cross the site. Location provides opportunity for a mixed use development. Site is adjacent to and therefore may adversely affect the disused railway line nature corridor and Cotgrave Forest Focus Area (part of the Borough’s ecological network).</td>
<td>RAD01 is allocated within Policy 5.1 for mix use development (residential and employment). Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria. Sequential Test establishes that no reasonable site exists for this mixed use development allocation. Flood risk and flood risk mitigation will be addressed within the flood risk assessment that will support any forthcoming application. Site is the most sustainable location at Radcliffe on Trent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RAD02 (Land adjacent to Grooms Cottage)</strong></td>
<td>Development of RAD02 will increase congestion on Shelford Road and overlook neighbouring properties.</td>
<td>RAD02 is allocated for development within Policy 5.2 of Local Plan 2. Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RAD03 (Land off Shelford Road)</strong></td>
<td>The main concerns highlighted during consultation focused on loss of Green Belt countryside, unsafe access, and congestion and safety on Shelford Road (requires direct access onto A52).</td>
<td>Advice from the Highways Authority and evidence within the submitted planning application for the site indicates that access can be achieved. Congestion issues are not considered significant enough to prevent the allocation of this site. RAD03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RAD04 (Land of Grantham Road (North of railway line))</strong></td>
<td>The main concerns highlighted during consultation focused on: access, congestion and safety on Shelford Road (alternative direct access onto A52 was considered a priority); its scale and the significant loss of Green Belt countryside; landscape and visual impacts and impact on services and facilities.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable and there is no housing requirement to allocate such a large area of land. RAD04 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RAD05a (Land north of Grantham Road (south of railway line) (1a))</strong></td>
<td>Whilst the site has the potential to access the A52 directly, the loss of Green Belt and agricultural land, and impact on the landscape and visual amenity were highlighted as main issues.</td>
<td>RAD05a (and RAD05b) is allocated for housing within Policy 5.4 of Local Plan 2 (renamed RAD05). These areas were previously combined within RAD05, but were separated and RAD05a was preferred on its own as it did not extend beyond the Harlequin area of the village on the A52. Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria. Access would be achieved more acceptably via the existing entrance to the St James Business Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RAD05b (Land north of Grantham</strong></td>
<td>Whilst the site has the potential to access the A52 directly loss of Green Belt, agricultural land and</td>
<td>RAD05b is allocated for development with RAD05a (renamed RAD05) within policy 5.4 of Local Plan 2. These areas were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road (south of railway line) (1b))</td>
<td>impact on the landscape and visual amenity were highlighted as main issues.</td>
<td>previously combined within RAD05, but were separated and RAD05a was selected as a preferred site as it did not extend beyond the village’s existing edge on the A52 (unlike RAD05b which extends further along the A52). Due to the reduction in housing being delivered on RAD01 (as result of the site being reallocated as a mixed use site (employment and housing)) RAD05b has been allocated for housing in Local Plan 2. Constraints, including landscape impacts and access, have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria. Access would be achieved more acceptably via the existing entrance to the St James Business Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD06 (72 Main Road)</td>
<td>Apart from access onto Main Road, no significant issues were highlighted or identified.</td>
<td>Although small, RAD06 has been allocated within policy 5.5 of Local Plan 2. Access can be achieved for seven units. Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD07 (Land north of Grantham Road (South of railway)(2))</td>
<td>The main issues highlighted during consultation focused on: the loss of Green Belt and intrusion into open countryside landscape; increased congestion on the A52; the distance from the centre of the village and experience of pedestrians.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable and there is no housing requirement to allocate RAD07. RAD07 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD08 (Land south Grantham Road)</td>
<td>Loss of allotments, proximity to Dewberry Hill Local Wildlife Site and access onto A52 were highlighted as the main issues that would constrain the site.</td>
<td>Constraints recognised. Selected allocations are more sustainable and there is no housing requirement to allocate RAD08. RAD08 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD09 (Land at Radcliffe on Trent Golf Club (west))</td>
<td>Access and the limited number of new homes were highlighted by consultees as the main concerns.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable (having less impact on landscape and biodiversity) and removal of site from the Green Belt in isolation would not comply with Green Belt policy. It is not appropriate or necessary to allocate this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD10 (Land at Radcliffe on Trent Golf Club (east))</td>
<td>Loss of Green belt and limited benefits in terms of housing numbers were highlighted as main concerns.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable (having less impact on landscape) and removal of site from the Green Belt in isolation would not comply with Green Belt purposes. It is not appropriate or necessary to allocate this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD11 (North of Holme Lane)</td>
<td>The main issues highlighted during consultation focused on loss of Green Belt, flood risk, impact on local recreational assets and conflict with the neighbourhood plan (which identifies the site within a leisure arc), and proximity to railway line.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable and there is no housing requirement to allocate RAD11. RAD11 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD12 (Land North of Shelford Road)</td>
<td>The main issues highlighted during consultation focused on increased congestion on Shelford Road, loss of Green Belt, impact on landscape and visual amenity, adverse effects on local wildlife site and possible presence of archaeological remains around Gallows Hill.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable and there is no housing requirement to allocate RAD12. RAD12 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD13 (The Paddock, Nottingham Road)</td>
<td>Surface water drainage and noise where identified as the main issues that could constrain RAD13.</td>
<td>RAD13 is allocated for development within Policy 5.6 of Local Plan 2. Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing Development at Ruddington**

**Housing target at**
As identified within the Core Strategy, allocations | Core Strategy sets a minimum target of 250 new homes. In
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan Matter</th>
<th>Main Issue</th>
<th>Summary of Borough Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruddington</td>
<td>should deliver no more than 250 homes on the edge of Ruddington. This figure was determined according to the levels of existing services and infrastructure. Additional housing would increase congestion, exceed capacity of local schools and medical services, sewage treatment works and result in significant loss of Green Belt countryside. Ruddington has provided enough housing already, further development would change the village’s identity.</td>
<td>order to address the slower than expected delivery of the strategic allocations and meet the Borough’s housing target for the plan period, Local Plan 2 has identified sites that will deliver 350 homes within allocated sites on the edge of the village. Advice from statutory consultees has indicated that, subject to improvements, the additional residents could be accommodated within the local schools and by the medical services. Sites selected would have the least impact on congestion within the centre of the village as they are located adjacent or close to the A60 or on the northern edge of the village, closer to Nottingham. An additional increase in homes by 350 units would not unacceptably change the character of the settlement, which would remain a large village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Plan 2 should set the target as a minimum as Ruddington is a sustainable settlement which could accommodate more growth.</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD01 (Land west of Wilford Road)</td>
<td>The main issues highlighted during consultation focused on flood risk, loss of Green Belt and merging with the main urban area, loss of Sellers Field, increased congestion on Wilford Road, impacts on the rural setting of Ruddington and loss of wildlife.</td>
<td>RUD01 is allocated for development within policy 6.1 of Local Plan 2. Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria. Sellors Field has been removed from the allocation and will be protected within Open Space/GI policies. Sequential test establishes that no reasonable or more sustainable alternative allocation is available. The site’s location within a green corridor requires onsite Green Infrastructure to address flood risk and biodiversity issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD02 (Land West)</td>
<td>The main issues highlighted during consultation</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable and there is no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Wilford Road (north))</td>
<td>focused on loss of Green Belt and merging with the main urban area, increased congestion on Wilford Road, impacts on the rural setting of Ruddington and impacts on local wildlife site and SSSI.</td>
<td>housing requirement to allocate this large area for development. RUD02 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD03 (Land adjacent to St Peter’s Junior School)</td>
<td>The main issues highlighted during consultation focused on the access of the site directly from the A60, its isolated location and presence of ecologically valuable grassland habitat.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are more sustainable and there is no housing requirement to allocate this site for development. RUD02 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD04 (Easthorpe House)</td>
<td>Easthorpe House is a listed building and the development of its grounds would significantly affect its setting.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are less constrained by heritage issues, more sustainable and there is no housing requirement to allocate this site for development. RUD04 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD05 (Land south of Flawforth Lane)</td>
<td>Flooding issues and congestion on Flawforth Lane were highlighted as the main issues of concern.</td>
<td>Site is within Flood Zone 1 and only a small area of the site adjacent to Flawforth Lane is identified as being at medium/low risk of surface water flooding. The site’s location east of the A60 would reduce its contribution to congestion within the settlement and no concerns regarding congestion have been raised by the highways authority. RUD05 is allocated for housing within Policy 6.2 of Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD06 (Land at Loughborough Road)</td>
<td>Direct access onto the Loughborough Road and location within Ruddington’s Conservation Area were highlighted as the main constraints.</td>
<td>The fundamental change in the character of the site and its location within the Conservation Area where it is identified as a positive open space in the Townscape Appraisal is a significant issue. Selected allocations are less constrained and are more sustainable. There is no need to allocate additional sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD07 (Land north west of Asher Lane)</td>
<td>This site is constrained by access issues and its Green Belt status.</td>
<td>Whilst RUD06 has not been allocated for development, it will be removed from the Green Belt as RUD13 surrounds the site and it cannot remain an isolated area of Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD08 (Land West of Pasture Lane)</td>
<td>The merging of Ruddington with Clifton (within the main urban area) and congestion on Clifton Road were highlighted as the main constraint.</td>
<td>Although the site is not considered important in Green Belt terms, the site is fundamentally constrained by access issues which cannot be resolved. RUD07 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD09 (Land South of Landmere Lane)</td>
<td>The main issues highlighted regarding RUD09 were the site’s isolated and unsustainable location and the limited contribution it would make to the housing target.</td>
<td>Site is fundamentally constrained due to potential to merge Ruddington and Clifton. This site has not been selected as an allocation within Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD10 (Land adjacent to Landmere Farm)</td>
<td>The main issues highlighted regarding RUD10 were the site’s isolated and unsustainable location and the limited contribution it would make to the housing target.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are less important in Green Belt terms and are more sustainably located. RUD09 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD11 (Old Loughborough Road)</td>
<td>The loss of prominent Green Belt land which separates Ruddington and Nottingham, landscape and visual intrusion, its isolated location, impact on local historic assets (Old North Road and Brick Kiln) and loss of wildlife were highlighted as constraints on the site.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are less important in Green Belt terms (RUD11 is isolated within the Green Belt and fundamentally constrained) and are more sustainably located. RUD11 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2. Self and custom build housing provision should be adequately provided for by Policy 13 (Self-build and Custom Housing Provision) of Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD12 (Land to the east side of Loughborough Road)</td>
<td>The main issue which constrains this site and which was highlighted during consultation is the adverse impact development would have on the setting of Easthorpe House which is visible across the site from Flawforth Lane. The site is also adjacent to Ruddington’s Conservation Area.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are less constrained heritage or other issues. RUD12 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD13 (Land opposite Mere Way)</td>
<td>The size of the site prompted concerns regarding urban sprawl, loss of Green Belt countryside and impacts on landscape and visual amenity. Congestion on Loughborough Road was also highlighted as a concern.</td>
<td>RUD13 is allocated for development within Policy 6.3 of Local Plan 2. Landscape and visual amenity issues have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD14 (Croft House)</td>
<td>Direct access onto the Loughborough Road and location within Ruddington’s Conservation Area were highlighted as the main constraints.</td>
<td>The fundamental change in the character of the site and its location within the Conservation Area where the front of the site is identified as a positive open space in the Townscape Appraisal is a constraint. Selected allocations are less constrained by these and other issues. Whilst RUD14 has not been allocated for development, it will be removed from the Green Belt as RUD05 and RUD13 surround the site and it cannot remain an isolated area of Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD15 (Land off North Road)</td>
<td>Site proposed for allocation.</td>
<td>Site is fundamentally constrained due to potential to merge Ruddington and Clifton. This site has not been selected as an allocation within Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD16 (Land west of Wayte Court)</td>
<td>Site proposed for allocation.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are less important in Green Belt terms and are more sustainably located. RUD16 has not been allocated in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Development at Aslockton</strong></td>
<td>Aslockton has already undergone considerable expansion for a small village which has limited services and public transport.</td>
<td>Local Plan 2 does not identify any allocations at Aslockton. Planning permission has been granted for 75 units on land south of Abbey Lane, within the plan period, and this constitutes the village’s contribution to the Borough’s housing target. Additional allocations would be unsustainable in this location. Recent appeal dismissals have supported this position. However, in accordance with the Core Strategy, small scale infill development is permitted and a Neighbourhood Plan could allocate small sites on the edge of the village to meet local need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing development at Aslockton</td>
<td>Housing allocations on the edge of Aslockton should be identified within Local Plan 2. The village contains a range of facilities and is served by good public transport services, including buses and trains.</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Development at Cropwell Bishop</strong></td>
<td>Main concerns regarding the allocation of land for 160 units relate to infrastructure especially the capacity of the primary school, lack of adequate public transport (especially in regards to lack of service after 6pm), insufficient capacity at the</td>
<td>Cropwell Bishop has capability to sustain around 70 dwellings on greenfield sites adjacent to the village, based on the existing size and status of the settlement, the capacity of local services (as advised by the relevant statutory consultees) and the size of those sites deemed suitable for housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing total for Cropwell Bishop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sewage works and local traffic congestion. Losses of Green Belt and agricultural land, and impacts on wildlife and village character were also highlighted.</td>
<td>development. There is presently no requirement to allocate more than 70 homes in Cropwell Bishop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cropwell Bishop could accommodate more than 160 homes.</td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI01a (Land south of Nottingham Road)</td>
<td>During consultation periods the following issues regarding this allocation were highlighted: Impact on the setting of the village and locally important buildings, loss of ridge and furrow</td>
<td>Selected allocations are less constrained by heritage or landscape issues. CBI01 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI01b (Land south of Nottingham Road (1))</td>
<td>Not consulted upon - Site was submitted during further issues and options, but was not selected within the subsequent preferred housing site documents.</td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI02 (Land north of Memorial Hall (1))</td>
<td>The main issues of concern regarding this site are the loss of Green Belt countryside, inadequate access of Hoe View Road via Mercia Avenue and impacts on the Canal and neighbouring wildlife site.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are less important in Green Belt terms and less constrained by access concerns, or biodiversity and heritage issues (due to proximity to Canal). There is no requirement to allocate more than 70 homes in Cropwell Bishop and CBI02 has not been allocated within Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI03 (Land north of Memorial Hall (2))</td>
<td>The main issues of concern regarding this site are the loss of Green Belt and intrusion into open countryside, inadequate access of Hoe View Road via Mercia Avenue and impacts on the Canal and direct loss of a local wildlife site.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are less important in Green Belt terms and less constrained by biodiversity and landscape issues. There is no requirement to allocate more than 70 homes in Cropwell Bishop and CBI03 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI04 (Land north</td>
<td>The main issues of concern regarding this site are</td>
<td>Selected allocations are less constrained by heritage and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Fern Road (2))</td>
<td>the loss of priority habitats (hedgerows and trees), impact on historic core of the village, access and loss of ridge and furrow.</td>
<td>landscape issues. CBI04 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI05 (Land east of Church Street)</td>
<td>Access to the site of Church Street, intrusion into the countryside, effects on rights of way, proximity to the sewage treatment works, overlooking of properties, potential archaeological remains, and surface water flooding are highlighted as issues.</td>
<td>CBI05 is allocated by Policy 7 of Local Plan 2 for around 70. The constraints have been recognised and mitigation measures are identified within the policy criteria for the development of the allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI06 (Land north of Fern Road (3))</td>
<td>The site’s distance from the village is considered unsustainable. Intrusion into the open countryside and loss of agricultural land are also main issues.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are in more sustainable locations where development would have less impact on the landscape and not intrude significantly into the Green Belt. CBI06 is not allocated as housing site in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI07 (Land north of Fern Road (1))</td>
<td>Although not consulted upon as a single allocation, it previously comprised the eastern half of the CBI05 prior to CBI05’s reduction in size and selection as a preferred housing allocation. The main issues of concerns regarding the larger site are the significant intrusion into the open countryside and landscape impacts as a result of the rising topography.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are less constrained by landscape issues. There is no requirement to allocate such a large area for housing. CBI06 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing Development at East Bridgford**

<p>| Housing total for East Bridgford | Opposition to the identification of East Bridgford as a location for limited housing development highlighted the loss of Green Belt, inadequate services and infrastructure (notably school capacity, medical | East Bridgford has scope to sustain around 125 dwellings on greenfield sites adjacent to the village, based on the existing size and status of the settlement, the capacity of local services and the size of those sites deemed suitable for housing |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan Matter</th>
<th>Main Issue</th>
<th>Summary of Borough Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>services, public transport and roads), changes in the character and community of the village, and the unsustainability of locating housing on the edge of the village.</td>
<td>development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR01 (Land behind Kirk Hill (east))</td>
<td>East Bridgford could accommodate more than 125 homes.</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The main issues of concerns regarding this site are the loss of land used by the local community for scouting, adverse impacts on the historic core of the village, impact on the setting and entrance to the village, and loss of Green Belt.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are less constrained by heritage issues. There is no requirement to allocate this site for housing. EBR01 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR02 (Land behind Kirk Hill (west))</td>
<td>The main issues of concerns regarding this site are the impact on the historic setting and entrance to the village, loss of Green Belt and intrusion into open countryside, proximity to the A6097 and loss of new woodland.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are less constrained by heritage and setting issues. There is no requirement to allocate this site for housing. EBR02 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR03 (Land north of Kneeton Road (1))</td>
<td>The main issues of concerns regarding this site are: the adverse effects on the setting of East Bridgford Manor, Manor Lodge, and Conservation Area; landscape impacts on the Trent Valley; loss of Green Belt agricultural land; distance from the village centre; congestion on Kneeton Road; and impact on rights of way.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are less important in Green Belt terms and less constrained by heritage and landscape issues. There is no requirement to allocate this site for housing. EBR03 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR04 (Land north)</td>
<td>The distance of this site from the centre of the</td>
<td>Selected allocations are less important in Green Belt terms and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>of Kneeton Road (2)</strong></td>
<td>Village, the significant loss of Green Belt countryside, landscape concerns and congestion on Kneeton Road were highlighted as main issues.</td>
<td>Less constrained by landscape issues. There is no requirement to allocate this site for housing. EBR04 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EBR05 (Land at Lammas Lane)</strong></td>
<td>Access via a single track road and loss of Green Belt countryside are highlighted as the main issues.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are not constrained by access issues. EBR05 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EBR06 (Closes Side Lane (west))</strong></td>
<td>The main issues of concerns regarding this site are: the narrowness of the roads; overlooking of neighbouring properties; impact on Conservation Area; loss of countryside and loss of rural views.</td>
<td>EBR06 is more constrained by access issues than the selected sites which can be accessed of Butt Lane and offer an additional connection between Butt Lane and Closes Side Lane. EBR06 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EBR07 (Closes Side Lane (east))</strong></td>
<td>The main issues of concerns regarding this site are: the narrowness of the roads; loss of countryside and loss of rural views.</td>
<td>EBR07 is more constrained by access issues than the selected sites which can be accessed of Butt Lane and offer an additional connection between Butt Lane and Closes Side Lane. EBR07 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EBR08 (Land to the North of Butt Lane)</strong></td>
<td>Main issues raised regarding EBR08 are the site’s protrusion into the Green belt and open countryside, effects on the rural approach/setting of the village, and loss of agricultural land.</td>
<td>EBR08 is allocated (with EBR11 and EBR12) as a housing site within policy 8.1 of Local Plan 2. Site specific criteria based policy requires a comprehensive development with sites to the north. They also address constraints and identify mitigation. The allocation sites EBR08, EBR11 and EBR12 together has the advantage of enabling a new access to be created between Closes Side Lane and Butt Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EBR09 (Land south of Springfield Lane)</strong></td>
<td>Main issues raised regarding EBR09 are the site’s extension into the open countryside, landscape impacts, its access via an unadopted road and presence of ridge and furrow.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are not constrained by similar access, landscape or heritage issues. EBR09 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR10 (Land south of Butt Lane)</td>
<td>During consultation the main issues raised were: the site’s visibility, especially over longer distances to the south and east; proximity to and impact upon a local wildlife site (Springfield Lane Woodland); impact on the setting of the village and right of way.</td>
<td>EBR08 is allocated as a housing site within policy 8.2 of Local Plan 2. Site specific criteria based policy addresses constraints and identify mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR11 (South of Closes Side Lane)</td>
<td>Site submitted during preferred options consultation and therefore no representations have been received on this site.</td>
<td>EBR11 is allocated as a housing site within Policy 8.1 of Local Plan 2. Site specific criteria based policy requires a comprehensive development with sites to the south. They also address constraints and identify mitigation. The allocation sites EBR08, EBR11 and EBR12 together has the advantage of enabling a new access to be created between Closes Side Lane and Butt Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR12 (North of Butt Lane (2))</td>
<td>Site submitted during preferred options consultation and therefore no representations have been received on this site.</td>
<td>EBR12 is allocated as a housing site within Policy 8.1 of Local Plan 2. Site specific criteria based policy requires a comprehensive development with sites to the north and south. They also address constraints and identify mitigation. The allocation sites EBR08, EBR11 and EBR12 together has the advantage of enabling a new access to be created between Closes Side Lane and Butt Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR13 (Land off Brickyard Lane)</td>
<td>Land proposed for housing development.</td>
<td>Selected allocations are not constrained by access issues. EBR13 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Development at Gotham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing total for Gotham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homes) focused on the loss of greenfield/Green Belt, flood risks, adverse impacts on views from Gotham Hills, inadequate services and infrastructure (notably school capacity, medical services, public transport and roads), and limited local shops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOT01 (Land to the rear of former British Legion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOT01 (Land to the rear of former British Legion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOT02 (Land north of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (west))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOT03 (Land north of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (east))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOT04 (Land South of Pygall Avenue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOT05a (Land east of Gypsum Way/The Orchards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOT05b (Land East of Gypsum Way/The Orchards (2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOT06 (East Leake Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOT07 (Land east of Hill Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOT08 (Land south of Moor Lane)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Development at Sutton Bonington</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing total for Sutton Bonington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton Bonington has sufficient services and facilities to accommodate 100+ homes, is in a sustainable location close to Kegworth and Loughborough. The village is not in the Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUT01 (Land north of Park Lane)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUT02 (Land south of Pasture Lane)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>settlement for growth in the subsequent preferred options due to concerns regarding primary school capacity. This position has since changed following further examination of future pupil numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUT03 (Land south of Landcroft Lane)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing Development at Tollerton**

| Housing total for Tollerton | Opposition to the identification of Tollerton as a location for limited housing development highlighted the contribution Tollerton will make within the Gamston strategic allocation, the loss of greenfield/Green Belt, inadequate services and infrastructure (notably school capacity, absence of medical services, public transport and highways capacity), and limited local shops. | The parish of Tollerton contains the Tollerton/Gamston strategic allocation (up to 4,000 new homes). Whilst delivery is delayed, the parish will provide a critical number of homes during the plan period and beyond. Sites to the north are constrained by sensitive areas of Green Belt (which prevent the merging of the village with the strategic allocation) or have access constraints. No sites are proposed on the edge of Tollerton. |
| Tollerton is sustainably located close to the edge of Nottingham and is well served by public transport. | See above |

| TOL01 (Land at Burnside Grove) | Potential Civil War archaeological remains, loss of open countryside, impact on village character, loss of Green Belt, increases in traffic through the village, excessive scale of development and overlooking of | See above |
### Local Plan Matter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan Matter</th>
<th>Main Issue</th>
<th>Summary of Borough Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>existing residents are the main issues highlighted during consultation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOL02 (West of Tollerton Lane and North of Medina Drive)</strong></td>
<td>The scale of development and subsequent loss of Green Belt, merging with the Gamston strategic allocation, and landscape impacts are a significant issue. Impacts on Jubilee Wood and rights of way are also a concern.</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOL03 (Land east of Tollerton Lane)</strong></td>
<td>Loss of open countryside and loss of long distance views from within the village, impact on Tollerton Lane (which is congested and dangerous), impact on the right of way, absence of defensible boundaries, and local character are identified as issues.</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOL4 (Jubilee Wood)</strong></td>
<td>This land was submitted during consultation on Further Issues and Options. Tollerton was not identified as a growth settlement in the Preferred Options. Consequently no representations on this site have been sought.</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Development at Other Villages

<p>| Extension of Former RAF Newton Strategic Urban Extension | An additional 150 units should be delivered within the allocation. This would require parts of the green infrastructure (planned allotments and public open space) to be accommodated beyond the allocation within the Green Belt. | Phase 2 within the Former RAF Newton SUE has not yet commenced and increasing the number of new homes within this allocation (and effectively enlarging it through the relocating of Green Infrastructure beyond its boundary) would not contribute to meeting the housing needs within the plan |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan Matter</th>
<th>Main Issue</th>
<th>Summary of Borough Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>period. An addition of 150 new units is not therefore necessary or appropriate at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costock</td>
<td>In order to provide a greater mix of housing sites and address the shortfall in housing delivery, a wider distribution of housing sites across the borough should be proposed in Local Plan 2, including allocations at Costock.</td>
<td>Although Costock has a primary school and public house, it does not contain sufficient services and facilities to meet the basic needs of existing residents. Whilst located close to East Leake, concerns regarding services within this Key Settlement have prevented further allocations within this settlement and would prevent the allocation of sites at Costock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunny</td>
<td>Land east of Loughborough Road is more sustainably located than the proposed mixed use regeneration site on the former Bunny Brickworks within Policy 23 of Local Plan 2.</td>
<td>This greenfield Green Belt site does not provide opportunities to deliver the regeneration of brownfield site for mixed use development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Green Belt

<p>| Existing Green Belt Boundaries | British Geological Survey (BGS) should not be removed from the Green Belt. | The complex of buildings does not contribute to the openness of the Green Belt and the creation of a new boundary around the BGS would create a more robust defensible Green Belt boundary. Removal has been assessed and proposed within the Green Belt Review Part 2b. |
| New inset boundaries          | Inset boundaries are too tightly drawn, reducing flexibility. | The Green Belt boundaries were drawn in accordance with the NPPF which requires robust and defensible boundaries that preserve land which is free from development (open). The additional housing and its distribution within allocations across outlying settlements provides flexibility. There is no |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan Matter</th>
<th>Main Issue</th>
<th>Summary of Borough Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarded Land</td>
<td>Safeguarded land should be identified within Local Plan 2 in order to provide flexibility and ensure long term delivery.</td>
<td>In order to increase five-year supply of housing land, land has been identified within the adopted Core Strategy (Local Plan 1) and the emerging Local Plan 2 which exceeds the Borough’s housing target up until 2028. The Strategic Allocations will continue to deliver homes within the next plan period. Consequently there are no exceptional circumstances for removing land from the Green Belt for safeguarding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Allocations</td>
<td>Local Plan 2 should allocate employment sites, especially the site identified within the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan (KEYD) which is off Platt Lane.</td>
<td>The employment allocation identified off Platt Lane within the Neighbourhood Plan has merit and is allocated for employment within the publication draft Local Plan 2. Land for employment is also identified within a mixed use allocations at Radcliffe on Trent (RAD01) and at Bunny (BUN01). These meet local demand (within the adopted Radcliffe on Trent Neighbourhood Plan) and, in the case of Bunny, regeneration purposes. As sufficient employment land will be delivered within the Strategic Allocations, and the Employment Land Forecasting Study identifies no need for additional employment sites, only these three sites will be allocated for employment development within Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Existing Employment Allocations** | Bunny Brickworks, British Gypsum, Langar Airfield, and Hathern Works (Sutton Bonington) should be retained as employment allocations. | Only Bunny Brickworks remains an allocation (for mixed use development).  
Existing employment sites will be protected and their future development managed through criterion based policies on employment development, Green Belt and development within the countryside. |
| **Centres of Excellence**         | Local Plan 2 should include further policies on Centres of Excellence.                                                       | Core Strategy Policy 4 is sufficient to manage development within Centre’s of Excellence.                                                                                                                                               |
| **Rural Diversification**         | Although supported, policies should ensure development does not adversely affect the landscape or environmental assets. | Local Plan 2 policy Development in the Countryside provides further guidance on diversification of rural enterprises and criteria which will manage its environmental impacts. Core Strategy policy 16 adequately covers landscape issues (requiring compliance with Nottinghamshire Landscape Character Assessment). |
| **Regeneration Sites**            | Although the allocation of Bunny Brickworks and the Former Islamic Institute as regeneration sites is supported within the majority of representations, the protection of local character and biodiversity assets is a main issue. | Although the Former Islamic Institute is covered by an extant planning permission for 95 homes it is also allocated for development as it is a brownfield site on the edge of Flintham. This policy will ensure reserved matters applications and/or future changes to the permitted development respects the site’s location.  
Site specific policies will manage the ecological effects of |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan Matter</th>
<th>Main Issue</th>
<th>Summary of Borough Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The neighbouring Bunny Trading Estate should be included within the Bunny Brickworks site. This would encompass a comprehensive brownfield site and ensure the Bunny Trading Estate can grow (this is hindered by the Green belt designation.)</td>
<td>Bunny Brickworks is currently a vacant site with a long standing policy allowing development. We have not assessed the neighbouring site or properties as part of Bunny’s Green Belt boundary review due to the overriding perception of openness within this area. Furthermore, due to the presence of structures within the site, there are opportunities to develop the site in accordance with national Green Belt policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and District Centres and Centres of Neighbourhood Importance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local and District Centres</strong></td>
<td>The proposed Local Centre for Radcliffe on Trent should be enlarged to include the railway station.</td>
<td>District Centre has been extended to include the railway station. This reflects the centre boundary as defined in the Radcliffe Neighbourhood Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary frontage on Shelford Road, Radcliffe on Trent, should extend to New Road</td>
<td>The frontage on Shelford Road from the proposed secondary frontage includes a significant number of non-retail uses. It does not comprise a frontage of retail uses (A1 to A5) and warrant designation as a secondary frontage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A regeneration zone should be designated south of Main Road, within Radcliffe on Trent’s local centre.</td>
<td>Local Plan 2 does not identify any regeneration zones. Instead, the adopted Neighbourhood Plan forms part of the development plan for Rushcliffe and this identifies the Main Road Regeneration Area within which policy 3 applies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The primary shopping area within East Leake’s Local Centre should be extended from the Three Horse Shoes to the bottom of Castle Hill.</td>
<td>The Local Centre boundary (rather than primary retail area) has been extended to reflect the village centre boundary within the adopted Neighbourhood Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan Matter</th>
<th>Main Issue</th>
<th>Summary of Borough Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28 Main St, 40 Main St, 42 Main St, Main St and small parade leading to Health Centre/Library should be identified as primary frontages; and the row of units behind odd numbers on Gotham Road as a secondary frontage.</td>
<td>The parade of shops leading to the health centre has been designated as primary frontage. 28 Main Street is an isolated retail unit and 40 and 42 Main Street are residential units. They are not part of a primary frontage. The units behind the odd numbers on Gotham Road are in business use and do not justify the designation as a secondary frontage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The frontages within courtyard off Long Acre should be identified as secondary frontages.</td>
<td>The frontages have been designated secondary frontages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontages on Wolds Drive, Keyworth should be primary frontages.</td>
<td>The frontages on Wolds Drive do not contain a sufficient percentage of shops to qualify as primary frontages. Its location beyond the Local Centre requires a greater flexibility of uses to serve the local community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District and Local Centres have inadequate parking provision.</td>
<td>Local Plan 2 policies require appropriate parking provision as part of all developments within District and Local Centres and Centres of Neighbourhood Importance. “6Cs” parking and/or Highways Authority requirements will continue to be applied.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whilst restrictions on non-A1 (shops) should be applied within the primary shopping area, they should not be too restrictive. A3 and A4 uses (cafes and public houses) encourage visitors and provide</td>
<td>The Retail Study and surveys indicate that Local and District Centres are performing well, with low un-occupancy rates. The emerging policies seek to maintain the current mix of uses, allowing for only 20% of the primary frontage to be non-retail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vitality.</td>
<td>(non-A1 to A5). 60% must be A1 (shops) and this reflects the current mix of units. Depending on the amount of non-retail this allows for up to 40% A2 to A5 uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further allocations for retail should be identified.</td>
<td>The Retail Study concludes that further allocations for retail uses are not required, given existing permissions. However there may be a need to review this position as the strategic allocations are delivered through the plan period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centres of Neighbourhood Performance</td>
<td>The junction of Debdale Lane and Nottingham Road at Keyworth should be a Centre of Neighbourhood Importance.</td>
<td>There is merit in this and the area is now identified as a Centre of Neighbourhood Importance within Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 uses should be restricted to maintain vibrancy.</td>
<td>Emerging policy within Local Plan 2 does not permit A5 uses to exceed 30% of units within the Centres of Neighbourhood Importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Impact Assessments</td>
<td>Support was expressed for a 500 metre square floorspace threshold for undertaking Retain Impact Assessments when located outside of a centre.</td>
<td>Welcomed, the 500 metre square threshold is included within the emerging plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold should be based on vitality, viability and effects of development on any town centre strategy. Not just average floor space.</td>
<td>This would result in inconsistent requirements to undertake retail impact assessments. The need to consider other issues is not suggested within the Retail Study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Design and Landscaping Character

<p>| Design | Local Plan 2 should contain more detailed policies on design to ensure development is sympathetic to | Core Strategy policy 10 contains a comprehensive list of design criteria and principles. No further policy is required. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan Matter</th>
<th>Main Issue</th>
<th>Summary of Borough Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Character</td>
<td>Mature/Local Landscapes should be re-instated. Locally valued landscapes have been identified in the Vale of Belvoir, Gotham/Barton ridgelines and River Trent Valley.</td>
<td>The emerging Local Plan 2 will not contain any further policy guidance on landscape. As with design, this issue is adequately addressed within Core Strategy policy 10. National policy no longer encourages the establishment of locally designated protected landscapes. The Nottinghamshire Landscape Character Assessment and Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy provide borough wide landscape guidance; this will continue to inform planning applications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historic Environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Heritage Assets</th>
<th>The Trent Valley and confluence with the Soar and Derwent are particularly sensitive areas.</th>
<th>Limited development is proposed in these locations and all allocations have been assessed within a Heritage Assessment. Where archaeological remains are suspected, mitigation measures have been included within site specific policies.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings of local importance, ancient woodland, hedgerows, ridge and furrow fields and historic parks and gardens should be protected.</td>
<td>Local Plan 2 protects local heritage assets (including buildings and parks and gardens) and ancient woodland. Local Plan 2 has sought to avoid allocating sites with preserved and easily identifiable ridge and furrow. Ancient (important) hedgerows are protected through other legislation.</td>
<td>A list of locally important assets will not be included within Local Plan 2 as these are likely to change during the plan period. Local Plan 2 contains criteria which determine whether</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated Heritage Assets</td>
<td>Policy should require assessments of significance and recognition of setting.</td>
<td>Criteria within Local Plan 2’s heritage assets policy requires the establishment of the asset’s significance and protects its setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An archaeology policy should supplement the Core Strategy</td>
<td>An archaeology policy is included within Local Plan 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change, Flood Risk and Water Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation</td>
<td>Local Plan 2 should contain a policy on renewable energy to avoid environmentally sensitive sites and land of high grade agricultural land.</td>
<td>Renewable energy policy is included within the Local Plan 2. This contains comprehensive criteria which should direct development to less environmentally sensitive locations. Policy does not prevent use of high grade agricultural land. In accordance with NPPF, loss of agricultural land is a material consideration that forms part of the ‘planning balance’ when determining planning applications. Local Plan 2’s Development within the Countryside policy provides further guidance where renewable energy developments are located beyond settlement limits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing Carbon Emissions</td>
<td>Local Plan 2 should contain further guidance on the reduction of CO2 during the construction and occupation of development</td>
<td>Government policy has removed the ability of LAs to include local plan policies that address CO2 emissions. This issue is addressed through building regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Efficiency</td>
<td>Local Plan 2 should contain lower standard water</td>
<td>Lower water use standards have been justified within the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards</strong></td>
<td>use of 110 litres per day than the national 125 litres.</td>
<td>Outline Water Cycle Study and they would not create viability issues for development. Local Plan 2 therefore requires 110 litres per day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managing Flood Risk</strong></td>
<td>Sites within flood zones 2 and 3 must be subject to sequential test.</td>
<td>A sequential test of sites has been completed and supports Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainable Drainage</strong></td>
<td>Local Plan 2 should contain a sustainable drainage policy.</td>
<td>Surface Water Management policy is included within the emerging plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drainage issues should be addressed through policies that deliver natural flood management measures and biodiversity enhancement within multifunctional GI.</td>
<td>Surface water management policy, managing flood risk policy and development affecting watercourses policy addresses these issues within Local Plan 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No further developments should take place within the River Trent Flood Plain.</td>
<td>Development will continue to occur in the main urban area of Nottingham which is within the River Trent floodplain as this contains some of the most sustainable locations in the Borough (the Core Strategy focuses development towards the main urban area). One site is also allocated at Radcliffe which is within flood zone 2 (and limited area in flood zone 3) as this is also one of the most sustainable locations on the edge of a Key Settlement. No other residential or employment development is allocated in the River Trent floodplain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land uses/development within the flood plain should provide flood storage.</td>
<td>Local Plan 2 contains Green Infrastructure policies that promote flood storage measures within areas where this is a primary function of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Green Infrastructure policies should identify the variety of types of spaces and their functions.</td>
<td>These are identified within the GI and Open Spaces policy and supporting text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The GI network should be mapped within Local Plan 2</td>
<td>The GI network is identified within Local Plan 2, but is not included within the policies map as it would over complicate the map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Plan 2 should recognise that one function of GI may be more important than another.</td>
<td>Local Plan 2 highlights the functions of each corridor and seeks to ensure these functions are improved where development takes place within them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RBC should create a GI Strategy to assist delivery/review of LP policy.</td>
<td>GI Strategy may follow adoption, subject to priorities at the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Green Space</strong></td>
<td>Land at Warner’s Paddock, Forest Road and Cogley Lane in Bingham were identified as potential Local Green Spaces.</td>
<td>These have been identified within the Local Green Space policy and policies map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inholms Gardens and Coney Grey Sports Ground in Flintham are possible Local Green Spaces</td>
<td>Inholms Gardens is identified as a Local Green Space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Plan 2 should recognise all green spaces not just Local Green Space.</td>
<td>Although they are not individually identified within the policies map, Local Plan 2 identifies a list of open space types that are protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharphill Wood should be a Local Green Space</td>
<td>Sharphill Wood is not identified as a Local Green Space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks and Open</strong></td>
<td>Local Plan 2 should not focus on formal parks and</td>
<td>Local Plan 2 identifies a list of open space types that are</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan Matter</th>
<th>Main Issue</th>
<th>Summary of Borough Council Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spaces</td>
<td>open spaces. It should highlight biodiversity benefits/functions of more informal open spaces.</td>
<td>protected, including individual wildlife sites, priority habitats, flood alleviation areas, woodlands and amenity/semi natural green spaces. Ecological networks of sites and habitats are also identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open space requirements should not be based solely on the size of development. It should allow for off-site provision and financial contributions.</td>
<td>Local Plan 2 policy does set a threshold above which a contribution will be required for open spaces. The contribution will depend on existing open spaces (quality and quantity) and the increased need for more as a result of the development. A financial contribution for off-site improvements is permitted where this would provide the most effective means of creating usable open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td>Local Plan 2 should consider biodiversity on a landscape scale and identify the ecological networks within Rushcliffe which connect habitats and nature conservation sites.</td>
<td>These are identified within the plan as Biodiversity Opportunity Areas and policies within the plan seek to preserve and enhance them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity Network</td>
<td>Local Plan 2 should deliver the Nature Conservation Strategy.</td>
<td>Nature Conservation Strategy and Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Project have informed the identification of ecological networks and emerging policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Plan 2 should contain a criteria based policy which protects sites according to their place in the hierarchy. This should include non-designated sites</td>
<td>Local Plan 2 contains a criteria based policy which protects sites and habitats according to their position in the hierarchy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and priority habitats.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>Protection of aged and veteran trees and ancient woodlands should be included within the wider criteria based policy that protects assets.</td>
<td>Local Plan 2 contains a separate policy on trees, reflecting the importance within the Borough of maintaining and increasing tree cover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-setting</td>
<td>Off-setting should only occur in accordance with the NPPF mitigation hierarchy (avoid, mitigate or as a last resort compensate). Policy should not be overly prescriptive.</td>
<td>Local Plan 2 reinforces the mitigation hierarchy within the designated and non-designated sites policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture, Tourism and Sports Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocations</td>
<td>Allocations for culture, tourism and sport should be included in the plan if they are required to support new development.</td>
<td>A need for specific culture, tourism and sporting facilities has not been identified within the supporting evidence base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarding Facilities</td>
<td>River Trent, River Soar, Grantham Canal and Great Central Railway should be safeguarded from development for their ecological, recreational, tourism and commercial benefits.</td>
<td>These facilities are safeguarded within Local Plan 2 Tourism and Leisure Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grantham Canal/River Trent Canal link along the Polser Brook should be safeguarded.</td>
<td>This route is safeguarded within the Local Plan 2 Tourism and Leisure Policy and identified within policies map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Bridgford Hockey Club seeks the allocation of land to the south of West Bridgford, immediately north of Ruddington to be allocated as a sports facility in Local Plan Part 2.</td>
<td>This proposal should be more appropriate advanced as a planning application. Green Belt policy allows for appropriate facilities for outdoor sport as long as the openness of the Green Belt is preserved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contamination and Pollution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Pollution</td>
<td>Noise pollution from aircraft flying into and from East Midlands Airport was highlighted as an issue, especially within East Leake.</td>
<td>Local Plan 2 cannot directly influence activity of the airport (which is not within the Borough) or the flight path of aircraft (which is often influenced by weather conditions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Pollution</td>
<td>Local Plan 2 should contain a specific policy on light pollution, which is a particular issue within rural areas. This policy should prevent the illumination of habitats that are important for light sensitive species (e.g. feeding corridors for bats).</td>
<td>Local Plan 2 pollution policy addresses light pollution and impacts on wildlife, including bats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Pollution</td>
<td>Local Plan 2 should contain a policy on air pollution.</td>
<td>Air pollution is included within the Local Plan 2 pollution policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Policy</td>
<td>Further policies on local transport are required to address inadequate rural bus service, rail services (between Nottingham and Grantham) and rat running.</td>
<td>Core Strategy policies 14 and 15 address travel demand and transport infrastructure. These complement the development targets, their distribution (which is delivered partly through Local Plan 2 allocations) and strategic allocations within the Core Strategy. Site specific policies in the Local Plan 2 outline highways improvements which are required to deliver non-strategic allocations. Wider transport issues, including public transport, are addressed within the Nottinghamshire County Council’s Transport Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trent Lane/The Hook River Trent Crossing</td>
<td>An additional River Trent Crossing between Trent Lane and The Hook was highlighted as a main issue.</td>
<td>Any additional River Trent crossing would be progressed through the Local Transport Plan. Local Plan 2 does not propose any development that would prevent the creation of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan Matter</td>
<td>Main Issue</td>
<td>Summary of Borough Council Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>6Cs Highway Design Guide should continue to be used.</td>
<td>Local Plan 2 policy requires compliance with Highway Authority standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telecommunications Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadband</td>
<td>Local Plan 2 should promote broadband within new developments</td>
<td>There are agreements at a national level to ensure that most new development is provided with necessary broadband infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minerals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minerals Safeguarding</td>
<td>Local Plan 2 should contain a policy that safeguards minerals resources.</td>
<td>Minerals safeguarding policy is included within Local Plan 2 and these areas are identified within the policies map.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Local Plan Part 2: Issues and Option, summary of consultation responses

Introduction

1. In total, 397 individual and organisations responded to the Issues and Options and the associated Green Belt Review consultations. These representations were received online, by email, by post and through comments on exhibition leaflets.

2. We received representations from the following town and parish councils/meetings: Aslockton, Barton in Fabis, Bunny, Bingham, Bradmore, East Leake, Elton, Flintham, Kinoulton, Orston, Gotham, Radcliffe on Trent, Ruddington, and Tollerton.

3. Representations were also received from Keyworth and Radcliffe on Trent Neighbourhood Plan Steering Groups.


5. In addition to statutory consultees, representations were received from a variety of local interest groups, and representatives from the development industry (including House Builders Federations, landowners and their agents).

6. A significant number of residents made representations, particularly those who live within East Leake, Keyworth, Radcliffe on Trent, and Ruddington. These are Key Settlements where additional development is required to deliver targets in the adopted Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy. The holding of public exhibitions within these settlements and the use of leaflet responses increased the representations within these settlements.

Housing Development

Housing Development adjacent to the Main Urban Area

7. In response to the question whether addition sites (in addition to those identified in the Core Strategy) on the edge of West Bridgford or Clifton should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development, 28 respondents agreed that no further sites should be allocated, 5 disagreed.

8. Those that agreed highlighted the need to maintain the separation between West Bridgford and outlying settlements, prioritise previously developed land, locating development close to shops, services and community facilities, and
opportunities to develop less sensitive Green Belt sites on the edge of outlying settlements.

9. **Aslockton Parish Council** disagreed, stating that Local Plan Part 2 should be consistent with the Core Strategy Policy 3 which promotes urban concentration with regeneration.

10. **Barton in Fabis Parish Council** supports the absence of further allocations, stating that more sensible sites exist around Key Settlements.

11. **East Leake Parish Council** also disagreed with the assertion that further sites should not be allocated adjacent to the Main Urban Area, believing additional sites should be allocated. **Elton Parish Meeting** state that the most sensible location is around the main urban area.

12. **CPRE** state that the strategic allocations already narrows the gap between the main urban area and villages and additional land will only erode this gap further.

13. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** and **Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group** have opposed the designation of Edwalton Golf Course as safeguarded land as the area is a Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and an important site for grass snakes, a protected species.

14. The **Sharphill Action Group** has specifically highlighted the need to prevent further land releases at Sharphill in order to protect the wood.

15. Support for additional site allocations predominantly came from the development industry, they emphasised the delay in delivering the Core Strategy’s strategic sites, absence of a 5 year housing supply of deliverable housing land, the need for flexibility and a range of sites to meet demand. Other representatives of the development industry suggest that a number of smaller sites at key and other settlements, in particular land that they are promoting would be a more appropriate option.

16. **John A Wells Ltd (Oxalis Planning)** indicates that additional land west of Sharphill Wood is available for development. A member of the public suggested that south of Clifton could be further developed.

17. **Havenwood Construction** disagree and suggest an area of land adjacent to Simkins Farm, Adbolton Lane.

18. **Myles** suggest an additional site in their ownership north east of Nottingham Knight roundabout.
In addition some concern was raised in relation to Edwalton golf course being identified as safeguarded land as it has some wildlife value.

Objections to the existing strategic allocations were made by a number of respondents. Conversely some comments state that further large scale development should be located next to the main urban area. In addition it was noted by some respondents that it important to maintain separation between the main urban area and other villages.

**Housing Sites within the Main Urban Area**

Although responses to the question of whether housing sites should allocated within the Main Urban Area were limited, support for the allocation of the Abbey Road Depot as a housing site outweighed objections (16 for/ 2 against). There was similar support for the allocation of the former Central College (18 for/ 1 against) and land between Lady Bay Bridge/Radcliffe Road (15 for/ 4 against).

There was more opposition to the allocation of land south of Wilford Lane (12 for and 10 against). Concerns were raised regarding the impact on a local wildlife site and flooding.

The *Environment Agency* state that WB1 Abbey Road Depot lies within an area of flood risk (flood zones 2 & 3). The flood risk sequential test will need to be undertaken in accordance with Policy 2 of the Core Strategy. WB3 South of Wilford Lane lies within an area of flood risk and is adjacent to the Greythorne Dyke which is both an EA main river and local wildlife site. The flood risk sequential test will need to be undertaken. In addition, WB3 (south of Wilford Lane) is located on a Historic Landfill. Development of this site will require additional consideration and an appropriate assessment to consider in detail risks to surface and groundwater water and human health. Finally, a 10m easement from the Greythorne Dyke must be provided to allow for future maintenance, improvements and natural river morphology. WB4 Land between Lady Bay Bridge and Radcliffe Road lies within an area of flood risk (flood zone 3). The flood risk sequential test will need to be undertaken. In addition, the site is located on aquifer where groundwater is sensitive to pollution. The submission of an environmental assessment will be necessary to assess the historic use of the site.

*Historic England* state that WB3 may have archaeological potential given its proximity to the River Trent.

Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) has stated that new pupils generated by all 4 sites identified in the Main Urban Area cannot be
accommodated in the existing primary school estate and there are no plans to expand or adapt existing schools.

26. **NCC** has also advised that the development of WB3 should improve pedestrian and cycle links within and through neighbouring open space and should reinforce and enhance open space and biodiversity links. The protection of Greythorn Dyke (LWS) and established woodland/scrub should be ensured if allocated.

27. **Aslockton Parish Council** state that priority should be given to brownfield sites

28. **Gotham Parish Council** suggest a more pro-active approach to identifying additional brownfield sites.

29. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust and CPRE** are concerned about the potential adverse ecological impacts of a development on WB3, and consider that the site should be subject to ecological survey before a decision is made as to whether to allocate this site. They have no strong opinion on the other sites

30. **Sharphill Action Group** supported all the allocations within West Bridgford and that they should be released before Zone 4 of Land of Melton Road, especially where much valued ridgeline to Sharphill Wood would be impeded. They also believe WB3 should have been allocated within the Core Strategy to avoid the release of Sharphill from the Green Belt.

31. One comment suggests that site WB3 may have ecological value and should be assessed before allocation. Another suggests that mixed use development on the sites should be promoted.

32. No alternative sites within the main urban area outside of the green belt were suggested.

**Bingham**

33. There was agreement from a clear majority of respondents for not allocating further greenfield sites for housing in Bingham (12 in favour and 3 against).

34. **Elton Parish Meeting** and **Orston Parish Council** has raised concerns that the town’s infrastructure, in particular parking, cannot cope with the existing population of Bingham and that further allocations would worsen the situation.

35. Support for additional allocations on the edge of Bingham was received from both **Gotham** and **Barton in Fabis Parish Councils**. They believe additional
sites would help sustain the settlement and that they should not be ruled out at this stage as they may perform better as housing sites than those around the main urban area. **Aslockton Parish Council** consider that allocations should follow the settlement hierarchy contained within the Core Strategy.

36. **CPRE** consider that further allocations would intrude into the countryside.

37. The **Crown Estate** consider that there is further land that they own at Bingham that could cater for longer term housing needs

38. Others that supported no further allocations considered the significant strategic allocation and brownfield sites sufficient to meet the housing requirements in the Core Strategy. This support came from both representatives of the development industry, members of the public and environmental bodies.

39. The following comments were also received in relation to further housing development in Bingham.

- Already overdeveloped
- Not enough parking
- Not enough green areas
- Need to protect Warners’ Paddock

40. There was general support for the employment site in Chapel Lane to continue to be allocated for such use, however one response would welcome the provision of an access through the site to the former allotment site to provide for new parking.

**Cotgrave**

41. 30 representations were received regarding the need to allocate additional sites at Cotgrave. Those that disagreed with the assertion in the Issues and Options document, that no further housing allocations are needed, outnumbered those that agreed (18 for/12 against).

42. **Aslockton, Barton in Fabis, Gotham** and **East Leake Parish Councils** supported further allocations at Cotgrave. Amongst the reasons given by the Parish councils include the view that the regeneration project will support new housing, that it is a sustainable settlement, is not far out from the urban area, has good services, facilities and public transport. It also has sites that are less important in contributing to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt.
43. **Elton Parish Meeting** supported the proposed restriction on further allocations, beyond the former Colliery, within Cotgrave.

44. **CPRE** consider that any further allocations would encroach into the countryside. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** consider that the site at Cotgrave Colliery is more than sufficient.

45. There were a number of responses from those representing landowners around Cotgrave who also disagreed with the assertion site no further allocations adjacent to the settlement are required. These representations emphasised Cotgrave’s sustainability and the on-going regeneration projects, which indicate that there is strong demand for housing and other investment. In addition the absence of a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites was also regularly highlighted in representations. This justified the allocation of additional sites to provide flexibility and increase delivery of housing. As a key settlement, Cotgrave was viewed as one of the more appropriate locations. Furthermore additional growth at Cotgrave would not be of a scale to affect the overall spatial strategy set by the Core Strategy, and would provide greater flexibility to account for the slower pace of delivery within the strategic sites.

46. **Barratt Homes** support development of the portion of COT1 fronting onto Hollygate Lane and consider it to be suitable and available.

47. **Langridge Homes** support the development of COT3 and state that the site is suitable for housing.

48. **Southwell and Nottinghamshire Diocese** support the development of COT4. They consider that the site does not contribute to the openness of the Green Belt and could either be allocated for housing or become safeguarded land.

49. **Featherstones Planning** on behalf of the landowner support development of COT5. It considers that it is suitable and available.

50. **Taylor Wimpey** support the development of part of COT9. The consider that the site is suitable, available and has no technical constraints.

51. **Parkers of Leicester** support development on either COT 8, or COT8 and COT7 together. It considers that should the latter be considered, then a primary school site could be accommodated within COT7. The consider that the sites are available and suitable

52. **Parker**, the owner of COT10 supports its development.
53. Wickmere Ltd support the development of COT 11. They consider that it is suitable and available.

54. The response from the public towards further development at Cotgrave was mixed. They generally were parochial in nature, with Cotgrave residents not supporting development whilst residents elsewhere did support some further growth.

**East Leake**

55. 41 representations were received regarding the need to allocate additional housing sites on the edge of East Leake. The majority (36) agreed that apart from those eight sites that already have planning permission for housing development, further green field land should not be allocated for housing.

56. Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) has stated that new pupils generated by further development in East Leake cannot be accommodated in the existing primary school estate and there are no plans to expand or adapt existing schools.

57. Aslockton Parish Council support development being directed towards key settlements.

58. Those that agreed (including Bunny Parish Council, and Elton Parish Meeting) considered the existing sites sufficient, highlighted the impact of further housing on infrastructure, community services and facilities, and encroachment into open countryside. Elton Parish Meeting also queried whether the excess at East Leake could lead to a reduction elsewhere.

59. East Leake Parish Council agreed that no further sites should be allocated on greenfield sites, highlighting Policy H6 of the East Leake Neighbourhood Plan which provides criteria for consideration of any further sites and emphasised issues regarding infrastructure and insufficient S106 money received from the existing permissions.

60. Gotham Parish Council state that further greenfield land should not be allocated at East Leake. Barton in Fabis Parish Council state that East Leake has good services and facilities and public transport, however, in the case of East Leake, the impact of resulting traffic on the road through Gotham should preclude some sites being developed.

61. CPRE are concerned that further development would encroach into the countryside.
62. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** consider that the existing sites with planning permission is enough.

63. The view from the development industry is mixed. Generally, those with site interests within East Leake were not supportive of the Borough Councils position in relation to further development at East Leake. One comment from the development industry states that development proposals should be judged on a site by site basis with harm to village character and weighed against benefits.

64. **Gladmans** state that East Leake still has the facilities to support further growth. They consider that the majority of EL14 is suitable and available for development.

65. **N and B Wright (Farming)** Support the development of site EL12. They state that it is suitable and available for development, and can provide a school site in a suitable location in order to facilitate new development.

66. Comments received from residents were as follows:

   - Concern over narrowness of roads proposed in new developments
   - Concern over parking
   - Concern over infrastructure in general (3 comments)
   - Concern over school provision (3 comments)
   - Concern over healthcare provision/state of health centre building (2 comments)
   - Need to find new site for health centre
   - Concern over traffic
   - Allocate British Gypsum for employment purposes
   - Should look at other areas for development
   - Employment can be anywhere in the village and does not need a dedicated site
   - Former Micro-propagation site should be reused for employment rather than housing
   - Use brownfield sites within the village
Keyworth

67. In response to the Issues and Options question on Keyworth and the allocation of sites proposed within the emerging Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan, 34 representations agreed that these should be allocated (including representations by Aslockton Parish Council and Elton Parish Meeting), 72 disagreed with the allocations proposed.

68. In terms of school places, Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) has advised that existing primary schools in Keyworth can accommodate pupils generated by 450 new homes. However S106 monies will be required for the 451st unit.

69. NCC have highlighted the need to protect LWSs which are adjacent to KEYA and KEYB. NCC have also advised that development of KEYA, KEYB and KEYC should follow recommendations within the Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment. These sites are within the Nottinghamshire Wolds Regional Character area and Widmerpool Clay Wolds DPZ.

70. Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust has raised concerns that KEYA may adversely impact the neighbouring wildlife site due to increased recreational disturbance and changes to hydrology.

71. Support for the neighbourhood plan proposals was expressed by respondents who felt the neighbourhood plan process had determined the suitability of sites, this should be respected, and that residents had been consulted enough.

72. There was not a ‘yes no’ question posed for each specific site within the consultation document or leaflet. However comments were made in relation to specific sites identified in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. These are summarised as follows:

KEY A

73. Bunny Parish Council do not support development in this location as they consider that there would be an unacceptable amount of traffic generated to the west of the village, feeding out along country roads.

74. Bloor Homes (Oxalis Planning) support site KEYA. They also however consider that the housing target for Keyworth should be higher and that an additional site north of Debdale Lane should also be allocated for development.
75. **Aldergate Properties** (Signet Planning) Support KEY A, however they consider that a more comprehensive scheme will be achieved if further land is allocated to the west of the site.

76. Other issues raised were as follows:

- **Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan Group** supported the sites identified in the draft Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan.

- A number of residents that live around the Nicker Hill area supported the allocation. Conversely residents who live in the west of the village generally opposed development of KEYA.

- A number of comments stated that KEYA is located close to a medical centre and primary school with capacity.

- A number of comments raised concerns over traffic. Bunny Lane was considered to be too narrow and the junction with the A60 was considered to be inadequate to accommodate development at Keyworth. Traffic travelling eastwards to the A46 will have to pass through the centre of the village.

- Visually intrusive

- Loss of farmland and biodiversity

**KEY B**

77. **Bunny Parish Council** prefer sites to the east of the village, including KEYB.

78. **Commercial Estates Group** support the allocation of the site for residential development and provision for the elderly.

79. Other issues raised were as follows:

- The allocation of the site for housing was not supported by residents living in the vicinity of the site. In addition it was commented that the site in the Issues and Potions document is larger than that identified in the draft neighbourhood plan.

- Some comments stated that there are issues with accessing the site, and concerns were raised in relation to the increase in traffic.

- Some comments referred to the fact that the site was far away from facilities and there were few or no links to the village centre.

- Concern was raised that the site was not served by bus service.

- Concern was also raised in relation to the visual prominence of the site and to the loss of farmland.
Bunny Parish Council prefer sites to the east of the village, including KEYC.

Featherstones Planning on behalf of numerous clients support the allocation of KEY C however they consider that additional land will be required across the Borough in line with their representation.

Other issues raised were as follows:

- KEY6 should be swapped around with KEYD (the draft employment site) to protect the existing residential properties. A number of people commented that they did not support the site for the following reasons.
- The site was not suitable for the elderly due to its distance from the village centre (site being promoted for elderly accommodation through the Neighbourhood Plan process).
- Development would be visually intrusive.
- Topography not suitable for development

Safeguarded Land at Keyworth

In general, most developers or landowners support the identification of safeguarded land around Keyworth in principle. Miller Homes support the allocation of the proposed safeguarded land at Platt Lane for housing and consider it to be a more sustainable option for housing than some of the proposed allocations within the draft Neighbourhood Plan. David Wilson Homes also support the provision of safeguarded land on their site at Selby Lane should it not be allocated for development.

There was also a degree of support from the allocation of safeguarded land at Platt Lane / Station Road as a housing site as it was considered a more suitable housing site than some of those proposed. Conversely some residents that live to the east of the village did not support its development or identification as safeguarded land as it is some distance away from facilities.

Some comments suggest that South Wolds school could be relocated to the proposed safeguarded land at Platt Lane and that the school site could be used for residential.

Other sites/alternative sites

As stated under responses to KEYA, both Aldergate Properties and Bloor Homes support the allocation of additional land west of Bunny Lane and north of Debdale Lane respectively.
87. **Barratt Homes** support the allocation of land south of Bunny Lane. They consider that their site is preferable to the neighbourhood plan sites in relation to several planning reasons, especially in relation to Green Belt considerations, its more sustainable location in relation to the centre of the village.

88. **David Wilson Homes** support the development of land off Selby Lane, and consider that the neighbourhood plan technical assessments were flawed, and that their own technical work supports the development of their site in preference to others.

89. Land south of Bunny Lane and Selby Lane that has not been put forward by developers or landowners were suggested by the public as alternative sites that are closer to the village centre and less intrusive.

90. Relocating the South Wolds School to the site off Platt Lane / Station Road and the redevelopment of the site for housing was also suggested by a number of respondents.

**Radcliffe on Trent**

**General Direction**

91. Consultation on future housing sites for Radcliffe on Trent asked respondents to firstly identify the general direction of growth which they supported (South, East or West), then to state whether they supported the proposed sites (either all of the site or in part) or not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Direction of Growth – Radcliffe on Trent</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

92. Support for the expansion of Radcliffe eastwards was evenly split, with the majority supporting development in this direction than opposing it (51 to 42). Similarly, expansion of the settlement south of the A52 was also evenly split with a majority supporting this direction than opposing it (48 to 36).

93. There was however significantly greater support for expansion west between the railway embankment and Radcliffe on Trent. 52 supported development in this area, whilst 30 opposed.

94. In their response, **Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council** accepts the need to identify green belt sites to meet a minimum of 400 new homes, but that it must
not be exceed 400. Capacity of A52 and Shelford Road where highlighted as a concern which they believe requires major infrastructure improvements.

95. **Barton in Fabis Parish Council** supported further development around the Key Settlements, rather than on the edge of the main urban area. Elton Parish Meeting do not support allocating sites to deliver more than 400 homes and emphasis the consideration of their proximity to facilities and transport corridors.

96. Comments regarding the new housing highlighted the separation of new housing south of the A52 from the centre of the village as a negative factor. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** considers development in this area unsustainable. The Trust also raised concerns that developing land to the west would extend the settlement towards the complex of wetlands, including Skylarks Nature Reserve and Holme Pierrepont County Park. They would prefer to see development spread towards the east.

97. Representatives of the development industry highlighted Radcliffe on Trent’s sustainability and suitability for further housing (above that identified in Local Plan Part 1), the absence of 5 years supply of deliverable homes and the possibility of increasing the settlement’s minimum housing target and allocate additional sites.

98. In terms of specific directions for growth, **Mosaic Estates** support growth to the west of the village, stating that in planning terms, the direction, in particular site RAD1, is the most appropriate for development. It is closer to Nottingham so would avoid the need for commuter traffic to pass through the village.

99. **William Davis** support development to the east of the village.

100. **Samworth Farms** consider that land to the east of Radcliffe on Trent represents the most appropriate direction of growth for the settlement in Green Belt terms. Furthermore it considers that land to the west of the settlement plays a key role in preventing the coalescence of Radcliffe on Trent with the urban edge of Nottingham. It also considers that land to the south of the settlement has a sensitive edge in landscape terms and therefore development opportunities are limited.

101. **Larkfleet Homes** support development in all directions. However specific support is mentioned for development to the south of the village as it offers superior accessibility and the shortest walking distance to the village centre and schools of any site within the village other than the very small RAD6 site. **Radcliffe on Trent Golf Club** also support development to the south of the village. They consider that if development were to be concentrated on either the
eastern or western sides of the village, this would close the gap between Bingham and Holme Pierrepoint respectively. In addition they consider that focusing development on the western side of the village would concentrate housing in areas at risk of flooding according to the Environment Agency’s online flooding map (flood zone 2).

102. The **Crown Estate** support development to the east of the village as the most sustainable and best direction in Green Belt terms best on the strategic review carried out in terms of north east sector. They raise constraints in terms of flood risk to the west of the village, and the narrowing of distance between Radcliffe on Trent and Nottingham. In addition, growth to the south of the village is also not supported, due to the segregation of the area by the A52.

103. In terms of other comments, there was some support for dispersing development within smaller sites south, east and west, rather than directing it in one direction as this would avoid the need for new infrastructure and reduce pressures on particular areas of the road network. This dispersal is promoted within the Neighbourhood Plan.

104. A significant number of respondents opposed the housing target believing that services (health and education) and infrastructure (the road network) would not be able to meet the needs of new residents.

**Housing Sites**

105. When asked specifically whether they supported the 10 site options (yes in full, yes in part or no) the following responses were received:

---

**Responses to Site Options – Radcliffe on Trent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Yes in full</th>
<th>Yes in part</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAD1 (Land north of Nottingham Road)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD2 (Land adjacent Grooms Cottage)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD3 (Land off Shelford Road)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD4 (Land of Grantham Road to north of railway Line)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD5 (Land of Grantham Road to south of railway Line (1))</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD6 (72 Main Road)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD7 (Land north of Grantham Road to south of railway line (2))</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD8 (Land south of Grantham Road)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD9 (Land at Radcliffe on Trent Golf Course (west))</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD10 (Land at Radcliffe on Trent Golf Course)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
106. **Nottinghamshire County Council** (NCC) provided landscape advice on all sites. Stating that RAD1 is well contained and would not be overly incongruous. It would however require a landscape block along Holme Lane. RAD2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 are within East Bridgford Escarpment Farmlands DPZ and have potential to ameliorate the landscape character of the area through careful design. However RAD 7 should be removed and RAD4 should not extend beyond RAD4 to contain the village and separate Radcliffe from Saxondale. RAD8, 9 and 10 are within Cotgrave and Tollerton Village Farmlands. Development should concur with landscape character actions. RAD8 and 9 border Dewberry Hill LWS and these sites should be carefully considered to avoid negative impacts on both amenity and biodiversity.

107. **The Radcliffe Community Action Group** has not identified any site preferences. It has summarised responses from the residents of Radcliffe to their village survey in 2014, which highlighted opposition to development and the removal of land from the Green Belt (Sites RAD1, 3, 4, 5 and 7 all received a majority of objections). Impacts on the A52 where a major concerns. The group recommends a mix of house types within smaller sites distributed around the village, rather than major development and loss of Green Belt.

108. **Mosaic Estates** support site RAD1. They promote the sustainability benefits of the site. They state that it had some support by a local plan inspector in a previous plan. They also state that there are no technical constraints, and the only constraint is that of Green Belt. This was demonstrated by the consideration of a previous planning application on the site. The site is one of the least sensitive in Green Belt terms.

109. **Oglesby** (Savills) consider that the technical work undertaken in relation to RAD2 on behalf of the landowner indicates that the site is deliverable and suitable for housing.

110. **William Davis** support the development of site RAD3. As with Mosaic Estates and RAD2, they consider that the site is suitable and has no constraints, and is one of the least sensitive in Green Belt terms. In addition, they consider that the site is large enough to offer mitigation in the way of allotment provision, open space, and sites for primary school provision and for a new health facility if required.
111. **Samworth Farms**, support the development of RAD 7 and RAD 8. In addition, they support the insetting of St James Business Park from the Green Belt to allow for infill development to allow for businesses expand in the future. They consider that RAD7 and RAD8 are both sustainable locations for development, as demonstrated by their own sustainability assessment of the two sites contained within their representation. They also state that, based upon their own assessment, they are the least sensitive in Green Belt terms.

112. **Larkfleet Homes and Radcliffe on Trent Golf Club** support the development of RAD9 and RAD10. They state that the sites are closer to the village centre than other sites. They also state in respect of RAD9 and RAD10, Larkfleet Homes state that the site is closest to the village facilities, within walking distance of a bus stop and has good access to the main highways network. Furthermore they consider that the site is well contained by existing vegetation, they are also considered to be infill development, as recognised by the Neighbourhood Plan group. Adding to the case, Radcliffe on Trent Golf club advance similar arguments together with a comparison with other sites. Their analysis concludes that the sites that are the most for allocation were RAD2, RAD8, RAD9 and RAD10 and part of RAD6.

113. In terms of additional sites, the **landowner** for fields and paddocks to the north of Holme Lane and to the south of the railway embankment has been put forward their land as available for development. They suggest that the land could be used for residential development, leisure and additional sports facilities. The **Crown Estate** do not support the development of RAD1, RAD4, RAD7, RAD8, RAD9 and RAD10. They have however submitted an additional site to the north of Shelford Road under their ownership. They consider that the site is acceptable in planning terms and does not perform well when looking at the purposes for including land within the Green Belt.

114. In terms of general responses, there was more support for RAD1 (west of Radcliffe) (yes in full or in part) than opposition. This was accompanied by less support for sites which are east of Radcliffe on Trent, most notably RAD3, RAD4, RAD5 and RAD7. There was considerable support for allocating parts of sites RAD3, RAD4 and RAD5 however. The responses to each site option reflect the representations made on the general direction of new housing.

115. There was stronger support for the smaller sites located off Shelford Road, Main Road, the A52 and Cropwell Road (RAD2, RAD6, RAD8, RAD9 and RAD10).
Ruddington

116. Consultation on future housing sites for Ruddington asked respondents to firstly identify the general direction of growth which they supported (North, North East, East South, or West), then to state whether they supported the proposed sites (either all of the site or in part) or not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Directions of Growth – Ruddington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

117. The responses to this question resulted in an even split between those who supported or opposed development to the north of the village (63/59). Concerns regarding the merging of Ruddington with the Main Urban Area, loss of village character and playing field where raised by a number of consultees, including the **Sharphill Action Group**.

118. There was however greater support than opposition for locating new housing within the north east and east of the village. **Bunny Parish Council** believe that development should avoid increasing traffic flows in the already congested centre. As such sites of the A60 and Flawforth Lane (East) would be preferable.

119. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** has raised concerns regarding development west of the village and its indirect impacts on Fairham Brook Wildlife Corridor. The sustainability of isolated sites to the east and north east was also highlighted as an issue.

120. In terms of the development industry, **Mordecai** support some development the east of the village. It considers that development would not severely impact on the green belt and the reasons for including land within it. **Bloor Homes** consider that development to the north of the village would not be detrimental to the purposes of Green Belt and indeed through the provision of landscaped open space a new, strong and permanent Green Belt boundary could be established. **Landmark Planning** support development to the east of the village. It states that this direction is closer to the village centre and the sites are more preferable in Green Belt terms. They raise concerns with development to the east and north of the village as having the potential to merge Ruddington with Clifton and Nottingham. **Mordecai** also support
development to the east of the village and have supported their position with their own landscape and green belt assessment.

121. **Sellars** consider that the south east of Ruddington represents the most appropriate direction of growth for the settlement. As with Landmark Planning they consider that land to the north and west of the settlement plays a key role in preventing the coalescence of Ruddington with the urban edge of Nottingham incorporating Clifton, Wilford and Edwalton. They also consider that development to the south east of the settlement between the existing built form on Musters Road and Asher Lane (with the Country Park beyond) may be appropriate in Green Belt terms however they understand that there are significant issues regarding access and highways which had not been resolved. **Featherstones** support development to the north east of the village.

122. Significantly more respondents opposed development south and west of the village. Those that opposed development west of settlement identified the merging of Ruddington with the Main Urban Area as a significant concern.

**Housing Sites**

123. When asked whether they supported the 10 site options (yes in full, yes in part or no) the following responses were received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Yes in full</th>
<th>Yes in part</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUD1 (land west of Wilford Road (south))</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD2 (land west of Wilford Road (north))</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD3 (land adjacent to St Peter’s Junior School)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD4 (Easthorpe House and adjacent land)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD5 (land south of Flawforth Lane)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD6 (land at Loughborough Road)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD7 (land north west of Asher Lane)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD8 (land west of Pasture Lane)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD9 (land south of Landmere Lane)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD10 (land adjacent to Landmere Farm)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

124. **Nottinghamshire County Council** has advised that RUD1, 2, 3, 9 and 10 are within the Mickleborough Fringe DPZ. RUD2 incorporates a length of disused railway. The cutting north is a SSSI and LWS (Willwell Cutting) and to the south the disused line extends as a LWS. Any development should provide a green link between these two LWSs.
125. NCC has also advised that RUD4 and 6 are within the Conservation Area and that development must be in keeping with the area. Furthermore the mature tree lined frontage should be preserved. RU8 has potential to link footpath 4 and Fairham Brook Nature Reserve thus extending green route that originates at Rushcliffe Country Park.

126. In terms of responses from the development industry, Bloor Homes support the development of RUD1. Their proposal covers part of the field and the existing Sellor's Playing Field, which could be replaced with a larger, more comprehensive public open space and a potentially new community hall to the north of the site. They consider that the site would not extend development out further than existing development. They also consider that the site is also well-related to public transport services and the local highway network with a large proportion of traffic able to travel northwards out of the village, away from the congested centre of the village.

127. Burt supports the development of RUD4 only. They consider that the land is well contained and well located in relation to the centre of Ruddington. They also consider that the building could be converted to residential units, and that a sensitive scheme could be developed in its grounds that would not impact on its setting. In addition, they have raised various concerns in relation to other sites around Ruddington.

128. Landmark Planning support the development of RUD5 and RUD7. In respect of RUD5, they consider that RUD5 is acceptable in planning terms, close to the village centre and is supported by the Parish Council.

129. Mordecai supports the development of RUD6. They state that the site is well contained and relates well to the village.

130. In terms of additional sites, Featherstones Planning have put forward land off Old Loughborough Road as having potential to be developed for self or custombuild housing. They state that the site could be developed whilst remaining in the Green belt as the proposal would not challenge the five fundamental purposes of Green Belt. Like the existing housing alongside it, they consider that the site could be developed but remain in the Green Belt, washed over by it. In addition, Sellars have promoted east of the junction of Loughborough Road and Mere Way. They consider that the site does not perform a significant role in relation to the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it.

131.Whilst the number of those who supported the allocation of RUD1 was matched by those that opposed the development (55/57), with the addition of those who supported the partial development of this site, a clearer majority supported the
allocation of this site in full or in part. Those that objected to the allocation of RUD1 highlighted the site’s risk of flooding, the loss of Sellor’s Field, visual impact on the setting of Ruddington, and the merging of Ruddington with West Bridgford.

132. There was a much larger difference in number between those who supported or opposed the allocation of RUD2 (18/85), with a clear majority opposing the development of this site. The primary concern was the merging of Ruddington with West Bridgford and loss of village character. The addition of those who supported the partial allocation of this site (23) does not alter the overall opinion that the site should not be allocated.

133. RUD3 was also opposed by the majority (66/51), however support and opposition were equal when considering those who also supported its partial development (64/66). The majority highlighted access issues onto the A60 and site’s isolated location as negative factors. Nottingham County Council has advised that if RUD3 contains ecologically valuable grassland habitat, it should not be allocated.

134. RUD4 received similar responses to RUD3, with a majority (62) opposed to the allocation. This majority was reduced by those who supported the partial development of the site. Combined with yes in full those that supported development on the site also totalled 61.

135. The partial and complete allocation of sites east of the A60 (RUD5 and RUD6) were supported by the majority of respondents. Supporters highlighted their ease of access onto the A60 and avoidance of congestion within Ruddington. However some residents highlighted flooding, congestion on Flawforth Lane and separation of these sites from the centre of the village by the A60 as issues which should prevent their allocation.

136. Both RUD7 and RUD8 were opposed by a clear majority of respondents. When commenting on RUD7 a considerable number of representations highlighted the impact on traffic congestion through the village as a negative factor. The merging of Ruddington and Clifton as a result of RUD8 was also regularly highlighted.

137. Conversely there was considerable support for allocating RUD9 and RUD10 which are located on Landmere Lane. Those that opposed their allocation highlighted their isolated location and limited contribution to the housing target.

138. In responses, many representations highlighted the lack of services, traffic congestion, parking and loss of village character as factors which must be considered before allocating sites for housing.
Housing development in other villages

139. Aslockton Parish Council, Barton in Fabis Parish Council, Bunny Parish Council, Gotham Parish Council, Kinoulton Parish Council and Elton Parish Meeting do not support allocating land for residential development around other settlements. Gotham PC considers there are sufficient opportunities within Gotham and rural exceptions to meet local need. Elton has highlighted the increase in housing stock within their parish due to barn conversions and concerns regarding developments in Aslockton which are not in the best interests of the area.

140. Aslockton Parish Council have expressed strong support for the restriction on developments within other villages for local needs only. However they consider that there is a need to define what local need means. Furthermore, they consider that no one settlement should be subjected to a large percentage increase in the number of dwellings and lose its character, and that development should be spread across all villages.

141. East Leake Parish Council does not support this approach as they believe consideration should be given to allowing some of the other villages to grow in planned and sympathetic way.

142. Fintham Parish Council has identified the Former Islamic Institute as a suitable site within the parish.

143. Midlands Rural Housing has highlighted the need within some villages for market housing to sustain services and, in accordance with the NPPF, to cross subsidies affordable housing schemes.

144. There was significant opposition from those representing the development industry who, in support of their clients’ sites within other settlements, highlighted the need to deliver 2,000 homes within ‘other villages’ to meet Core Strategy housing requirements, the absence of a five year supply of deliverable housing sites and the opportunities within other settlements, including brownfield sites, to provide greater flexibility.

145. Aslockton, Costock, Cropwell Bishop, East Bridgford, Gotham, Tollerton and Sutton Bonnington have been highlighted as settlements which could sustainably accommodate further housing.

146. Gladmans consider that all villages could make a contribution towards housing supply, an that the settlement hierarchy is too simplistic given the relative sustainability and accessibility to facilities that some of the smaller settlements
across the Borough have. Allocations at other villages would provide some flexibility in the plan in terms of delivery

147. In the case of Aslockton, **Davidsons Developments** consider that the village contains a number of facilities, and that it is accessible to other facilities in neighbouring towns and villages by public transport. Alongside arguments made that a range of smaller sites would assist delivery, they consider that their site to the north of Abbey Lane is suitable and deliverable. **Featherstones Planning** raise similar arguments relating to the settlements sustainability, and consider that a site north of Cliffhill Lane is suitable and available for development.

148. In the case of Bunny, **IDC and Associates** considers that the development of Bunny Brickworks for mixed use purposes would allow for the redevelopment of a previously-developed site and provide for economic benefits as supported by the National Planning Policy Framework.

149. In the case of Costock, **IH Moore** consider that the village has some facilities and is accessible to other facilities by Public Transport. They consider that land at Millers Lane could provide for smaller units that are lacking across the Borough and in particular in the new developments with planning permission in adjacent East Leake.

150. In the case of East Bridgford, **Aldergate Properties** consider that there is a need to identify further sites, and that the village is a suitable place due to its access to facilities, the fact that it is served by public transport, and its proximity to the Trunk Road network. They suggest that land off Closes Side Lane is available and suitable for development, subject to its allocation, and is without any constraints. In addition, **Allwood** are promoting their site east of Lammas Lane as being potentially suitable for development. They have provided a sustainability appraisal of their site against the criteria set by the Borough Council in support of the site, together with a Green Belt assessment. **Jackson**

151. In the case of Gotham, **Crosbie** considers that some development should be provided at other settlements, and support development north of Kegworth Road. They have provided a sustainability appraisal of their site against the criteria set by the Borough Council in support of the site, together with a Green Belt assessment. **Jackson** also support allocations for development at Gotham, and have suggested land of Moor Lane. **Saint Gobain** consider that Gotham is a sustainable settlement to accommodate some growth. They consider that 3 parcels of land within their ownership have potential for residential and other development.
152. In the case of Sutton Bonington, Paget Estates consider that Sutton Bonington is a sustainable settlement, and that there is a need to allocate smaller sites have importance is providing for housing supply. They consider that the area of land off Park Lane could deliver up to 50 dwellings and new areas of open space.

153. In the case of Whatton, Hallam Land suggest that Whatton and Aslockton are a sustainable location for further growth, and sites for development should be allocated in order to offset the delay in delivery on larger sites across the Borough. They suggest that land of Dark Lane could provide for up to 125 dwellings and could be integrated into the village.

154. In terms of other locations, John A Wells suggest that a positive policy should be incorporated into Local Plan Part 2 to allow for redevelopment of farm complexes for residential development, and cite their site at Lodge Farm, Wysall of a site that would benefit from this

155. The majority of general responses agreed that the LAPP should not allocate any land for housing development at ‘other villages,’ however some responses considered that spreading the burden of development across all villages would lessen the impact that development would bring. One comment suggested that Bradmore could accommodate a small development of around 50 dwellings.

**Affordable housing at ‘other villages’**

156. 33 representations were received regarding the need to allocate sites within other villages purely for affordable housing. The majority (18) did not favour allocating affordable housing sites; rather they considered these sites should come forward on a case by case basis to meet identified need. Those representing the development industry identified a lack of certainty that these sites would come forward and that they would be best delivered as a proportion of open market development. Kinoulton Parish Council was against allocating sites purely for affordable housing.


158. Midlands Rural Housing supported allocations for affordable housing within settlements of less than 3,000 residents.
Accessibility and wheelchair housing standard

159. A limited response was received from consultees regarding additional accessibility policies. 24 responses supported such a policy, 4 responses opposed. Those that supported included Keyworth and Radcliffe on Trent’s Neighbourhood Plan Steering Groups, East Leake Parish Council, and Flintham Parish Council. There was support for the delivery of the Lifetime Homes Standards to reflect the need of an ageing population.

160. Those that opposed additional standards, included those from the development industry, who referred to the lack of evidence supporting additional policy, the Deregulation Bill 2015 which prevents Council’s setting additional technical requirements and that Building Regulations are sufficient. Aslockton Parish Council opposed such standards, citing the need to consider site suitability for any disability adapted dwellings.

Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

161. A limited response was received from consultees regarding the allocations of sites to meet the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. 9 responses supported the allocation of sites, 15 responses opposed. Those that supported further sites highlighted the need to avoid unplanned applications for sites. Support was received from the National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Group who is concerned that sites to meet plot needs are reliant on strategic allocations that are delayed. They also highlighted that the absence of an up-to-date assessment of need is a serious concern.

162. The Sharphill Action Group has identified the Gamston Strategic Allocation as a suitable area to locate a site.


164. Elton Parish Meeting believes there are no suitable sites within the parish.

Custom and Self-Build

165. 16 responses provided representations on how best to deliver custom and self-build housing developments.

166. East Leake, Flintham and Keyworth Parish Councils’ support the creation of the register and a policy which includes a proportion of custom and self-build housing within housing proposals.
A number of consultees supported the incorporation of plots within larger developments, suggesting a threshold beyond which developments should set aside plots for custom and self-build, this ranged between 50 and 100 units. Within these sites one respondent suggested 10% as a suitable proportion of custom build plots. If the plots are not purchased they could be built by the developer and sold on the open market. Sites COT10 and COT 11 are suitable for a proportion of Custom and Self-Build housing.

However significant concern was raised regarding viability, market saturation and lack of demand. The Home Builders Federation highlighted the need for a viability assessment of the impact of any policy.

One comment suggested that the plan should encourage exceptional design and environmental standards, as well as allowing one off developments to be approved in rural areas.

There were some concerns that delivery within general housing sites would not help boost supply. It would be difficult to manage and deliver, therefore potentially constraining rather than boosting housing delivery. Alternatively one-off sites would provide additional flexibility and deliver faster if made known to small locally operated builders.

Land in Council ownership was suggested by one respondent (including the Council Depot).

Other Housing Issues

Other issues highlighted by respondents included:

- the need for high build standards;
- Appropriate densities within rural, town and city locations;
- concerns regarding the reliance on Keyworth’s Neighbourhood Plan;
- the need for sheltered accommodation in Keyworth;
- the need to bring sites forward quickly;
- the need for a robust evidence base which addresses sites being deliverable, available, suitable and viable for development;
- the need for further design policy;
- reference to neighbourhood plans and their weight in decision making;
- traffic impacts on Tollerton;
- the requirement to fundamentally review of the whole Local Plan and objectively assessed need. This should reflect changes to NPPF and inclusion of Starter Homes and consider implications of current delivery;
Consideration of windfall sites to reduce the housing targets; and
Poor delivery of social housing or smaller units for rent.

173. **Nottinghamshire County Council** has advised that sites for housing and other uses discussed in the Local Plan Part 2 should be considered in relation to the strategy of the applicable Development Policy Zone (DPZ) within the Landscape Character Assessment.

174. The **Environment Agency** has highlighted the need to have regard to the Humber River Basin Management Plan and the use of an appropriate buffer zone along waterways within the catchment. These policies should also encourage the enhancement of river and stream habitats through, for example, the removal of hard engineered structures. Planning policy should also ensure the sites allocated can contribute towards the delivery of the habitat creation opportunities identified in the Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping. All potential site allocations will require Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) to be incorporated.

175. **Historic England** advises that they have recently published an advice note entitled The Historic Environment and Site Allocations in Local Plans.

**Green Belt**

**Alterations to existing Green Belt ‘inset’ boundaries**

176. The majority of representations support the alterations to the existing inset Green Belt boundaries of Cotgrave (9/4), Cropwell Bishop (9/1), East Bridgford (9/1), Keyworth (11/5), Radcliffe on Trent (10/0), Ruddington (13/2) and Tollerton (9/0).

177. Concerns were raised that the removal of the British Geological Survey at Keyworth was a precursor for the removal of adjacent sites. However the **Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** supports the alterations.

178. A significant number of comments highlighted wider issues regarding the need for a comprehensive review of the Green Belt to meet Core Strategy housing targets. These issues have been addressed within the Core Strategy itself, the Issues and Options consultation, and Draft Green Belt Review Part 2.

**Creation of new Green Belt ‘inset’ boundaries**

179. The majority of representations support the creation of new Green Belt ‘inset’ boundaries for Bradmore (12/3), Bunny (11/4), Cropwell Bishop (10/4), Gotham
(14/5), Newton (10/2), Plumtree (13/1), Shelford (10/2), and Upper Saxondale (13/2).

180. Representatives of the development industry consider the inset boundaries are too tightly drawn, reducing flexibility, and highlighted alternative boundaries for Gotham and Bunny to accommodate suitable housing allocations. Furthermore that these changes to the Green Belt should occur alongside a wider strategic review of the GB.

181. **Bunny Parish Council** do not believe the changes will lead to any significant proposals for new housing and that the requirements within the Conservation Area should be observed.

182. **Bradmore Parish Council** preferred to be washed over by the green belt but, in the event of the village being inset from the green belt, do not object to the boundary and focus on infill development.

183. **Gotham Parish Council** agree with policy in Core Strategy and that housing for local need which in Gotham can be accommodated within the village envelope or exceptions.

184. **Barton in Fabis Parish Council** agree with Core Strategy that housing in other settlements should be for local needs only and in Gotham there is capacity for that scale of housing within the proposed village envelope and through rural exception sites Barton Parish Council fully supports submission by Gotham Parish Council regarding development within their village.

**Safeguarded Land**

185. 73 representations were received regarding the designation of further ‘safeguarded land.’ 60 supported allocating safeguarded sites, 12 opposed.

186. A significant number of those that supported safeguarding land specifically supported the allocations proposed within Keyworth’s Neighbourhood Plan and consulted upon within the Issues and Options document. There were a number of representations which suggested the safeguarded sites on the edge of Keyworth should be allocated as housing sites and developed within the plan period.

187. Representatives of the development industry have highlighted housing delivery issues and the need to identify safeguarded land for longer-term development needs. Given the uncertainties in meeting the current plan period housing target such sites may become necessary for development in the plan period. All
low-medium sites in Green Belt Review should be removed and safeguarded - respond to shortfalls.

188. Sites in Cotgrave, Gotham, Keyworth have been suggested as potential safeguarded land.

189. **Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** support the safeguarded land identified for Keyworth.

190. **Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council** support the consideration of Safeguarded land around Radcliffe within the Green Belt Review.

191. **Gotham Parish Council** expressed concern that the decision to safeguard pre-empts the review and decisions on future land allocations in any review of the local plan.

192. **Aslockton Parish Council** highlighted the need to clarify what ‘safeguarded land’ is as it implies land will be protected from development.

193. The **Sharphill Action Group** highlighted the surplus of land designated within the main urban area and absence of need to bring the Edwalton Golf Course forward.

194. **Wickmere** have promoted Land south of Hollygate Lane, Cotgrave. They state that whilst site can/should be delivered in the short term, longer term the site could be safeguarded to compliment longer term regeneration objectives.

195. Opposition to safeguarding land highlighted that doing so will make it more likely that sites on safeguarded land will be allocated and developed in preference to harder to develop sites such as regeneration sites. There was also concern that a potential surplus of land within Greater Nottingham and that the slow release/build rates does not warrant further release.

**Other Green Belt Matters**

196. Identification of additional Green Belt land through the Review was suggested. For example around Bingham where expansion is encroaching towards neighbouring settlements. **East Leake Parish Council** has suggested that removal of land from the Green Belt should be accompanied by expansion of the Green Belt.

197. **Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council** supports the NPPF requirement that green belt inset boundaries should not include within them land that is required to be kept permanently open, and should follow defensible boundaries that are
readily recognisable and likely to be permanent, such as railways, rivers, roads, woodland, field hedge lines, ridgelines, etc…

198. **Barton in Fabis Parish Council** believes clear defensible boundaries should be agreed in all cases. For any development within the green belt there must be a detailed development master plan led by the Borough Council (not developer led) formulated in co-operation with local communities.

199. **Elton Parish Meeting** enquire whether the Council has considered extending the Green Belt within Rushcliffe.

200. One comment suggests that the site of the proposed Park and Ride at Gamston should be removed from the Green Belt.

201. A number of comments state that land to the west of Sharphill Wood should remain in the Green Belt in order to retain its setting and links to the wildlife corridors to the west and south.

202. A number of responses form the development industry state that Green Belt boundaries are too tightly drawn and do not consider the requirement to establish long term permanent boundaries.

203. In addition to Key Settlements, Green Belt boundaries of ‘other villages’ should be reviewed. **Featherstones Planning** suggest a particular revision to the Green Belt to the north of Sutton Bonington.

### Employment Provision and Economic Development

#### Additional Employment Allocations

204. In response to the general question regarding the need to allocate further sites, 54 respondents agreed that sites should be allocated and 22 replied that further sites shouldn’t. The majority who agreed supported the employment allocation (KEYD (Land of Platt Lane)) at Keyworth. Those that disagreed believed adequate employment sites had been allocated through the Core Strategy and/or that further allocations should be justified through the evidence base.

#### Existing Employment Allocations

205. Whilst responses to the question regarding existing employment allocations were limited, there was significantly more support for the retention of Bunny
Brickworks, British Gypsum (Gotham), and Hathern Works (Sutton Bonnington) as employment allocations than objections.

206. **Elton Parish Meeting** suggest a review of all employment allocations to see if they are suitable or would be better put to us in some other form. If employment land is not taken up the reasons behind need to be known before any decisions can be realistically be made on these sites. The parish council questions whether these large rural sites are applicable now.

207. **Bunny Parish Council** support the continued identification of Bunny Brickworks as an employment site and should not be allocated for housing. If employment use is not viable it should be restored to its original state (grassland).

208. **Nottinghamshire County Council** advised that development of employment sites within rural areas should adhere to the recommended landscape actions in the relevant DPZ. NCC has highlighted the possible presence of priority habitats at Chapel Lane (Bingham), Hollygate Lane (Cotgrave) and Hathern Works (Sutton Bonnington), and advised that it must be demonstrated the site is of low ecological value prior to allocation. Regarding Bunny Brickworks, NCC suggests that if it is demonstrated that the site contains priority habitat – it should not be considered.

209. **Saint Gobain** consider that their operations south of Gypsum Way should be removed from the green belt to allow for operational flexibility in the future.

210. One comment suggests that the local wildlife site within Bunny Brickworks and at Langar should be omitted.

**Langar Airfield**

211. Support was split regarding the allocation of three employment sites at Langar Airfield with 11 in support and 6 objections. **Nottingham Wildlife Trust** and two other respondents have raised concerns that the proposed allocations include Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) and would therefore require detailed ecological assessment before inclusion in the plan. **Barton in Fabis Parish Council** believes these sites should be prioritised above development at Clifton Pastures.

212. **Elton Parish Meeting** has identified issues regarding HGV traffic accessing Langar airfield and restrictions on weight in Leicestershire routing traffic of the A52 and through villages in Rushcliffe. The parish council support continued restrictions on the extent of development at the airfield.
Existing Employment Sites

213. In response to the question regarding the protection of existing employment sites, 12 responses were received. These overwhelmingly supported (11/1) the retention of a criteria based policy which prevented the loss of sites which could still provide acceptable standard of viable employment accommodation.

Centres of Excellence

214. Only 10 respondents expressed a view on whether Core Strategy policy 4 was sufficient to manage development within Rushcliffe’s Centres of Excellence. There was an even split with 5 supporting more detailed policies and 4 believing the Core Strategy policy is sufficient. Representations from Uniper (Formally EON and operator of Ratcliffe on Trent Power Station) have requested the extents of the Centres of Excellence are defined within Local Plan part 2.

Rural Diversification

215. 17 responses were received regarding rural diversification. The majority (9) believed Core Strategy policy 5 sufficiently encouraged and managed the scale and type of diversification and that no further policy was required within Local Plan part 2.

216. However, Aslockton and Kinoulton Parish Councils consider the Core Strategy and NPPF policies regarding rural diversification too vague and that Local Plan part 2 should include a detailed criteria based policy outlining where diversification is appropriate.

217. Elton Parish Meeting proposes the demonstration of need, appropriate diversification and impacts on rural setting and open countryside as criteria.

218. Orston Parish Council supports rural diversification provided it preserves or enhances the Orston Conservation Area and does not significantly harm landscape character.

219. Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust have cautioned against a policy which permits oversized industrial units on the edge of villages. Applications must consider impact on protected species, notably birds and bats, and enhance biodiversity.

220. Rushcliffe Borough Council Environmental Sustainable Development Officer raised similar concerns to NWT, highlighting the need to retain the external appearance of buildings and compliance with Landscape Character Assessment.
221. Comments also highlighted the need to support economic growth alongside housing in rural areas and protection of the local environment against pollution (light, noise, odour etc…) and impacts from traffic.

**General Employment Comment**

222. **East Leake Parish Council** believes a more holistic approach to employment land should occur and that use of green field land is unwarranted. They also state that in the case of East Leake, the East Leake Neighbourhood Plan provides criteria for allocating employment land in the village.

**Regeneration**

**Regeneration Sites**

223. The allocation of Bunny Brickworks and the Former Islamic Institute (Flintham) as regeneration sites was overwhelmingly supported within representations, including submissions by **Aslockton Parish Council** (who suggest residential development), **Bunny and Fintham Parish Council**, and **Elton Parish Meeting**. There were however concerns regarding the need to respect local character and wishes of local residents and the impact of regeneration upon Bunny Woods, an ancient woodland and Local Wildlife Site, which is adjacent to the site. Conversely, **Bunny Parish Council** consider that the brickworks should remain allocated for employment purposes, and should be restored to grassland if employment development is not forthcoming.

**Retail Centres**

**Local and District Centre Boundaries and Frontages**

224. Responses to the suggested local and district centre boundaries, primary shopping areas and shop frontages were supportive, with only one or two objections against the centre’s proposed in Bingham, East Leake, Radcliffe on Trent, and West Bridgford.

225. **Radcliffe on Trent Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** and **Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council** suggest that: the proposed boundary for the Radcliffe on Trent Local Centre should extend north to the station; the secondary frontage on Shelford Road should be extended to its junction with New Road; and a regeneration zone to the south of Main Road within the proposed Local Village Centre should be allocated.
226. **East Leake Parish Council** advises that Local Plan Part 2 should be in conformity with Neighbourhood Plan by: extending the primary shopping area from Three Horse Shoes on Brookside to the bottom of Castle Hill; identifying 28 Main St, 40 Main St, 42 Main St, Main St and small parade leading to Health Centre/Library as primary frontages; and the row of units behind odd numbers on Gotham Road as a secondary frontage.

227. Detailed comments have been received regarding Bingham’s district centre boundary and retail frontages.

228. Comments in relation to Wolds Drive Keyworth suggest that this area should be a primary shopping area.

229. There were numerous comments within responses regarding the lack of parking within all local and district centres.

**Non-retail uses in centres**

230. Representations regarding non A1 retail uses in the primary shopping area highlighted the differences in uses within the A1 use class (undertakers, retail, hairdressers etc…) and the suggestion that non A1(a) (retail) should be restricted in the primary shopping area.

231. There was also support (1 representation) for the retention of the restriction of non-A1 uses within the primary shopping area (no more than 35% of units of the defined retail area)

232. However another response considered the existing approach over prescriptive, that the types of use within each centre should be determined by the market and A3 and A4 uses encourage visitors, provide vitality.

**Allocations within or on the edge of retail centres**

233. A limited number of representations were received regarding retail allocations. 10 responses contained 8 objections to the allocation of retail sites (including one representation by **Flintham Parish Council**) and, provided there was an identified need, 2 supporting comments,

234. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** consider that if any new retail of commercial development is allocated, this should be sustainable and build in features such as Sustainable Urban Drainage Schemes (SUDS). They also refer to guidelines for ecological impact assessment for new developments and the need to follow these guidelines when assessing new development.
235. **East Leake Neighbourhood Plan steering group** consider that the extent of the village centre in the neighbourhood plan sufficient to provide enough possible sites.

236. **Elton Parish Meeting** do not believe further allocations are necessary as there is room for development in all centres that could be developed if necessary.

237. **Aldi stores** have advised that there is a requirement for further retail floorspace in Rushcliffe and that this should not be restricted by a specific quantum of floorspace. Instead the policy should be based on the NPPF.

238. In Bingham, it has been suggested that policies should recognise likely increased pressures for retail developments within the industrial estate, north of the railway line, as housing comes forward in that area. It must be managed to avoid adversely affecting the district centre.

### Centres of Neighbourhood Importance

239. Two responses expressed opinions regarding designation of centres of neighbourhood importance. One supported the extent of the centres at Melton Rd; Boundary Rd, Musters Rd and Loughborough Rd (the Wolds). The other raised concerns that the definition was not sufficiently clear.

240. **The Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** has suggested that the junction of Debdale Lane and Nottingham Road in Keyworth should be designated a centre of neighbourhood importance. This was supported by another representation.

241. Whilst support for a mix of A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5 uses was expressed by a number of consultees, as this provided flexibility and vitality, concerns were raised regarding A5 uses and the loss of vibrancy within centres during the day. There was also support for D1 and D2 uses in local and district centres.

### Threshold for requiring Impact Assessments

242. The issues and options consultation asked whether an impact assessment should be applied to retail developments greater than a 500m2. There was overwhelming support (18/3) for this threshold, including from **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust**.

243. This support highlighted the need to protect the vitality of town centres and promote sustainable developments, which did not increase congestion on the edge of Nottingham. Some respondents believed existing out of centre retail developments had already adversely affected local and district centres.
244. There was however concern from Aldi that the use of a threshold based on the average floor space of committed retail developments in Rushcliffe did not take account of NPPF guidance which includes scale, vitality and viability, and effects of development on any town centre strategy.

Other Retail Matters

245. Whilst accepting that the Local Plan has limited influence on public transport, Elton Parish Meeting has highlighted the lack of public transport as an issue which increases parking problems in Bingham.

Design and Landscaping Character

General Design – Need for further policy

246. 21 consultees responded to the Issues and Options question regarding the need for more detailed design policy. The responses were evenly split (12 in favour and 7 against).

247. Barton in Fabis and Gotham Parish Councils supported further policy and believe that design has been developer led and this has led to unsightly developments. Developments must be designed in sympathy with both the natural environment and existing architectural styles. There should be a review of the Core Strategy, Design SPD and best practice to determine what constitutes good design.

248. Aslockton Parish Council encourages more local consultation and criteria which promote low carbon and address the impact on climate change.

249. East Leake Parish Council has highlighted Neighbourhood Plan policy H5 and that Building for life standards should be adhered to.

250. Elton Parish Meeting believe more importance and recognition should be given to the contribution that mature landscapes make to enhancing the setting of a place both from outside and from within.

251. Kinoulton Parish Council identified design as a key planning issue which warrants regular review of the design SPD. Design policy should address car parking standards.

252. Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust have suggested that the recommendations of the Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment and Rushcliffe Nature
Conservation Strategy 2016 should inform a more detailed policy. These comments were also made by others, who also highlighted the need to design developments that achieve net-gains in biodiversity. The Exeter Design SPD was regularly mentioned.

253. **Historic England** has suggested a detailed policy should address shop front design and preservation of historic styles/features.

254. The **Environment Agency** advised that Local Plan Part 2 should include more detailed policy in relation to the design of new development as Policy 10 in the ACS does not include the requirement to consider Sustainable Drainage Systems as part of the design.

255. Representations from the development industry have cautioned against prescriptive policy which goes beyond NPPF guidance on scale, density, massing height, landscape, layout, materials and access. Local Plan Part 2 should not impose architectural styles. There was also a suggestion that all allocations should have bespoke design guidance.

**Landscape Character**

256. One respondent requested the revival of Mature Landscape Areas and reversal of the erosion of dark landscape(s).

257. **East Leake Parish Council** identifies policies within the Neighbourhood Plan and the protection it gives to ridgelines. Gotham and Barton in Fabis Parish Councils also highlights the importance of ridgelines as boundaries.

258. **Orston Parish Council, Aslockton Parish Council** and **Elton Parish Meeting** have identified the Vale of Belvoir as a mature and valued landscape. A landscape policy should recognise features considered of local importance.

259. **Flintham Parish Council** has identified the river banks between West Bridgford and Flintham as a valued landscape, so that diverse habitats are able to thrive.

260. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust**, other environmental groups and consultees refer to existing landscape character guidelines, including the Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment, and summary of landscape types in the Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy 2016-2020 (chapter 8) and the need to reflect these documents in the plan.

261. **Historic England** has suggested a flexible approach to allow valued landscapes to be identified during the process of site assessment and that
valued landscapes can be classified non-designated heritage assets if important to the setting of designated heritage assets or combination of factors (field patterns, historic landscapes). The plan should recognise local landscapes, but not be a limited list.

262. Valuable landscapes in the Borough, identified by consultees, include the ridge line view of Sharphill, the River Trent Valley, Gotham Moor, other moors/open spaces and long distance views. Ridge and Furrows should also be recognised as landscape features.

Other Design and Landscape Issues

263. **Nottinghamshire County Council** has identified The Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study: Wind Energy Development (2014) as a source of evidence to support landscape policy. Landscape and views of borough wide importance have been identified and these can be used to inform the impact of developments other than wind turbines. It also considers views which extend across the boundary.

264. In addition, NCC have advised that the plan should include reference to protection of key vistas and views originating from outside Rushcliffe as well as requiring developments to consider the impact on landscape character of adjoining district.

265. NCC has also advised that key vistas are also recorded in Conservation area Appraisal documents. LAPP should highlight need to consider and mitigate the impact on these views and impact on landscapes.

266. **Aslockton Parish Council** has suggested a minimum density for developments over a certain size.

267. **Elton Parish Meeting** believes design and landscape policies should ensure that developments in the countryside value the countryside irrespective of any official designation.
Historic Environment

Important Local Heritage Assets

268. **Historic England** has identified the archaeological resource of the Trent Valley and its confluence with the Soar and Derwent as being particularly sensitive and complex. Developments will require specialist archaeological experience and expertise to assess the impacts of proposals.

269. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust and Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group** have highlighted the ecological and historic value of historic buildings, ancient hedgerows, ancient woodland, ridge and furrow fields and historic parks and gardens.

270. **Orston Parish Council** requests a specific reference in the plan to Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans. In particular, reference should be made to the following elements in Townscape Appraisal Maps: unlisted buildings; important views and vistas; important tree groups; and open spaces.

271. **East Leake Parish Council** has highlighted policies in the neighbourhood plan and suggested wide criteria should determine inclusion on the local list. In addition, the plan should include additional controls for alterations to assets.

272. **Elton Parish Meeting, Aslockton Parish Council** and **Flintham Parish Council** have identified conservation areas, listed buildings, historic buildings, scheduled monuments and possible important archaeology as important historic elements in their parishes.

273. One respondent highlighted the tendency to focus on specific buildings/objects rather than consider wider historic value. Industrial and particularly transport heritage appears to be overlooked and should be both protected and supported as an asset.

274. Whilst there were a limited number of representations on the conservation of historic assets, there was overwhelming support for a list of these local historic assets, including support from **Aslockton Parish Council, Elton Parish Meeting** and **Historic England**. Aslockton Parish Council support clear guidance on what will or will not be permitted whilst Elton believe the LAPP should recognise their contribution within local landscapes.

275. **Historic England** highlights consistency with other LPAs and their importance as part of a positive strategy for the historic environment (NPPF). They strongly recommend the development of local bespoke criteria developed in conjunction...
with widespread public consultation. Selecting assets according to the local context was also supported by other consultees.

**Designated Heritage Assets**

276. Similarly to local assets, a limited number of comments were received regarding designated heritage assets (30). Whilst there was no overwhelming support for further local policy, as the NPPF was considered sufficient (the majority view of the development industry), Historic England supports a detailed policy which expands on the NPPF at a local level.

277. **Historic England** also advises that clear wording should require assessments of significance and recognition of setting and that a minimum standard can be helpful. They suggest policy wording which reflects the emphasis on identifying significance and a stronger policy where development affects a heritage asset at risk.

278. **Elton Parish Meeting** and **Aslockton Parish Council** believe the policy should be widened to include those local heritage assets without specific designations that are of local importance (including archaeology) in respect of their contribution to the character and setting of the area.

279. Other comments highlighted the need for guidance on protecting or sympathetically incorporating heritage assets into the development which also considers the local, national and international significance of the asset.

**Other Heritage Issues**

280. **Historic England** considers that a policy related to archaeology should supplement Policies 10 and 11 of the Core Strategy and suggested policy wording has been provided.

281. **Aslockton Parish Council** believes policies should include existing principles of statutory consultees such as Historic England, County Council and Borough Conservation Officers.

282. **Elton Parish Meeting** highlighted the need to consider views from both outside and within a heritage asset.
Climate Change, Flood Risk and Water Use

Renewable and low carbon energy generation

283. Whilst only a limited number of consultees commented on whether the plan should identify areas suitable for renewable and low carbon energy generation, 14 responses supported the identification of these areas, 1 opposed.

284. To avoid the loss of good quality agricultural land, the use of brownfield sites, unsuitable for housing or employment, was suggested. Support was also dependent on sites being objectively assessed.

285. Aslockton Parish Council raised concerns that the need for a range of criteria for different technologies would make it difficult to identify sites. It would also increase cumulative effects.

286. Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust believe guidance in relation to sites suitable for renewable energy production (especially wind, solar and bio crops) would be useful, to avoid sensitive sites, such as the River Trent, which is a bird migration corridor, or local wildlife sites etc. Any further guidance (in addition to the wind energy SPG) should encourage wildlife-friendly management around renewable energy sites but only if it would be beneficial for, and not potentially harm, wildlife.

287. Compliance with Footnote 17 of the NPPF was highlighted - making clear what criteria have determined their selection, including for what size of development the areas are considered suitable.

Reducing carbon emissions

288. There was an even split between those who supported further policy on how development should contribute to reducing carbon dioxide emissions. 12 supported further policy and 6 opposed.

289. East Leake Parish Council believes that directing new housing towards the urban edge is the most effective way of reducing CO2. Street design, including connectivity by providing footpaths and cycle paths that reduce car journeys and investment in public transport is also important.

290. Elton Parish Meeting encourage consideration as to how any development might be able to take emissions reduction into consideration. Aslockton Parish Council suggests all new build have to use some renewable energy.
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust and Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group encourage woodland planting on suitable sites (i.e. avoid important grasslands and wetlands etc…) and the trees should be present in the long-term in order to achieve carbon storage benefits. Any new woodland created should be managed to enhance their wildlife and, where appropriate, timber value.

Numerous consultees from the development industry state that policies cannot now be introduced that seek to repeat or expand upon those Building Regulation standards except in very limited and specific circumstances. Furthermore, the Deregulation Act 2015 has removed the power of Planning Authorities to require residential developments to exceed the energy performance requirements of Building Regulations.

The Home Builders Federation has accepted that the Council can specify the proportion of energy generated from on-site renewables and / or low carbon energy sources but the Council cannot set a local standard for energy efficiency above current Building Regulations.

Water efficiency standards

There was overwhelming support for RBC setting a lower standard for water use of 110 litres per person per day than the national 125 litres (26 in support and 6 against).

Kinoulton Parish Council supports the lower standard as the need for reduced water consumption is evidenced through the Nottingham and Ashfield Outline Water Cycle Study.

Barton in Fabis Parish Council has highlighted the absence of mains drainage and that water conservation is already an important issue as residents pay for disposal. They believe there is no need for further regulation.

Elton Parish Meeting highlight the need to encourage rainwater capture.

Aslockton Parish Council did not support lower water conservation standards.

The Environment Agency state that whilst Rushcliffe Borough is not classed as a water stressed area, the borough should try to meet the tighter standard of 110 litres/person/day to facilitate a greater level of water efficiency in new developments. The CLG Cost Impacts report from the Housing Standards Review demonstrates the cost of achieving 110l/p/d is just £9 per dwelling, compared to achieving the baseline building regulations standard of 125l/p/d.
Having more efficient homes, particularly homes that are efficient with hot water use, will save carbon and benefit new development and the environment.

300. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** supports a reduction in water consumption due to ecological benefits within rivers and streams.

301. Representations from the development industry stipulate that lower standards must be justified, and that the Greater Nottingham & Ashfield Water Cycle Strategy 2010 requires updating.

**Managing Flood Risk**

302. The **Environment Agency** states that windfall sites are subject to the application of the flood risk sequential test as shown in points 6 and 7 of policy 2 within the Core Strategy. To be acceptable these sites must demonstrate that they are safe for end users, do not increase flood risk elsewhere and where possible improve on the existing flood risk.

303. **East Leake Parish Council** have highlighted that the neighbourhood plan restricts development within flood zones 2 and 3.

304. **Elton Parish Meeting** believes all flood risk areas should be avoided.

305. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** and other environmental groups opposed development which is not resistant flooding or that adversely affected floodplains.

**Sustainable Drainage**

306. The need for further policy guidance on sustainable urban drainage was supported by 14 of the 18 respondents. There was considerable support from the environmental sector, including **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** who highlight the need for multi-functional green space that alleviated flooding and provided biodiversity opportunities.

307. In addition they consider that the plan should include policies that encourage land uses within flood plains that provide flood storage (Nottinghamshire County Council (2010) Nottingham Floodplain Project)

308. **Aslockton Parish Council** believes greater powers should be given to local water authorities when determining applications. They also question whether SUDS are designed to cope with unprecedented rainfall which is likely with climate change and that policies need to cater for these extremes.
309. **East Leake Parish Council** has identified a need to separate storm drains and sewers and increase capacity at pumping stations and sewage treatment works. The parish also considered the promotion of SUDs as attractive village ponds as misleading.

310. **Barton in Fabis Parish Council** has advised that no further development is promoted within the River Trent Floodplain and that flood plans be developed with the parish councils. Similar comments were received from the Radcliffe on Trent Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.

311. **Elton Parish Meeting** has highlighted the need to consider the amount of hard surfacing and whether it might cause any local flooding issues.

312. Similarly, the **Environment Agency** has advised that any additional policy should address flood risk and enhance biodiversity using opportunities for natural flood management. They consider that policies that promote the deculverting of watercourses, where they are present within development sites is absent from the Core Strategy and would benefit the LAPP. Also, a policy requiring an easement of 10 metres (8m is a legal requirement for Main Rivers) from watercourses and flood defence structures within new developments would be supported.

313. Representations from the development industry questioned whether there was evidence to justify further policy and that the Core Strategy contained sufficient policies.

**Other Climate Change Issues**

314. **Elton Parish Meeting** highlights the need to consider traffic generation and its air quality impacts on the surrounding area.

**Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity**

**Green Infrastructure**

315. The issues and options consultation identified 8 types of land use which constitute the green infrastructure network. Of those who responded (19) these uses were supported by the majority.

316. Suggested additional land uses within the green infrastructure network include, rights of way, railways corridors (active and disused), waterways (including
rivers, streams and canals), ponds, wetlands and lakes, parklands, cemeteries, woodlands (identified as in deficit by respondent), semi-natural green space, private gardens, geological sites and orchards. These are identified within the Rushcliffe Strategic Green Infrastructure (Existing and Potential), Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy 2016/2020 and The Rushcliffe Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Report.

317. Land west of Sharphill Wood has been suggested as a community park for new and existing residents.

318. Regarding existing GI and areas of deficit, environmental bodies and Nottinghamshire County Council highlighted that these networks (or their absence) have been identified and evidenced in a number of documents e.g. 6cs Study, Rushcliffe Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping exercise, Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy and Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment. The use of Natural England’s Accessible Natural Green Space Standard (ANGSt) model was also promoted.

319. East Leake Parish Council has identified the Sheepwash and Kingstons Brook as important areas of GI. The council believes the GI network should be mapped in Part 2.

320. Nottinghamshire County Council advised that all the types of GI listed in the Issues and Options document should be included in the GI network. It also stated that the LAPP should identify where GI contributes to the wildlife network or green route connections for humans or both.

321. Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust supports Core Strategy approach, the selection criteria in Part 2 and would wish to see Part 2 set the course for implementation of this policy. They believe it should be recognised that, in certain circumstances, one criteria might be more important than another, e.g. in the wider countryside and near existing wildlife sites, Biodiversity will be most important, whereas sports provision could be more important in towns and villages.

322. The Wildlife Trust also advises that, whilst the inclusion of the network on proposals maps is particularly important, a mechanism should be in place to ensure the map is kept up to date in relation to GI and open space as some sites may be lost in the future but new ones will be created. The creation of a ‘live’ list was expressed by a number of respondents. In relation to proposals map and detailed policy or stand-alone strategy, the Trust has no particular view as there are pros and cons either way. A stand-alone strategy allows more detail but a strongly worded policy would of course carry more weight.
323. Once identified within part 2 of the plan, the majority of respondents, including environmental bodies, considered the policy within the Core Strategy provided sufficient protection. However Nottinghamshire County Council advise that ‘biodiversity opportunities’ as identified in CS Policy 16 should be qualified (allowing movement, linking sites and fragmented habitat).

324. A standalone strategy independent of Part 2 was supported by East Leake Parish Council.

325. Other supporters of a standalone strategy, including Nottinghamshire County Council, identified that a wide ranging comprehensive approach could be taken within the strategy, provided the network is identified in the plan.

326. Nottinghamshire County Council advises that site specific guidance on GI could be provided in relation to each allocation that is taken forward.

Local Green Spaces

327. East Leake Parish Council advises that Local Green Space policy should, as required by the NPPF, be consistent with Green Belt policy.

328. The following areas in Bingham have been identified as Local Green Space: Warner’s Paddock; land to the south east of Jebb’s Lane; land to the north west of Forest Road; land to the east of Cogley Lane. These spaces have been, and will remain important to the character of the settlement and of significance to residents.

329. Flintham Parish Council has identified Inholms Gardens and Coney Grey Sports Ground as possible Local Green Spaces.

330. Radcliffe on Trent Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group has identified 15 areas, which meet the NPPF local green space criteria, within the neighbourhood plan.

331. Elton Parish Meeting believes it would be helpful if the LAPP were to recognise all green space, not just officially designated Local Green Space, alongside policies that protect parks open space.

332. Land west of Sharphill Wood has been promoted by a local councillor as an area of Local Green Space.

333. Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust advises that decisions on Local Green Space should be informed by the local community and parish councils, and that they
should benefit biodiversity. Similar comments have also been made within other responses.

Parks and Open Spaces

334. A limited number of respondents (11) commented on the need for further policies to protect parks and open spaces. 4 that thought the Core Strategy provided sufficient policy protection.

335. A number of representations expressed concern that the plan focused more on formal recreational open space, rather than wilder informal areas that deliver benefits to biodiversity and contribute to the ecological network. Concerns regarding the lighting of sports pitches were also expressed by one respondent.

336. Representatives of the development industry have encouraged the plan to be flexible and not based solely on criteria related to the size of development. It should also allow for offsite provision and financial contributions (paragraph 73 and 74 of NPPF).

Open Space, Sports and Recreational Standards

337. Elton Parish Meeting has highlighted concerns regarding the loss of school recreational spaces and suggested sharing sports and recreational space.

Biodiversity

338. In response to questions regarding the identification of existing biodiversity assets and the wider network of sites, the environment bodies, including wildlife trust, Nottinghamshire County Council and individuals identified the following documents/sources as critical:

- Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping and Nature Conservation Strategy
- Rushcliffe Strategic Green Infrastructure
- Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy
- Greater Nottingham Landscape Character
- Nottinghamshire Biodiversity Action Plans
- Nottinghamshire Biological and Geological Records Centre

339. East Leake Parish Council has identified the Sheepwash, Kingswash Brook, golf course, railway line as important elements of the ecological network.

340. Gotham Parish Council, Barton in Fabis Parish Council and Elton Parish Meeting advise that the plan should identify where it is possible to extend and
link between sites to promote diversity and protection. A link between Holme Pit SSSI and Attenborough Nature Reserve SSSI was suggested by Barton in Fabis.

341. One respondent noted the link between biodiversity and green infrastructure networks and shouldn’t be treated as separate issues to be managed / considered. The borough is a biodiversity network as a whole, typified by isolated pockets of quality habitat which are well identified and protected. Focus should be on a landscape scale approach, facilitating the improvement and movement of biodiversity such that it can adapt to change, hence development of corridors are particular important.

342. Regarding the identification of the network in the plan, representations from the environment sector have emphasised the need to keep the map up to date. The network maps should reflect updates from the Local Wildlife Site inventory and Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping. Nottinghamshire County Council emphasised the need to integrate the GI and Ecological Networks.

343. In response to the question whether further policy is required, Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust consider the Core Strategy Policy 17 is positively worded, so no further policy is required. They emphasize however that a mechanism for delivery/ implementation is required and that the Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy is a key part of this. Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group and others have also emphasized the importance of delivering existing strategies and policies. Concerns regarding mitigation and compensation not achieving intended results were also raised.

344. Nottinghamshire County Council propose a separate policy within the LAPP which requires developments to demonstrate how they contribute to the protection, restoration and expansion of the biodiversity network.

345. The need for further policies which protect designated and non-designated was supported by Kinoulton Parish Council, Elton Parish Meeting and Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group. Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust advised that the plan should reference paragraph 118 of the NPPF and that were development cannot satisfy the mitigation hierarchy planning permission should be refused. As with protection of the wider biodiversity network, there was widespread belief that enforcing existing policy protection was the priority.

346. Nottinghamshire County Council advises that, in accordance with the NPPF, the LAPP should contain a criteria based policy in relation to the hierarchy of sites as CS policy 16 does not provide this. This policy should cover developments that affect non-designated sites.
347. Representatives of the development industry, **East Leake Parish Council** and a small number of individual residents considered further policy on protection of wildlife sites as unnecessary.

348. The protection of ancient woodland and veteran trees was supported by the majority of those who responded, including **East Leake Parish Council** and **Elton Parish Meeting**. The **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** questioned whether it should have an individual policy. Rather it should be part of a policy which protects and enhances all irreplaceable and priority habitats as identified in the Nature Conservation Strategy.

349. **Nottinghamshire County Council** has advised that impacts on ancient woodland and veteran trees are addressed within the NPPF and further policy may not be necessary.

350. Representations identified protection and enhancement of traditional orchards and implementation of National Pollinator Strategy, and avoiding garden grabbing. Design guide to include installing habitat improvement during development of sites e.g. Swallow and swift boxes; bat brick etc… was also highlighted.

351. Concerns regarding off-setting were expressed by some respondents (including **Elton Parish Meeting**). Whilst it may be appropriate for large scale strategic projects or those that have a cumulative impact, the concept has not been fully developed. Off-setting should only occur in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy, as a last resort. Nottinghamshire County Council believes that off-setting provides an alternative approach to delivering ecological compensation, subject to the mitigation hierarchy.

352. An overly prescriptive off-setting policy should be avoided.

**Culture, Tourism and Sport Facilities**

**Allocations**

353. A limited number of responses commented on whether the plan should allocate sites for culture, tourism and sport (7). 5 considered allocating sites necessary to support new housing developments, increase tourism and income. Those that thought it unnecessary (2) considered Rushcliffe well provided for.

354. Concerns regarding the impact of lighting sports pitches were expressed by one respondent.
Further Policies

355. **East Leake Parish Council** supports further policies to determine proposals for cultural and sporting facilities.

356. **Elton Parish Meeting** believes further policies would help ensure that new facilities are genuinely needed and that they are appropriate.

357. **Radcliffe on Trent Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group** has highlighted policies in the draft neighbourhood plan that seeks to improve sports facilities.

358. **Aslockton Parish Council** believes there is sufficient policy already.

Safeguarded recreational facilities

359. There was universal support for the safeguarding of the River Trent, River Soar, Grantham Canal, and Great Central Railway as recreational assets that provide ecological, recreational, tourism and commercial benefits. Nottinghamshire County Council advises that any policy regarding these assets should not compromise their ecological function.

360. **The Canal & River Trust** welcome the inclusion of a policy which seeks to safeguard the River Trent, River Soar and Grantham Canal from development which would prejudice their commercial potential and is keen to promote the wider benefits and amenity value of all inland waterways. The Trust supports the inclusion of a policy which safeguards the Rivers’ and Canal’s from inappropriate development which would prejudice their ecological, recreational and tourism value.

361. **Elton Parish Meeting** has expressed concern that too much commercialism along the Canal will adversely affect its quiet enjoyment.

362. **Sport England** have raised concerns that Rushcliffe does not have a detailed assessment of playing pitches and the leisure facilities strategy 2011 is not robust.

363. The Fairham Brook and proposed Grantham Canal/River Trent link via Polser Brook was also suggested.

364. Clipston Forest, manor houses and their parks and gardens have been identified by Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust as additional recreational facilities.

365. Concerns were expressed that the compartmentalisation of recreational facilities, GI and biodiversity networks fails to recognise the multifunctional benefits and holistic approach to GI.
366. Protection should recognise importance of neighbouring land such as water bodies adjacent to River Trent.

**Contamination and Pollution**

**Contamination and land instability**

367. Eight representations commented on the need for further policy on contamination and instability. Responses were evenly split, with those believing further policy was required in order to address fracking.

368. **East Leake Parish Council** has raised concerns that the gypsum mine may increase instability. **Elton Parish Meeting** also highlights the need for a policy which ensures mineral extraction does not cause air and water pollution or land instability.

**Noise pollution**

369. 8 responses supported further policy and 3 opposed. The need to address noise pollution due to flights to and from East Midlands Airport was highlighted and specifically the need to maintain restrictions on night flights.

370. **East Leake Parish Council** has highlighted neighbourhood plan policies which address development within the airport safeguarded area.

371. **Barton in Fabis Parish Council** highlights absence in NPPF of sources of noise pollution. The plan should identify these.

372. **Elton Parish Meeting** suggest restrictions on unsociable working hours or excessive HGV movements should be within a detailed policy.

373. Fracking was also highlighted as a potential noise issue. A specific policy on fracking was requested.

**Light pollution**

374. 11 responses supported further policy on light pollution and 3 opposed. Impact on wildlife, especially bats, woodlands and wildlife corridors was highlighted by environmental bodies and individuals.

375. **East Leake Parish Council** has suggested that impacts of light pollution and measures to address it is included within a checklist for DC.
376. The importance of Green Belt fringe and deep countryside was highlighted and County Highways standards should be overridden by local policy.

377. **Barton in Fabis Parish Council** and **Elton Parish Meeting** consider light pollution a major issue in rural areas. Policies outlining best practice in reducing light pollution and identifying and reducing/eliminating the major sources should be included.

378. Fracking was again highlighted as a potential cause of pollution, which should be managed.

379. One respondent from the development industry considered existing policy and guidance within the NPPF and NPPG sufficient.

**Air Pollution**

380. 8 representations were received, these were equally split between those who believed further policies were required to address air pollution and those who considered existing policies in the Core Strategy, NPPF and NPPG sufficient.

381. **Barton in Fabis Parish Council** suggested the inclusion of policies outlining best practice in reducing air pollution and identifying and reducing / eliminating the major sources should be included.

**Other Contamination and Pollution Issues**

382. **Elton Parish Meeting** suggests there may be issues with the extraction of shale gas and therefore a policy with respect to contamination and pollution in the Lapp would be helpful.

**Transport**

**General transport policy**

383. The majority of respondents agreed that further policies on local transport were required (9 out of 14)

384. **The Trent Lane to the Hook Steering** Group proposes that a policy in support in principle of their proposed bridge is included.

385. Representations from individuals highlight the need for specific reference to rural bus services (including services to Cropwell Butler, Cropwell Bishop and Cotgrave) and addressing rat running.
386. **Tollerton Parish Council** has submitted a comprehensive response highlighting congestion on the A52 Trunk Road (Highways Agency) at peak period flows. This must be reviewed as a matter of urgency and given utmost priority. This will be critical when the housing development commences.

387. Other comments suggest that improvements to the rail network and services should be made in order to meet demands of the expansion of Radcliffe and Bingham. Congestion on the Trent bridges as a result of development at Sharphill was also highlighted.

Highway Design and Parking Standards

388. Regarding highway design and parking standards, there was clear support for the continued use of the 6Cs Highway Design Guide.

389. **Kinoulton Parish Council** however is concerned that existing approach to parking standards does not reflect impacts on viability of existing businesses or facilities.

390. Concerns were raised regarding the location and design of parking facilities demonstrates insensitive/unsympathetic development.

391. One comment suggests that the LAPP should comply with the requirements of the Traffic Management Act 2004, The current parking related problems in Bingham have put this issue to the front of my mind but I believe parking provision should be central to the Borough wide plan.

392. Parking issues were raised in Keyworth at Church Drive. South Wolds School requires its own parking.

Telecommunications Infrastructure

393. The majority of respondents (5 of 7) agreed that there was no need for further policies, beyond those in the NPPF and Core Strategy, within part 2 of the Local Plan. Those that did not agree identified a need for a policy that supported broadband in rural areas. **Elton Parish Meeting** identified their parish as having poor broadband provision.

General

394. A wide variety additional issues were raised, these included protection of Warner’s Field in Bingham, the threshold for affordable housing sites in small
rural settlements, and the consideration of viability issues when determining planning applications.

395. **Nottinghamshire County Council** has advised that mineral safeguarding, and minimising and managing waste needs to be addressed.

396. The need for a health centre in East Leake was identified by 2 consultees.
Appendix D: Local Plan Part 2 – Issues and Options, summary of exhibition responses

Introduction

Planning officers from Rushcliffe Borough Council organised ‘drop in’ exhibitions within the five Key Settlements of Bingham, Keyworth, East Leake, Radcliffe on Trent, and Ruddington (as identified in the adopted Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy), and West Bridgford (part of Nottingham’s Main Urban Area).

With the exception of Radcliffe on Trent, one exhibition was held in each settlement and these occurred early within the consultation period. These exhibitions were promoted through various mediums as explained within each event summary.

As the Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy deferred the identification of the non-strategic allocations in and around the Key Settlements to Part 2 of the Local Plan, the events were focused on these settlements and West Bridgford, which as the main urban area of the Borough offered a further opportunity for residents to comment.

Purpose of Events

In accordance with the Borough Council’s adopted and draft Statements of Community Involvement (the draft is being consulted upon alongside the Issues and Options Local Plan Part 2), the exhibitions provided opportunities for local residents and others with an interest in development in the Borough to discuss the policy and allocations issues and options with Borough Council’s planning officers and those elected members who also attended.

Exhibition Material

The inclusion of tailored exercises for each settlement that an exhibition was held within ensured residents were able to express their views and comment on the local issues identified and options proposed. These exercises are explained within the consultation reports for each event.

To assist members of the public, response forms were created for each event, these included the specific questions on each settlement within the Issues and Options consultation. These could be completed at the exhibition, or at home and posted back to the Borough Council in pre-paid envelopes that were provided at each event.

In addition to tailored exercises, generic information regarding protection and enhancement of biodiversity and heritage assets, green infrastructure, climate change and flooding, and employment were provided on exhibition boards.
Information regarding the Draft Green Belt Review was also included as part of the exhibition material. The Green Belt review is an important element of the evidence base, establishing new Green Belt boundaries for proposed inset settlements, suggests minor amendments to existing boundaries and informs the selection of development allocations around Key Settlements.

**Events Schedule**

The following exhibition schedule was organised:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 10(^{th})</td>
<td>15:00 – 20:00</td>
<td>Radcliffe on Trent</td>
<td>Trent Room, Grange Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 11(^{th})</td>
<td>15:00 – 20:00</td>
<td>Ruddington</td>
<td>St Peters Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 15(^{th})</td>
<td>15:00 – 20:00</td>
<td>Keyworth</td>
<td>Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 17(^{th})</td>
<td>15:00 – 20:00</td>
<td>East Leake</td>
<td>Parish Council Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 22(^{nd})</td>
<td>15:00 – 19:00</td>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>Town Council Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 23(^{rd})</td>
<td>14:00 – 18:00</td>
<td>West Bridgford</td>
<td>Lutterell Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 18(^{th})</td>
<td>15:00 – 19.30</td>
<td>Radcliffe on Trent</td>
<td>Trent Room, Grange Hall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Radcliffe on Trent

Location: Trent Room, Grange Hall

Date and Time: Wednesday 10\textsuperscript{th} February 2016, 15:00 – 20:00

Friday 18\textsuperscript{th} March 2016, 15:00 – 19:30

Exhibition Promotion

The first exhibition at the Trent Room, Grange Hall was promoted through informing people on the Local Plan consultation list, through the Borough Council’s website, through the Parish Council, through Ward members, through a press release and through a leaflet drop. Due to some reports that leaflets were not delivered on time in certain parts of Radcliffe on Trent, a second event was advertised and held at the end of the consultation period. This resolved concerns that some residents will have missed an opportunity to attend. The second exhibition was promoted within a second targeted leaflet drop and large poster outside the Grange Hall, and through the Borough and Parish Councils websites.

Attendance

Approximately 250 members of the public attended the first event on the 10\textsuperscript{th} February. Approximately 175 members of the public attended the second event on the 18\textsuperscript{th} March.

Exhibition Exercises

The adopted Core Strategy identifies a minimum housing target for Radcliffe on Trent of 400 homes during the plan period. These will be delivered through the allocation of sites for residential development around Radcliffe on Trent.

The issues and options consultation identifies 10 potential housing sites which could contribute to the delivery of the minimum target. These sites were taken from information contained within the Borough Councils Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and responses from developers and landowners to the recent draft Radcliffe on Trent Neighbourhood Plan consultation.

Consequently, the exercises focused on:

- the strengths and weaknesses of each potential housing sites,
- the general direction of housing growth (east, south or west); and
- the selection of supported sites.
**Exercise 1 – Site Strengths and Weaknesses**

**Question 1:** *We have identified some potential strengths (positives) and weaknesses (negatives) for building new housing on each of the 10 sites shown. Do you agree or disagree?*

**Post-it note responses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAD 1</td>
<td>• Proximity to A52, access concerns can be resolved <em>(5 similar comments)</em>&lt;br&gt;• Low traffic impact on the village&lt;br&gt;• Easy access to bus route and cycle path&lt;br&gt;• Flood alleviation technology/design is now available so not an issue <em>(3 similar comments)</em>&lt;br&gt;• Good site for affordable housing&lt;br&gt;• Closer to main employment – Nottingham&lt;br&gt;• Most appropriate site&lt;br&gt;• Low impact on existing homes, provided appropriate gap is left <em>(2 similar comments)</em>&lt;br&gt;• Easy access to village centre <em>(2 similar comments)</em>&lt;br&gt;• Could contain contamination in one area</td>
<td>• Pylons reduce developable area and not ideal for residential area <em>(6 similar comments)</em>&lt;br&gt;• Increased flood risk to new and neighbouring properties (southern area and on Nottingham Road). Less than 300 deliverable <em>(17 similar comments)</em>&lt;br&gt;• Access difficulties onto Nottingham Road/A52, especially in rush hour <em>(7 similar comments)</em>&lt;br&gt;• Additional congestion on A52 <em>(3 similar comments)</em>&lt;br&gt;• Nottingham road is too narrow and unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists.&lt;br&gt;• Air quality&lt;br&gt;• Not close to village centre or schools&lt;br&gt;• Water treatment facilities at full capacity&lt;br&gt;• Inadequate village facilities&lt;br&gt;• Noise from RSPCA centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD 2</td>
<td>• Site is an ‘infill’&lt;br&gt;• Alongside RAD3 this site is the best option</td>
<td>• No direct access onto A52 – Shelford Road already too busy. Cumulative impacts on congestion due to Newton development. Shelford Road is already a shortcut <em>(9 similar comments)</em>.&lt;br&gt;• Infrastructure has got to be significantly improved&lt;br&gt;• Need a school and health centre&lt;br&gt;• Poor bus service (one an hour and none on Sunday) <em>(3 similar comments)</em>&lt;br&gt;• Waste water treatment capacity problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD 3</td>
<td>• Site Ok provided traffic</td>
<td>• No access to the A52 – all traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       | volume and speed on Shelford Road is tackled.  
- Could part fund bridge access over railway to A52 linking RAD 3/4 and 5/7 (5 similar comments)  
- Development could fund upgrades to Shelford Road and drainage  
- Reasonably compact and only narrow invasion of Green Belt | will go down Shelford Road. This is already a rat-run and congested (16 similar comments)  
- Poor/dangerous access onto Shelford Road (7 similar comments)  
- Insufficient infrastructure in the village  
- School children will have to share with traffic and no barriers. Speed restrictions required on Shelford Road.  
- Loss of land to grow food to feed the growing population  
- Loss of village scenery  
- School capacity issues  
- health facility capacity  
- Drainage could affect Clumber Drive |
| RAD 4 |                                                                                                                                                                                                           | School children forced to share with traffic and no barriers (on Shelford Road or A52).  
- Needs servicing by bus (only one an hour on Shelford Road)  
- Major visual impact on landscape  
- Intrusion into open countryside (2 similar comments)  
- Poor access to A52 (will require new bridge over railway line) and Shelford Road – more vehicles will cause even more problems on these roads (4 similar comments)  
- Cumulative traffic impacts along Shelford Road if accessed via RAD3 (3 similar comments).  
- Amenities are at maximum overload and will not sustain such a large development (3 similar comments)  
- Huge site which is out of proportion for Radcliffe. |
| RAD 5 | Good access to A52 and A46 (roundabout at bottom of Saxondale Drive) (3 similar comments)  
- Less impact on existing houses | Amenities are at maximum overload and will not sustain such a large development  
- Serious intrusion into open countryside  
- Serious invasion of Green Belt (2 similar comments) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|      | Development could create outlet along Oatfield Lane to A52.  
      | Improve existing A52  
      | No problems with this site | similar comments)  
      | Significant landscape impacts  
      | Increased congestion on the A52 (5 similar comments)  
      | Difficult access onto A52 due to traffic (10 similar comments)  
      | Another junction on A52 will increase congestion.  
      | Loss of agricultural land  
      | Impact on wildlife  
      | Unpleasant walk along A52. Impossible to walk children to school as road is too busy and site too far from village (2 similar comments)  
      | Impact of fracking on residents (previously proposed on RAD 7)  
      | No facilities nearby  
      | Limited green space for recreation/dog walking |
| RAD 6 | Infill plot (2 similar comments)  
      | Site is OK  
      | Good site for small starter, affordable or retirement homes  
      | Small site is less likely to disrupt  
      | Close to village centre | Site is adjacent to Wharf Lane playing field and should remain 'green' as extension to the playing fields as size of community increases.  
      | Better use would be leisure (2 similar comments)  
      | This is a better site for a health centre (2 similar comments)  
      | Too small to make worth while  
      | Poor access on to Main Road. Traffic coming around a blind bend from village. |
| RAD 7 | Direct access onto A52 (3 similar comments)  
      | Traffic can cope  
      | Development could facilitate new railway bridge on Oatfield Lane and roundabout on A52.  
      | RAD5 and RAD7 will deliver 400 homes with minimum loss of good agricultural land.  
      | No problem | Significant intrusion into open countryside.  
      | Increased congestion on A52 which is at capacity (7 similar comments)  
      | Difficult access onto A52 due to traffic (7 similar comments)  
      | Loss of agricultural land  
      | Unpleasant walk along A52. Impossible to walk children to school as road is too busy and site too far from village (2 similar comments)  
<pre><code>  | Loss of Green Belt, merging of |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Radcliffe and Newton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Too far from village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of health facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Proximity to busy road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD 8</td>
<td>• OK but requires review of allotment demand</td>
<td>• Loss of well used allotments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sits between existing houses on three sides</td>
<td>These should be protected or relocated (12 similar comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Superfluous allotments but use part of site.</td>
<td>• Impact on wildlife (2 similar comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Adjacent to Dewberry Hill nature reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Difficult access to dangerous A52 (6 similar comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Residents would have to cross the A52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD 9</td>
<td>• Good use of available unused space (2 similar comments)</td>
<td>• Problematic hill access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Great idea for small development (3 similar comments)</td>
<td>• Construction traffic impacts on Cropwell Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accessed onto Cropwell Road, not direct onto A52 (3 similar comments)</td>
<td>• Limited number of homes delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Close to village, transport and schools (2 similar comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Site could deliver unmet need for large bespoke house or 20 luxury homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not widely visible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will not harm GB purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not in flood zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Traffic generated would not go through village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD 10</td>
<td>• Smaller development - no visual impact</td>
<td>• Limited number of homes delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Less impacts upon A52</td>
<td>• Significant negative impact on Green Belt which is not outweighed by the number of homes that could be delivered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Site could support more than 10 homes (4 similar comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exercise 2: General Directions for New Housing**

**Question:** With respect to general directions around the village, do you support housing development:
Sticky-dot responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exercise 3: Housing Site Selection**

Question: *Do support housing development at...*

Sticky-dot responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes – all of site</th>
<th>Yes – part of site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAD1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD10</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ruddington**

Location: St Peters Rooms

Date and Time: Thursday 11th February 2016, 15:00 – 20:00

**Exhibition Promotion**

The exhibition at the St Peters Rooms was promoted within leaflets which were delivered to households within Ruddington and through a press release on the Issues and Options consultation. It was listed, alongside the other exhibitions, within the consultation letter sent to all registered consultees, the Local Plan Part 2 consultation webpage, and through the village’s monthly newsletter (see http://ruddingtonparishcouncil.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/Issue-73-February-2016.pdf).
**Attendance**

Approximately 250 members of the public attended the event.

**Exhibition Exercises**

The adopted Core Strategy identifies a minimum housing target for Ruddington of 250 homes during the plan period. These will be delivered through the allocation of sites for residential development around Ruddington.

The issues and options consultation identifies 10 possible housing sites which could contribute to the delivery of the minimum target. These sites were taken from the Borough Council’s Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.

Consequently, the exercises focused on:

- the strengths and weaknesses of the possible housing sites,
- the general direction of housing growth; and
- the selection of supported sites.

There was also an opportunity to comment on Ruddington’s Local Centre and retail policies.

**Exercise 1 – Site Strengths and Weaknesses**

Question 1: *We have identified some potential strengths (positives) and weaknesses (negatives) for building new housing on each of the 10 sites shown. Do you agree or disagree?*

Post-it note responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUD 1</td>
<td>• Good road links and transport <em>(3 similar comments)</em></td>
<td>• Land susceptible to flooding. Developing site will increase flood risk to surrounding properties <em>(18 similar comments)</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• OK for school and village.</td>
<td>• Detrimental to entrance of the village <em>(2 similar comments)</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Best place to build as it still retains some Green Belt to the north of the village.</td>
<td>• Loss of village feel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Less impact on village centre compared to other options or similar or larger size.</td>
<td>• Playing field is a village asset owned/bequeathed to the village. It should remain a playing field <em>(16 similar comments)</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Like idea of better provision of recreational use – new village hall fit for purpose.</td>
<td>• Moving playing field further north will reduce use and encourage car use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good public services</td>
<td>• Development of the site will lead to merger of village with Wilford/West Bridgford <em>(3 similar comments)</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Site rounds of the northern boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| RUD 2  | • Good site for development - easy access onto Wilford Road and good public transport (2 similar comments).  
• Subject to flood risk issues – site is OK (2 similar comments)  
• Doesn’t merge other boundaries | • Close to Wilwell Cutting SSSI (3 similar comments)  
• Loss of greenfield site, visible from village centre  
• Increased congestion on Wilford Road which will not cope (3 similar comments)  
• Increased flood risk (9 similar comments)  
• Far more than the 250 needed. Impact on village  
• Too close to city boundary. Joins Ruddington to Nottingham. Strategically important area of Green Belt (6 similar comments)  
• Too far from GPs, shops and schools (2 similar comments).  
• Site not needed within plan period (2028)  
• Large estate is not in keeping with the village (3 similar comments)  
• Landscape impacts  
• Impact on wildlife – important for wetland birds  
• Proximity of railway corridor which should be protected for future use.  
• Impact on school capacity and local services. |
| RUD 3  | • The best site  
• Provided speed limits are reduced site has good main road access (4 similar comments) | • Isolated location  
• Unsafe pedestrian access alongside A60  
• Direct access to school would compromise security |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|      | • With pedestrian access constructed through to Ashworth Avenue (and Wilford Road), this site could be suitable *(2 similar comments)*.  
• Minimal effect on the village  
• Should be limited to 40-50 homes | • Unsafe access onto A60 – national speed limit and poor sight lines *(2 similar comments)* |
| RUD 4 | • Good access onto A60 *(3 similar comments)*  
• Good access to village centre | • Development east of A60, beyond old eastern boundary, would set a precedent.  
• Housing gain doesn’t cover loss of Green Belt  
• Impact on listed building *(4 similar comments)*  
• Impact on Conservation Area *(2 similar comments)*  
• Congestion on A60 at peak hours and access. problems |
| RUD 5 | • Good use of land *(5 similar comments)*  
• Safe access to major roads *(4 similar comments)*  
• Opportunity to incorporate by-pass road between A60 and Flawforth Lane  
• Close to the centre of Ruddington *(2 similar comments)* | • HGVs exceed weight limit on Flawforth Lane  
• Outside of Ruddington beyond settlement boundary.  
• Would extend into farmland and create a built up corridor to the Wheatcroft roundabout.  
• Would have cumulative impacts with 1200 homes at Wheatcroft Island *(2 similar comments)* |
| RUD 6 | • Could provide needed retirement homes  
• Least impact on traffic within Ruddington *(3 similar comments)*  
• Easy access onto 2 main roads via road through RUD5.  
• Safe and easy access onto A60 *(3 similar comments)*  
• No impact on road infrastructure  
• Contribute to better crossing facilities. | • Breaks the natural long-standing village building  
• Prime agricultural land  
• Within conservation area  
• Increased congestion on A60 |
<p>| RUD 7 | • Opportunity to provide social housing and retirement/single | • Poor access along Asher Lane and The Green <em>(13 similar comments)</em> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|      | occupancy | • Traffic impacts and increased accidents *(15 similar comments)*  
|      | • Best Green Belt option *(2 similar comments)*  
|      | • Resolves housing allocation requirement in one site. Hence less impact on rest of village.  
|      | • Consider alternative access along railway line.  
|      | • Flooding within NW corner *(3 similar comments)*  
|      | • Distance from schools will force parents to use cars and increase congestion through Ruddington  
|      | • Adverse impact on award winning Country Park *(4 similar comments)*  
|      | • Impact on allotments *(2 similar comments)*  
|      | • Lack of public services  
|      | • Adjacent to railway line which is active at weekends and could be busy in future  
|      | • Rural aspect  
|      | • Impact on schools, shops and local businesses  
|      | • Impacts on wildlife - bird species  
|      | • Impact on local Kennels which may have to close due to noise disturbance to new residents  
|      | • Opportunity to provide social housing and retirement/single occupancy  
|      | • Provide small houses  
|      | • Resolves housing allocation requirement in one site. Not piecemeal development *(2 similar comments)*  
|      | • New estate already built opposite *(2 similar comments)*  
|      | • Could develop the land nearest Asher Lane, but not the whole site.  
|      | • Equidistant to 2 major roads.  
|      | • Flood risk *(2 similar comments)*  
|      | • School capacity  
|      | • Merger of Ruddington and Clifton. Loss of village identity *(9 similar comments)*  
|      | • Residents would have to be directed through Clifton to avoid impact on Ruddington.  
|      | • Safety concerns when walking over the bridge *(2 similar comments)*  
|      | • Traffic impacts on Ruddington  
|      | • Poor access to public transport  
| RUD 8 | • Good Infill  
|      | • Site would blend and not prone to flooding  
|      | • Good use of land and accessible to main commuter route *(3 similar comments)*.  
|      | • Minimal effect on village  
|      | • Far enough away from village  
| RUD 9 | • Flood risk *(2 similar comments)*  
|      | • School capacity  
|      | • Merger of Ruddington and Clifton. Loss of village identity *(9 similar comments)*  
|      | • Residents would have to be directed through Clifton to avoid impact on Ruddington.  
|      | • Safety concerns when walking over the bridge *(2 similar comments)*  
|      | • Traffic impacts on Ruddington  
|      | • Poor access to public transport  
<p>| | | |
|  |  |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not to cause congestion problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good location for transport – can walk/drive into Ruddington.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD 10</td>
<td>• Good Infill</td>
<td>• Poor access to public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good location for transport – can walk/drive into Ruddington.</td>
<td>• Small contribution to overall requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good use of land and accessible to main commuter route (3 similar comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does not affect village centre (3 similar comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Developing this site means less on bigger sites and less impact on Ruddington Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exercise 2: General Directions for New Housing**

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

Sticky-dot responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exercise 3: Housing Site Selection**

Question: *Do support housing development at...*

Sticky-dot responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes – all of site</th>
<th>Yes – part of site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUD1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exercise 4: Ruddington Local Centre

The following comments on the proposed local centre and primary shopping area boundaries, and the primary and secondary frontages were made on a response sheet:

- The primary shopping area should include Church Street, Co-op, doctors, bakers library and White Horse (4 similar comments)
- High Street should be made a pedestrian precinct. A one way system should be put into operation.
- The local centre should include The Green as this is an important part of the village centre and focal point of the village.
- No new retail development. This would encourage large units which would undermine the excellent small businesses we have.
- Transport through village centre must be improved before development can be successful.
- Where are all the new residents and visitors to the museums an shops going to park?

Keyworth

Location: Keyworth Village Hall

Date and Time: Monday 15th February 2016, 15:00 – 20:00

Exhibition Promotion

The exhibition at the Village Hall was promoted within the press release on the Issues and Options consultation. It was included within Keyworth’s Parish Newsletter and listed, alongside the other exhibitions, within the consultation letter sent to all registered consultees, and on the Local Plan Part 2 consultation webpage. The delivery of leaflets advertising the event to properties was also arranged.
Attendance
Approximately 200 members of the public attended the event.

Exhibition Exercises
The adopted Core Strategy identifies a minimum housing target for Keyworth of 450 homes during the plan period. These will be delivered through allocation of sites for residential development providing additional housing around Keyworth.

The Draft Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan has identified and consulted upon three preferred housing sites (KEY A, B and C), two possible reserved sites, and one employment allocation (KEY D). All of these sites are presently located within the Green Belt. As release of land from the Green Belt can only occur through the Local Plan process, these draft proposals formed the bases for consultation on the Issues and Options.

Therefore three exercises focused on the proposed:

- housing allocations;
- employment allocation;
- safeguarded land; and
- policy approaches within Keyworth’s Local Centres (the main village around the Square and the smaller local centre at Wolds Drive).

Exercise One: Housing Allocations
Question 1: Do you agree with the draft Neighbourhood Plan’s proposals for housing allocations? These are shown as site KEY A, KEY B, KEY C on the plan.

Sticky-dots responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 2: If no, where should the new 450 homes go instead?

Post-it note responses (separated according to sites/area/subject):

KEY A

- KEY A will cause traffic problems in the village.
- Site on Bunny Lane (KEY A) is in a dangerous location as access is onto a single track road, due to parked cars, plus limited visibility on a road where cars already drive too fast (2 similar comments).


- Traffic entrances and exits from/to the developments should be on roads outside the village e.g. Bunny Lane and Station Road to avoid extra traffic within the village.
- Site A should be accessed from Debdale Lane. It needs more access points (2 similar comments).
- Obvious place for housing is A. (3 similar comments)
- Site A is suitable for housing (3 similar comments) and ideal for an old people’s complex.
- Settlement needs retirement homes/village.
- Must protect west of village. Sites KEY A sticks out for miles. It is the most visible site and can be seen from the A453 (3 similar comments)

KEY B, C and D

- Homes should be built closer to the centre of the village, otherwise community is split. Sites B, C and D are too far from the centre of the village, development has been uneven, concentrating too far north, rather than south (9 similar comments)
- Sites C and D are too far from the village and church (3 similar comments)
- Sites B and C are too far from the centre (3 similar comments).
- Site B is too distant from the centre of the village to make sense for extra care facility
- Sites B, C and D would increase urban sprawl.
- Site B will need access improvements - dangerous at present turning right onto Nicker Hill
- Sites A and C look suitable
- Residents from the Nicker Hill allocation are 1+ km to public transport.
- Site C too isolated for housing and on a steep slope (2 similar comments)
- Too much traffic already on Station Road and difficult to get on to Melton Road
- Don’t agree with sites KEY C and KEY D – Platt lane too narrow and busy (football and cricket).
- Site B sticks out for miles
- Relocate School to site B or safeguarded land and build housing in the centre of the village (4 similar comments)
- Increased traffic as a result of Platt Lane and Nicker Hill will increase congestion out of the village (3 similar comments).
- Develop towards the existing road infrastructure – A606 (A46 and A52) (2 similar comments)

Employment Land

- Use Key C for employment
- Extend industrial site at Debdale Lane rather than KEYD.
Key D is too far from the village

**Safeguarded Areas**

- Safeguarded land would be better *(3 similar comments)*
- Use safeguarded land at Debdale Lane for housing
- Use safeguarded land between Platt Lane and Station Road *(6 similar comments)*
- Platt Lane triangle (Safeguarded) is ‘dead space’
- Site C should be changed to safeguarded land.

**Alternative sites**

- Land south of Selby Lane is less visible and disrupting *(4 similar comments)*.
- South of Bunny Lane (land slopes away and site is close to sewage treatment works), not remote sites on Platt Lane *(5 similar comments)*
- Low lying land which will have a minimal visual impact to existing housing e.g. proposed safeguarded land, land south of village and around Willow Brook.
- Traffic volume is best dealt with by sharing east/west and north/south. Bunny Lane is an excellent choice.
- Suggest Lynwood, Hillside Farm, Debdale Lane as alternatives

**General Comments**

- Additional Housing will require sewage and drainage to be upgraded.
- The Neighbourhood Plan proposals turned out to be a very unprofessional job. Rushcliffe should undertake site surveys of all the original sites.
- Existing plan is least worst option
- No - sites that have been chosen have such a large visible impact on the village, the two safeguarded sites and the other sites around the village.
- No – The village should not be over developed and villages surrounding have better possibilities for expansion *(2 similar comments)*.

**Exercise Two: Employment Allocations**

Question 1: *Do you agree with the draft Neighbourhood Plan’s employment site allocation?*

**Sticky-dot responses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Neither Yes or No</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 2: If no, why not?

Post-it note responses:

- The site allocated is okay, but need for other sites – this is not enough.
- Concentrating all employment in one location leads to greater road usage on already narrow road. Platt lane will need upgrade (8 similar comments)
- Debdale Lane is a better site, put more on Debdale Estate (2 similar comments)
- Site down Debdale has terrible access (see above)
- Yes or No not correct question
- Difficult to say as there is only one site (2 similar comments)
- It would help to know what employment is envisaged. It would logically be better on a bus route, or widen Platt Lane.
- No evidence of need – potential vacant office space in BGS not being taken into account
- KEY D is good. Use KEY C for employment also and put housing on Debdale Lane.
- Could the railway line be used in the future?
- Safeguarded land is nearer to the present village. If we need employment land, safeguarded seem to be the best areas.
- KEY D would be better for housing. Employment could go on end of Debdale Lane.
- I don’t agree or disagree with the employment site allocation, but it would be helpful to know exactly what that means – heavy industry, light commercial or anything else.
- Infrastructure should be in place.
- No Heavy industry

Exercise Three: Safeguarded Land

Question 1: Do you agree with the draft Neighbourhood Plan’s proposals for safeguarded land?

Sticky-dot responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 2: If you answer NO, please tell us why. Should another site(s) be identified as safeguarded land instead?

- Use of safeguarded land should be reconsidered as sites might improve visual impact on village (2 similar comments).
- No to Platt Lane. It is on an important rural entrance to Keyworth.
- Access issues.
- Too remote from village.
- If we must have them, these are the least worst options!
- Safeguarded land should be the first choice. Remove KEY B and D both too far from centre.
- Safeguarded land on Platt Lane seems to be a good option for housing
- Safeguarded land on Debdale is crazy. Why not take the closes site to the village – south of Bunny Lane (2 similar comments).
- Impact of extra traffic going out of the village and trying to get to town is too bad already.

Exercise Three: Keyworth’s Local Centres

Question 1: Do you support the suggested centre boundaries, primary shopping areas, primary frontages and secondary frontages?

Post-it note responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Depends on where the eventual building will be and how many new houses we end up with (x2)
- No evidence of need – many existing shops have been vacant for years.

Village Centre:
- Extend village centre to include Village Hall and Car Park. Make latter more available to short term parking to reduce shoppers over-spilling their car-parking into adjoining residential roads, such as Brookview Drive.

Wolds Drive:
- Keyworth tavern should be secondary (2 similar comments)
- Budgens frontage should be red (primary frontage) (3 similar comments)
- Shops on Wolds Drive are as busy as the Square – should be red
- South Wolds School should
Question 2: Do you have any comments to make on what the approach should be towards the proportion of shop uses, non-shop uses within the primary shopping areas of the East Leake Local Centre?

Post-it note responses:

- Primary shopping should be key. Budgens area to remain ‘primary’ shopping area.
- Prefer not to see proliferation of coffee shops etc… Set limit to 70% retail.
- More parking needed for the Square shops – Always congested at entrance to Blind Lane. Very difficult to park in morning for doctors surgery especially for disabled people. *(5 similar comments)*
- The square will not be a busy hub unless ‘day-to-day’ shops are provided for. It will cease to be a ‘centre’ *(2 similar comments)*
- The parade/square needs a revamp to provide a nice accessible retail centre *(2 similar comments)*

Question 3: Should we allocate land for new retail or other commercial development in or around the Keyworth’s Local Centre?

Post-it note responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Comments

- Need to get vacant premises sorted first with something useful in the Square – veg, bread shop *(4 similar comments)*
- Too many vacant shops already *(3 similar comments)*
- More Parking required *(3 similar comments)*
- No - already well covered
- Can’t get businesses to take on existing shops!
- We do not need more retail we have enough.
- KEY B and C are a long way from the centre - will there be more parking at Wolds Drive?
- Centre is slowly dying. Already
difficult for shop
pers as retail
staff, office workers and large
numbers of health centre staff-
park all day in car park!

East Leake

Location: Parish Council Offices

Date and Time: Wednesday 17th February, 15:00 to 20:00

Exhibition Promotion

The exhibition at the Parish Council Offices was promoted within the press release on the Issues and Options consultation. It was also advertised in the village newsletter (see http://www.east-leake.gov.uk/docs/Jan%2016.pdf) It was also listed, alongside the other exhibitions, within the consultation letter sent to all registered consultees, and on the Local Plan Part 2 consultation webpage.

Attendance

Approximately 50 members of the public attended the event.

Exhibition Exercises

The adopted Core Strategy identifies a minimum housing target for East Leake of 400 homes during the plan period. As planning permissions have exceeded this minimum target the Local Plan Part 2 Issues and Options Consultation does not propose any further allocations within or on the edge of East Leake. Therefore the exercises focused on:

- whether, in addition to the existing planning permissions and recently completed housing developments, further land should be allocated for housing;
- the need to identify employment sites; and
- policy approaches within East Leake’s Local Centre.

Exercise One: Housing

Question 1: Do you agree that, apart from those eight sites that already have planning permission, no further green field sites should be allocated for housing?

Sticky-dots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 2: If no please tell us which site(s) you would like to see allocated.**

**Post-it notes**

No further green field sites identified.

**Exercise Two: Employment**

**Question 1: Do you think we should allocate any sites for employment in East Leake?**

**Questions 2: If yes where and why? If no, why not?**

**Sticky-dots and post-it note responses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Where or why not?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocations should be accompanied by a Business Support Unit (Hub) in the centre for smaller businesses (x4)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson’s Garage Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in central shopping area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park could go anywhere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need employment for young people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to Stanford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create opportunities to keep and maintain agriculture and horticulture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut commuting out of village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use current facilities – Youth Club, Parish Offices, offices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much room left thanks to new housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes- but how are we going to get businesses to flourish?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand retail sector.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No industrialised town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better use should be made of what is already there</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exercise Three: East Leake Local Centre

Question 1: Do you support the suggested centre boundaries, primary shopping areas, primary frontages and secondary frontages?

Sticky-dots and post-it note responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Comments

- Yes – but need a greater diversity of shops and a bank.
- Convenient to have shops in a close location. There is a need for convenience shops elsewhere.
- Accessibility from new housing to centre is needed.
- Allow current retailers to flourish.
- Yes – but there should be land allocated for modest expansion if there is a demand.
- Keep to retail offering - healthy mix.
- Improve village shop facades. Looks very dated.

- Not sure boundary for centre is complete.
- Needs expansion to support the increase in population.
- Should match the area in the Neighbourhood Plan which has already been consulted on. Space is needed to expand facilities and village grow (x2).

Question 2: Do you have any comments to make on what the approach should be towards the proportion of shop uses, non-shop uses within the primary shopping areas of the East Leake Local Centre?

Post-it note responses:

Reponses highlighted the need to preserve retail as the primary use within the local centre. Johnson’s Garage and health centre/library were identified as locations for development.

- Johnson’s Garage would be ideal for a Care Home/Retirement Centre or small houses for first time buyers.
- Keeping the primary shopping area for shops (four comments), not houses. E.g. Ivor’s House and Johnsons Garage.
• Create a larger retail centre by relocating and refreshing the health centre/library (two comments).
• Need for a bank.
• Need to draw people in with Independent shops (bakers and greengrocers)

Question 3: Should we allocate land for new retail or other commercial development in or around the East Leake Local Centre?

Sticky-dots and post-it note responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Comments

• We need more retail: another supermarket, possibly on the outskirts of the village, plus a bank, garage/petrol station.
• Site behind 48 Main Street.
• All new commercial development should be outside the shopping area.
• Mix of shops, restaurants and services.
• Keep retail to existing area.
• Quality retail in centre of village.
• Make better use of existing space.
• Need local shopping mix of independent retailers
• Centre is already congested – any more commercial development would result in traffic and parking chaos.
• Commercial/business development could be elsewhere in the village
• Not commercial in shopping area. Need business cluster.
• Move the health centre/library

Bingham

Location: Town Council Offices

Date and Time: Monday 22nd February, 15:00 to 19:00

Exhibition Promotion

The exhibition at the Town Council Offices was promoted within the press release on the Issues and Options consultation. A news article was placed in local newsletters. It was also listed, alongside the other exhibitions, within the consultation letter sent to all registered consultees, and on the Local Plan Part 2 consultation webpage.

Attendance

Approximately 30 members of the public attended the event.
Exhibition Exercises

The Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy includes the strategic allocation north of Bingham (Policy 21). As this allocation will deliver the Core Strategy’s housing target for Bingham, no further allocations are proposed in Local Plan Part 2, in or on the edge of the settlement. Therefore the exercises focused on:

- whether, in addition to the strategic allocation, further land should be allocated for housing;
- the retention of existing employment sites;
- policy approaches within Bingham’s District Centre; and
- the identification and protection of local green spaces.

Exercise One: Housing

Question 1: Do you agree that, apart from land to the North of Bingham (which has already been allocated for development through Local Plan Part 1), no further greenfield sites adjacent to the town should be allocated?

Sticky-dots and post-it notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Comments</td>
<td>The strategic allocation is enough</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking in Bingham is very difficult and the schools are full.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 2: If no, please tell us which site(s) you would like to see allocated.

Post-it notes

No further sites were proposed.

Exercise Two: Employment

Question 2: Do you think that the employment sites at Chapel Lane, Bingham should continue to be allocated for employment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Comments</td>
<td>Chapel Lane is already industrial and employs a number of people,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Exercise Three: Bingham District Centre

Question 1: Do you support the suggested centre boundaries, primary shopping areas, primary frontages and secondary frontages?

Sticky-dots and post-it note responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Question 2: Do you have any comments to make on what the approach should be towards the proportion of shop uses and non-shop uses within the primary shopping areas of Bingham’s District Centre?

Post-it notes responses

No comments made on Question 2.

Question 3: Should we allocate land for new retail or other commercial development in or around Bingham’s District Centre?

Sticky-dots and post-it note responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Support more retail, provided the parking problems are resolved.</th>
<th>I would support more retail units if the parking problems were resolved. Suggest higher parking charges for long stay to prevent park and ride/ all day parking.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Exercise Four: Local Green Space

Question 1: Are there any spaces in Bingham that should be designated? If so where?

A map of Bingham was on display and members of the public encouraged to identify areas of Local Green Space that are important to the local community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Warner’s Paddock (6 post-it notes)</th>
<th>Land south of rugby pitch (suggested wildlife area) (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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West Bridgford

Location: Lutterell Hall, Church Drive

Date and Time: Tuesday 23rd February, 14:00 to 18:00

Exhibition Promotion

The exhibition at the Lutterell Hall was promoted within the press release on the Issues and Options consultation. It was also listed, alongside the other exhibitions, within the consultation letter sent to all registered consultees. An article was also placed within the West Bridgford Wire, a local news website.

Attendance

Approximately 20 members of the public attended the event.

Exhibition Exercises

The Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy identifies three strategic allocations on the edge of the main urban area. These will deliver the majority of new homes required in or on the edge of the main built up area. As no further significant development is proposed, the exercises focused on:

- a limited number of allocations within the urban area (some of which have planning permission for housing);
- whether further employment land should be allocated and where it should be located;
- policy approaches within West Bridgford’s District Centre; and
- the location and protection of local green spaces.

Exercise One: Housing Sites

Question 1: Do you support housing development at: WB1 (Abbey Road Depot); WB2 (Central College); WB3 (South of Wilford Lane); WB4 Land between Lady Bay Bridge/Radcliffe Road).
Sticky dot responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WB1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the limited responses, caution should be taken when drawing conclusions on public support (or not) for these three sites.

Question 2: *Are there other sites?*

Post-it note responses

No alternative/additional sites were suggested

**Exercise Two: Employment**

Question 1: *Should employment sites within West Bridgford be allocated and protected in the Local Plan?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the limited responses, caution should be taken when drawing conclusions on public support (or not) for allocating employment site within West Bridgford.

Question 2: *If yes, please identify where.*

No sites where identified.

**Exercise Three: West Bridgford District Centre**

Question 1: *Do you support the suggested centre boundaries, primary shopping areas, primary frontages and secondary frontages?*

Post-it note responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inclusion of Gordon Road supported

None
Question 2: Do you have any comments to make on what the approach should be towards the proportion of shop uses and non-shop uses within the primary shopping areas of West Bridgford’s District Centre?

Post-it note responses:

Reponses focussed on the dominance of non-retail uses, particularly cafes and restaurants, and need to encourage more retail.

- Mixed retail use. Proportionately less bars, coffee shops and restaurants
- Imbalance of restaurants etc…
- Shops need encouragement

Question 3: Should we allocate new retail or other commercial development in or around West Bridgford’s District Centre?

Sticky-dot and post-it note responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the limited responses, caution should be taken when drawing conclusions regarding public opinion towards the future development of West Bridgford’s District Centre.

**Exercise Four: Local Green Spaces**

A map of West Bridgford was on display and members of the public encouraged to identify areas of Local Green Space that are important to the local community.

Areas identified:

- Amenity open spaces within Gamston which link the Canal with Beckside and Lings Bar hospital.

One comment made: “Good Record [the Co
Appendix E: Local Plan Part 2 – Further Options, summary of consultation responses

Introduction

1. In total, 1322 individuals and organisations responded to the Further Options consultation and the associated Green Belt Review consultation conducted at the same time. These representations were received online, by email, by post and through comments on exhibition leaflets.

2. The Council received representations from the following town and parish councils/meetings: Aslockton; Barton in Fabis; Bradmore; Bunny; Costock; Cropwell Bishop; Cropwell Butler; East Bridgford; East Leake Parish Council; Elton; Gotham; Holme Pierrepont and Gamston; Keyworth; Normanton on Soar; Normanton on the Wolds; Orston; Radcliffe on Trent; Rempston; Ruddington; Shelford; Sutton Bonington; Tithby and Wiverton; and Tollerton.

3. Representations were also received from the Borough Councillors for East Bridgford and Tollerton.


5. In addition to statutory consultees, representations were received from a variety of local and national interest groups, and representatives from the development industry (including House Builders Federations, landowners and their agents).

6. In summary, of those responses received, the number principally concerning potential housing development at particular locations breaks down as follows:

- More than one settlement: 130
- Adbolton Lane (Simkins Farm), West Bridgford: 85
- Cotgrave: 115
- Cropwell Bishop: 125
- East Bridgford: 75
- East Leake: 300
- Gotham: 85
- Keyworth: 75
- Ruddington: 55
- Radcliffe on Trent: 15
- Sutton Bonington: 40
- Tollerton: 225
7. The holding of public exhibitions within these settlements and the use of leaflet responses increased the representations within these settlements. East Leake Parish Council held an independent public event and produced its own leaflet.

**Housing Land Supply**

8. In response to the question whether respondents agree with the Borough Council’s assessment of the present housing supply situation and that enough land will need to be identified by Local Plan Part 2 to accommodate around 2,000 new homes, 73 respondents agreed and 111 disagreed.

9. Although the development industry were supportive of the Council’s acknowledgement of a housing shortfall, a large number of respondents from this sector considered that this had been underestimated and that more than 2,000 homes needed to be allocated through Local Plan 2 in order to achieve a 5 year housing land supply. These respondents considered that the Council had over-estimated delivery in the housing trajectory (principally in relation to the strategic sites).

10. Of those that disagreed with the proposed figure of 2,000, a range of alternative minimum housing figures were suggested, ranging from 2,200 – 4,300. Other common suggestions were of between a 5%-20% contingency buffer. It was argued that this additional allowance was needed in order to account for any future under-delivery. The option of Local Plan 2 including reserve sites or safeguarded sites was also suggested as a way of the plan providing more flexibility.

11. A smaller number of agents and developers agreed with Council’s figure of 2,000 homes.

12. In relation to the housing trajectory and 5 year housing land supply, a number of respondents from the development industry suggested that a lapse rate needed to be applied (following recommendation of Local Plan Expert Group). A number of respondents provided their own version of the housing trajectory as part of their submissions, all of which were more conservative in terms of their delivery figures.

13. The **Home Builders Federation (HBF)** supported the Council’s approach to 5 year housing land supply, both in terms of applying the 20% buffer (to both the annualised housing requirement and shortfall), and the use of the Sedgefield approach. However, they stressed that not including a lapse rate would only be appropriate if the Council’s assumptions on the housing
delivery rates of individual sites and windfall allowances were realistic and there was sufficient contingency within the overall HLS. If this wasn’t demonstrated it suggested that the Local Plan Expert Group recommendation of a 10% lapse rate should be applied. They concluded that the Council should be allocating 2,000 homes plus a 20% contingency. It was argued that this would provide sufficient flexibility for unforeseen circumstances.

14. Bunny PC were opposed to any further loss of Green Belt land and expressed concern over the impact of any new development on infrastructure and facilities that are shared by neighbouring villages.

15. Costock Parish Council and Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council agreed that the Borough Council’s figures were accurate.

16. Barton in Fabis Parish Council were opposed to the release of additional greenfield sites for development and suggested an independent review was needed to scrutinise why the large urban extensions haven’t been developed.

17. East Bridgford Parish Council suggested that Local Plan 2 should be planning for a lower number of houses and that new housing should be built in areas closer to employment opportunities and not focused on rural areas.

18. East Leake Parish Council understood the timing issue with respect to the next five years, and possibly 2019 to 2024, but argued no evidence had been provided as to why the sites cannot be delivered by the end of the plan period.

19. Gotham Parish Council argued that a full or partial review of the Core Strategy would be needed if Gotham was to be allocated housing as this was not a settlement named within the original spatial hierarchy. They also wanted adequate explanation as to the causes for under performance and whether neighbouring authorities could accept some of the proposed housing.

20. Sutton Bonington Parish Council expressed concern that the method for calculating the housing figure was insufficiently robust.

21. Tollerton Parish Council considered it appropriate for the Borough Council to update the evidence base for the need for more housing given recent national changes. The Parish Council also urged the Borough Council to take proactive action to bring the strategic sites forward and publish a clear plan as to the action it will take and evidence to demonstrate that the sites will be developed within an appropriate timescale to avoid further review of the Green Belt and identification of additional housing sites.
22. **Tollerton Against Backdoor Urbanisation (TABU)** shared the view that the Council should recalculate the housing figure. They also considered it inappropriate for the 20% buffer to be applied as 'persistent' under-delivery had not been demonstrated (as the strategic sites had only been allocated for three years). They also suggested the whole of the Greater Nottingham's housing requirement should be recalculated (such a position was endorsed by the Examiner for the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy).

23. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** wanted more robust justification as to why the large sites aren’t delivering. They considered the local plan process should focus on these rather than on allocating more sites in unsustainable locations. Concern was expressed regarding the greater environmental impact of distributing development across villages instead of focusing on sites on the edge of Nottingham. This would lead to a greater degree of habitat fragmentation in terms of biodiversity and more unsustainable travel patterns. Overall, they considered that the Council’s approach was contrary to the spatial strategy of urban concentration and regeneration established under the Core Strategy. It was also stressed that impacts on designated sites and strategic and local wildlife corridors should be avoided. This view was echoed by the **Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group (RNCSIG)**

24. **CPRE** had similar concerns to Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust and the RNCSIG and stressed the need for the Council to demonstrate the reasons for non-delivery and the actions being taken to improve delivery rates.

25. **North West Leicestershire DC** emphasised the importance of ensuring that housing land assumptions were kept up to date and recalculated as necessary, accounting for any potential further under-delivery prior to adoption of Local Plan 2.

26. The **Coal Authority** required consideration to be given to ground conditions / land stability as part of the site allocation process.

27. **Sharphill Action Group** supported the Council’s approach, recognising the importance of the NPPF in terms of guiding plans in respect of land supply.

28. In relation to responses from residents, a common concern was that the proposed approach ‘rewarded’ developers for slow delivery on the strategic sites. There was general concern at allocating further greenfield and greenbelt sites as a result. Some suggested this approach was contrary to the Core Strategy policy of urban concentration and regeneration and was in contravention of the settlement hierarchy established. A number of respondents expressed frustration that more could not be done to get
developers to build the sites that have already been identified and that the focus should be on bringing forward the larger sites instead of allocating further sites in less sustainable rural settlements.

29. Other concerns highlighted by respondents included:

- concern that government population forecasts have been over-estimated and that these may be reduced with the UK leaving the EU;
- proposals to build 1,000 houses a year considered overly ambitious given market uncertainties;
- need to reassess the demand from other local councils and recalculate housing figures accordingly;
- the need to reassess housing need on a community level basis;
- housing trajectory underplays windfall rates;
- the need to use the term ‘at least’ 2000 homes instead of ‘around’;
- concern that insufficient regard has been paid to infrastructure requirements;
- the need for suitable house types, principally smaller and more affordable units, which could be developed quicker thereby addressing current shortfall;
- the requirement to explore options of increasing density on existing sites or breaking the larger sites up into smaller parcels in order to encourage delivery;
- need to introduce mechanisms to prevent ‘land banking’;
- support for community led housing schemes by smaller scale developers would more likely to be accepted by the community and would be more positive in terms of design and innovation and more likely to employ local tradesmen;

30. Other comments received in support of the Council’s approach included:

- the recognition that there is a general need for new housing across the country;
- support for allocating additional land in the ‘key settlements’.
- lack of sustainability of rural areas for development compared to sites on the edge of the main urban area;
- support for further development in rural areas – reflective of White Paper to help rural communities thrive;
- approach focussed on smaller sites in rural areas will most appropriately address lack of 5 year housing land supply as these sites can deliver quicker;

31. Other comments received in objection to the Council’s approach included:
- considered inappropriate to be prescriptive on housing numbers;
- concern that the Council has applied a 20% buffer instead of a 5% buffer and that persistent under delivery has not been demonstrated and that is it premature to call the Core Strategy ‘out of date’;
- the need to prioritise previously developed land for development before greenfield and Green Belt sites;
- the need to protect Green Belt sites from development;
- the need to adhere to the Core Strategy housing strategy;
- objection to rural sites being used to make up shortfalls elsewhere;
- revised approach is contrary to findings of the 2012 and 2014 Sustainability Appraisals which both highlighted the increased negative environmental effects of deviating from a strategy of urban concentration and regeneration.

**Housing Sites adjacent to the Main Urban Area**

32. In response to the question whether respondents agree with the Borough Council’s view that none of the three strategic allocations adjacent to the main urban area should be expanded as part of resolving the housing shortfall, 97 agreed, 71 disagreed and 27 stated they didn’t know.

33. The majority of respondents from the development industry agreed that expanding the current strategic allocations would not address the current shortfall, and that the only way for the Council to do this was by allocating smaller sites for housing in a wider variety of locations.

34. The HBF argued that expansion of the strategic allocations was a strategic matter and as such should be deferred until the Part 1 Plan is next reviewed.

35. Historic England highlighted the importance for any expansion of the strategic allocations to take into account the methodology and advice set out in Historic England Advice Note 3. They advised that this should also be referred to in any Sustainability Appraisal work.

36. Holme Pierrepont and Gamston Parish Council agreed that more sites should be considered across the borough as this would help ensure that the Council wasn’t dependent solely on the same large volume housebuilders.

37. Barton in Fabis Parish Council agreed that as the large sites aren’t currently delivering, increasing housing numbers on those sites would not help the shortfall situation.
38. **Gotham Parish Council** highlighted the requirement for a sequential test to be undertaken to ensure there are no more suitable sites in the main built up area. They also considered that there would be capacity within the key settlements to accommodate the additional 900 homes. Local needs development at Bradmore, Bunny, Cropwell Butler, Gotham, Newton, Plumtree, Shelford and Upper Saxondale could contribute to the five year land supply.

39. **East Leake Parish Council** emphasised the importance for the Council to ensure housing is delivered adjacent to the main urban area. They suggested that Edwalton Golf Course was a suitable site for development as this has been removed from the Green Belt.

40. **Sutton Bonington Parish Council** are of the view that the strategic allocations were capable of expansion with appropriate design and higher densities.

41. **Sharphill Action Group** supported the Council’s approach, arguing that this would not help address the immediate shortfall due to the current difficulties in bringing those sites forward.

42. Of the responses received from members of the public, the majority disagreed with the Council’s approach, arguing that the sites adjacent to the main urban area were more suitable as they were located in a more sustainable location and had availability of appropriate infrastructure compared to sites in the rural area. **East Bridgford Parish Council** shared this view.

43. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** highlighted the negative environmental impact of increasing the numbers of units on the three strategic allocations, in particular the impact on important wildlife corridors such as Fairham Brook and Sharphill Wood and the impact of coalescence between Tollerton and the strategic allocation.

44. **Nottingham City Transport** supported additional development South of Clifton due to the ease of providing improved bus services in this area


46. Respondents who supported the Council’s view that housing allocations should not be increased in this area expressed concern over any further loss of open space adjacent to Sharphill Wood and the impact on local infrastructure.
47. Other issues highlighted by respondents included the need for the Council to consider:

- the option of de-allocating sites if they are not deliverable;
- the impact of increasing the footprint of the strategic allocations on existing infrastructure;
- including self build as part of the strategic allocations;
- increasing density on the strategic allocations;
- developing Edwalton Golf Course as was considered to be a sequentially preferable site;
- Inconsistencies in the housing trajectory for delivery on the strategic allocations, e.g. Edwalton 150 dwellings per year, Clifton and Gamston 250 dwellings per year

**Additional sites**

48. Additional land to the south of the current strategic allocation at East of Gamston was identified by the landowner as a suitable area for development. It was argued this site could come forward early in the plan process and should be considered before site options in the rural areas are progressed.

49. Additional land at to the north of the strategic allocation (north of the canal) was also put forward by the landowner (*Havenwood Construction and Rockspring Barwood Ltd*). This was also suggested through the Core Strategy Examination. It was argued that this site could come forward in smaller pockets of housing, involving opportunities for small developers and self and custom build, before major infrastructure was required. It was argued that this should be prioritised ahead of housing in the rural area due to the site being more located in a more sustainable area.

50. Additional land at Melton Road, Edwalton (to the west of Sharphill Wood) was put forward from the landowner for consideration for a retirement village. It was argued that as this would serve a different market to the rest of the allocation, and could be brought forward earlier in a discrete phase in the plan period and contribute to the 5 year housing land supply.

51. Hill House Farm (54 dwellings) and 229 Melton Road (20 dwellings) were also put forward as suitable sites adjacent to the Melton Road, Edwalton allocation.

52. A site to the north of Nottingham Knight Roundabout was also suggested as a suitable site. This site was also promoted through the previous round of Local Plan consultation at the Issues and Options.
Simkins Farm, Adbolton

53. In response to whether respondents supported development at Simkins Farm, the majority disagreed. **52 agreed all** of the site should be developed, **8 agreed part** of the site and **110 disagreed** with any development (with a further 84 anonymous respondents also disagreeing).

54. Those respondents who were supportive of development (including East Bridgford Parish Council, Costock Parish Council and Nottingham City Transport) cited the accessibility of the site in terms of proximity to the main urban area and associated facilities. CPRE also supported development of part of the site.

55. **Crofts Developments** (who have land interests in the site) were also supportive of development, stating that the site benefited from flood defences and had also been subject to a heritage survey which concluded that the impact of development would be ‘less than substantial’.

56. **Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group (RNCSIG)** highlighted that the site was close to a LWS and that this should be protected.

57. **Holme Pierrepont and Gamston Parish Council** highlighted the importance of the site in terms of heritage (in relation to the setting of the listed building), flood risk, the risk of coalescence if the site were developed and the negative impact on the wildlife corridor.

58. **Historic England** stressed the importance of the presence of both designated and non-designated heritage assets adjacent to the site which could be adversely impacted by development.

59. **Nottinghamshire County Council** identified that the site was within the search area for sand and gravel. It requested that the presence of sand/gravel is highlighted if the site was allocated.

60. Objections from members of the public related primarily to the loss of Green Belt, unsuitability of the land due to flood risk and the concern of development increasing the risk of flooding elsewhere, negative environmental impact on local wildlife (in particular in relation to Pinders Pond), and the impact on archaeology in respect of the ‘lost village of Adbolton’.

61. Other issues highlighted by respondents objecting to the site included:
- The importance of the site as valued open space adjoining a built up area;
- Encroachment into the countryside;
- Educational value of the site;
- Concern over the increase of traffic in a congested area;
- Lack of infrastructure capacity in relation to schools, health centres and retail;
- Negative impact on the character of Lady Bay;
- Over-intensity of proposed development;
- Precedent of previous applications on the site being refused on the grounds of Green Belt, archaeological value and heritage value
- Impact on light and air pollution;
- Heritage value of the site due to the listed building of Simkins Farm adjoining the site.

62. Other issues highlighted by respondents supporting the site included:
- Potential suitability of the site for frontage development;
- Support over a general increase in new houses in the Lady Bay area;
- Appropriateness of the site as infill;
- Support for development of sites such as this in accessible locations close to facilities.

**Housing Development at the 'Key Settlements'**

**Bingham**

63. There was agreement from a clear majority of respondents for not allocating further greenfield sites for housing in Bingham (71 in favour and 25 against).

64. Those that supported no further allocations included **Tithby and Wiverton Parish Council, Costock Parish Council, Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, RNCSIG, CPRE, Nottingham City Transport** and a number of representatives from the development industry.

65. **Tithby and Wiverton Parish Council** expressed concern that the further spread of Bingham would affect the rural character of surrounding areas. This view was echoed by **CPRE**.

66. Representatives of the development industry highlighted the single ownership by the Crown Estate of the majority of potentially developable land around Bingham as reason for not allocating further sites (given the lack of progress with land North of Bingham). Others expressed the unwillingness of developers to bring forward more dwellings in one area as saturating the market would negatively affect market competitiveness. Concern was also
expressed that any additional development would be disproportionate to the size of the town, given the significant development already proposed and that there was inadequate infrastructure to accommodate anything further. It was also argued that additional housing delivery in this location would not help address the immediate housing shortfall.

67. There was only limited support for additional allocations on the edge of Bingham. Comments received in support related to the relative sustainability of the settlement in terms of public transport, services and facilities when compared to more rural settlements. **Tollerton Against Backdoor Urbanisation (TABU)** supported this view, stating that the Council should take a proactive role in finding additional sites in Bingham if none had come forward.

**Cotgrave**

68. In response to the question whether it is agreed that Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for housing at Cotgrave in the plan period, **80 agreed, 102 disagreed and 38 stated that they didn’t know.**

69. A number of reasons were cited by those of the view that Cotgrave should have no further housing allocations. In particular, around 50 respondents believe that local services, facilities and infrastructure is insufficient to accommodate further development. Limited or a lack of capacity at the local primary schools and at Cotgrave’s medical centre was mentioned by around 30 respondents. Over 20 respondents raised issues relating to highway safety issues should there be further development and, in particular, questioned the ability of the junctions of Hollygate Lane, Colston Gate, Bingham Road, and Old Park to cope with further traffic. Around 15 respondents made the point that the development of the former Colliery means that have further development is unnecessary or questionable, or that the town needs time to assimilate that development. Around 20 respondents expressed concerns that the village character of Cotgrave would be negatively affected by development. A number of respondents are critical of the potential loss of greenfield and Green Belt land for development, and also the impact on the local natural environment.

70. In respect of comments from those respondents who are more supportive of development, a number made the point that more housing would assist regeneration and that infrastructure should be delivered before any development goes ahead. This infrastructure should improve links between Cotgrave and Nottingham. Others highlighted the need to locate development in close proximity to existing facilities.
71. Representations from those outside of Cotgrave believe that due to: its proximity to Nottingham and A46; its attractiveness for commuters; and the presence of existence of facilities which can be expanded that greenfield land should be allocated. Others raised concerns that brownfield land should be allocated and that development in Cotgrave would increase congestion along Plumtree Road and Cotgrave Road.

72. **East Bridgford Parish Council** believe that as Cotgrave is sufficiently large, has sufficient infrastructure and access to employment and economic areas, greenfield land should be allocated.

73. **Tithby and Wiverton Parish Council** state that the existing Green Belt should be retained around Cotgrave.

74. **Historic England** recommends that site assessments for additional sites are undertaken. This would add to the limited historic environment information included in the SHLAA and current Green Belt Review for additional sites and assist with moving forward, including informing SA work.

75. **Barratt Homes** (promoting COT1) support additional housing being directed towards Cotgrave given the facilities and services.

76. **Aldergate Properties** support limited additional growth beyond when Cotgrave Colliery finishes delivering. Without an extensive increase in facilities too much additional housing will be disproportionate to the settlement and place increased strain on local services.

77. **Langridge Homes** (Promoting COT3) states that Cotgrave is an optimum Key Settlement where a significant proportion of the additional housing requirement should be allocated. Range of services, town centre regeneration, and good transport links to Nottingham and beyond. There will be growing demand over the plan period for homes after colliery scheme is completed.

78. **Trustees of GW Brough** (promoting COT6) support limited additional growth with acknowledgement that the Colliery site has already been identified – further sites should only be allocated toward back end of plan period to ensure this development isn’t stifled.

79. **Parker Strategic Land Limited** (promoting COT7 and COT8) believe that with adequate support, there is scope for significant potential growth. This growth needs to be enough to support adequate facilities and continue regeneration. This is best achieved through a single larger site releases than a series of smaller releases. There needs to be a masterplan drawn up for
Cotgrave as a whole, rather than a piecemeal approach, which sets guidelines for its planned expansion, taking account of new facility requirements.

80. **Langer Investments** (promoting COT2) agree that greenfield land should be allocated as Cotgrave is a Key Settlement which benefits from a range of services and facilities (i.e. sustainable settlement). NPPF focuses development in sustainable locations. Development would maximise town centre improvements and comply with Housing White Paper.

81. **Southwell Diocese** supports the removal from the green belt and development of land of Woodgate Lane. The site is suitable and available for development in whole or in part.

82. **Taylor and Wimpey** (promoting COT9 and COT10) state that since the start of the plan period Cotgrave has under-delivered compared to other key settlements. Furthermore the Core Strategy sets a 'minimum' target. Additional sites need to be identified in order to make up for constrained delivery in the parish in the early years of the plan period.

83. **Wickmere Nottingham Limited** (promoting COT11) supports greenfield allocations on the edge of Cotgrave, rather than on the edge of the main urban area.

84. **Hoyland** (promoting addition site east of Hollygate Lane) state that as a Key Settlement Cotgrave is a sustainable settlement for further growth. Former Cotgrave Colliery development further strengthens the sustainability of the settlement.

85. **Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group** state that every effort should be made to limit land take from the wider countryside by ensuring timely use of sites already identified. Existing identified sites should be sympathetically developed.

86. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** does not support the allocation of green field land for development.

87. **CPRE** does not support the allocation of greenfield land for development as these would encroach into open countryside and affect the Cotgrave Wolds.

88. Representatives of those promoting land outside of Cotgrave state that the number of additional dwellings should be determined having regard to overall housing requirement and the suitability of sites and that Cotgrave has a range
of facilities. Others advise that development should be located adjoining the main urban area.

89. **TABU** highlight that the increase in housing is not as large as that proposed in Tollerton.

90. A range of views were expressed on the total number of new homes that should be accommodated on greenfield sites at Cotgrave up to 2028. Whilst individual representations suggested between none and 1000 (in addition to the colliery), the majority (approximately 25) believed zero additional homes should be built. The second most popular response was ‘as few as possible to meet need’ or no more than 100-150. One consultee suggested Cotgrave should grow by the same amount a Bingham and East Leake (30% (875)).

91. Residents highlighted the need to improve infrastructure before homes are built and that the identity of Clipston should be preserved.

92. The **Borough Councillor for East Bridgford** suggests between 400 and 600 as this will bring it into line with the other large villages.

93. **Barratt Homes** (promoting COT1) suggest that a minimum of 770 dwellings should be provided in Cotgrave given its position in the “key settlement” hierarchy reflecting size, population and provision of services, facilities and infrastructure.

94. **Trustees of GW Brough** (promoting COT6) suggest 300 dwellings can be accommodated across 2-3 sites without adverse or major cumulative impact on the immediate locality of the selected sites or facilities.

95. **Langridge Homes** (promoting COT3) advise that Cotgrave should allocate land for 1000 homes to support town centre regeneration, balance demographics and meet market demand. Low-medium Green Belt sites.

96. **Parker Strategic Land Limited** (promoting GOT7 and GOT8) has not provided a total number. However they believe there are adequate facilities to support a significant growth and that this can be achieved through larger single site releases. Green Belt releases are insignificant. Currently the boundary is drawn to tightly and restrains growth.

97. **Taylor and Wimpey** (promoting COT9 and COT10) suggest a minimum of 150-200 additional homes
98. **TABU** Cotgrave should provide a proportion of Rushcliffe’s requirement for 13,150 houses that is proportional to its size and population. As a settlement, a large number of additional houses would cause less impact.

99. Representatives of those promoting land outside of Cotgrave believed there should be no cap, or no more than 100. The absence of a railway station was highlighted as a limiting factor.

100. When asked whether there was support for any of the additional sites, the following responses were received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes – all of site</th>
<th>Yes – but only part of site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COT1 – Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT2 – Land at Main Road</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT3 – Land rear of and to the west of Main Road</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT4 Land off Woodgate Lane</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT5 – Bakers Hollow</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT6 – The Brickyard, Owthorpe Road</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT7 – Land behind Firdale (2)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT8 – Land behind Firdale</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT9 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (1)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT10 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (2)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT11 – Land south of Hollygate Lane (3)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT12 – Land south of Plumtree Lane</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other location</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

101. All the possible sites in Cotgrave received significantly more opposition than support. However support for the allocation of COT9 almost equalled those who oppose it when both yes and yes in part are combined.

102. **Historic England** state that the cluster of Listed Buildings, including the Grade I Church of All Saints, and their setting, along with other heritage assets and their setting will need to be taken into account as part of any site assessment work. The setting of Scheduled Monuments to the south of Cotgrave, e.g. the bombing decoys, may also need to be taken into account. It is recommended that site assessments for additional sites are undertaken. This would add to the current Green Belt Review and assist the SA.
103. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** objects to all the proposed allocations. Cotgrave Forest and nearby plantations provide a valuable habitat and GI resource, identified as a ‘focal area’ in the Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Report for Rushcliffe. The following allocations could impact on such woodland habitat: COT1 and COT2; COT6 and COT12 would form barriers to movement of wildlife through the woodland around the eastern edge of Cotgrave; COT11 would adversely affect the Grantham Canal which is both a designated Local Wildlife Site and a Green Corridor.

104. **Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group** advises that areas south, east and north of Cotgrave are part of the Cotgrave Forest focal area. Opportunities to extend woodland should be kept open. COT1 should contain a buffer adjacent to woodland north. COT6 and COT12 represent barriers to movement through woodland on Cotgrave’s eastern edge. COT11 should be restricted towards the edge of the Canal which is a LWS and Green Corridor. S106 monies should be spent on buffering.

105. **CPRE** state that any further Greenfield allocations at Cotgrave would encroach into open countryside and detract from the attractive, intact Cotgrave Wolds.

106. **Pedals** highlight that the Canal towpath has considerable value as a commuter route, especially since the recent surface improvements in the Cotgrave Country Park area and west of Hollygate Lane. This would also benefit some of the proposed further housing site closer to the north side of the village and the towpath, e.g. COT1 and COT11.

107. **TABU** state that COT12 would lead to the merging of Cotgrave and Clipston. COT4 may be very visible from the strategic allocation and may increase the perception of merging of those settlements. Development to the north and east of Cotgrave would be most appropriate, both to avoid merging of settlements and in terms of access to the A46.

108. General responses from consultees highlighted the need to locate development nearer to the centre, towards the north and east (closer to the A46), that expansion allows the concentration of services in one location, and that large sites should be avoided as these are proven to take longer to deliver. Others highlighted the need to avoid areas that are part of the Cotgrave Forest Focal Area (north, east and south)

**COT1: Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park**
109. **Barratt Homes** (promoting COT1) support approximately 300 dwellings at Site COT 1. It is well located in relation to the centre of Cotgrave and both existing and new (planned) employment opportunities in the vicinity. It also provides an ideal opportunity to enhance connectivity to/from the former Colliery and associated Country Park.

110. **Canal and River Trust** advise that Site COT1 lies to the west of the Grantham Canal and the north-east corner of the site is only 25-30m from the canal towpath. Any development of this site should consider opportunities to create pedestrian/cycle links to the canal towpath, which will also give access to the wider Cotgrave Country Park.

111. Other comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
   - Would result in destruction of woodland/wildlife area.
   - Hollygate Lane is inadequate to take the increase in traffic along Hollygate Lane, in addition to extra traffic from the colliery’s development and the A46.
   - The junction with Main Road/Colston Gate is already dangerous.
   - Should only be limited infill so that woodland is buffered
   - Rotation slip of slag heap – clay embankment removed, reducing stability.
   - Surface water flooding
   - Archaeological Bronze Age remains may be on site
   - Loss of food producing land
   - Would link Hollygate Lane with industrial estate and village
   - Is Infill and would not intrude into open countryside

**COT2: Land at Main Road**

112. **Langer Investments** (promoting COT2) advise that COT2 is available and deliverable and within walking distance from the centre. Nottingham Community Housing Association is committed to the development of the site with regards to the provision of 40 affordable homes.

113. Other comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
   - Would exit on to a blind summit.

**COT3: Land rear of and to the west of Main Road**

114. **Langridge Homes** (promoting COT3) state that COT3 is available and deliverable, would not adversely affect the setting of the village’s historic core, would not reduce distance between Cotgrave and Gamston/Tollerton allocation, is screened by topography, would round off the settlement and is close to the centre.
115. **Environment Agency** advises that COT3 is within Flood Zone 1 only, however, it is adjacent to a watercourse where a 10m easement must be provided. Development of this site must not cause deterioration to the WFD quality of the adjacent watercourse.

116. Other comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
   - Would spoil the “village feel” of the old part of Cotgrave. If housing required would be less impact on the village by choosing alternative sites with a less rural and historical significance.
   - Add to existing unacceptable traffic levels.
   - There are potential access visibility issues due to a blind hill
   - Destroy the character of this area of the village. Would have a huge visual impact.
   - Highway safety would be compromised.
   - There would be a loss of privacy.
   - There would be light pollution.
   - Overlooking would be an adverse impact.
   - Scope to adequate services is questioned.

**COT4: Land off Woodgate Lane**

117. **Southwell Diocese** (promoting COT4) believe that COT4 can deliver around 100 new dwellings (rather than the 80 dwellings indicated in the document) in a sustainable location, and will include other planning benefits in terms of structural planting and landscaping, affordable homes and footpath linkages.

118. Other comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
   - Proximity to the sewage works
   - Road leading to the site is unadopted and is a bridleway used by pedestrians and horses.
   - Increased traffic on Rectory Road, increasing noise and compromising safety
   - Rectory Road is not wide enough to cope with the extra traffic.
   - Plumtree Road has narrow pavement
   - Dangerous access from Woodgate Lane onto Plumtree Road – blind summit.
   - Adversely affect property values, destroy view and our privacy.
   - Noise levels could become a nuisance.
   - Would reduce the distance between Cotgrave and the strategic allocation at Tollerton/Gamston.

**COT5: Bakers Hollow**
119. **Ruzicka** (promoting COT5) state that Bakers Hollow is suitable for development. As it is well located in terms of access, well contained and would not extend outer edge further than the existing settlement.

120. Other comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
- There are drainage issues already.
- Access would be on/close to a blind summit.
- Too far from services and facilities within the centre of the village and no pavement on Plumtree Road.
- Additional traffic levels on Plumtree Road would worsen already dangerous road conditions.
- Would increase traffic along Cotgrave Lane/Plumtree Road where traffic is already too high.
- These fields have an open aspect with a broad sweep of farmland.
- This green belt land is prime agricultural land of high quality.
- The distance between this western edge of Cotgrave and the neighbouring village of Clipston would be greatly reduced.
- These fields also provide a recreational area for local residents to have easy access to walk in the countryside along the public footpaths which cross and border this area.
- Land is liable to flooding

COT6: The Brickyard, Owthorpe Road

121. **Trustees of GW Brough** (promoting COT6) state that COT6 has a landowner supportive of development; that its site boundary should be amended to discount the wooded area; is low grade agricultural land; is well contained; that available access from Owthorpe Road can be achieved with direct connection to A46; services and facilities are within walking distance; and development would balance directional growth of the village.

122. **Nottinghamshire County Council** state that COT6 will affects an area of woodland/scrub which contributes to a continuous belt of woodland along the southern side of the Cotgrave and is likely to be of ecological value. If allocated, the woodland/scrub would need to be omitted from the allocation, with development restricted to the open fields (but maintaining the mature field boundaries).

123. Other comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
- Site has been the subject of a planning application previously and permission was refused.
- There are drainage issues already (approximately 5 comments).
Part of wildlife corridor through woodland on Cotgrave’s woodland edge.
Will increase congestion through the village
Site is screened from main roads.

**COT7: Land behind Firdale (2)**

124. **Parker Strategic Land Limited** (promoting COT7 and COT8) believe that COT7 and COT8 are best placed to accommodate growth as: they are an extension to existing housing area; are contained by landform; the green belt can be re-set, is close to A46, there is strong developer interest and new school can be provided.

125. Other comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
- Site should not be built without COT8
- Add to existing unacceptable traffic levels.
- Access would be dangerously close to a bend.
- Expansion east most sensible option
- Less disruptive to current residents
- Will increase congestion through village (Bingham Road and Hollygate Lane junction)

**COT8: Land behind Firdale**

126. **Parker Strategic Land Limited** (promoting COT7 and COT8) believe that COT7 and COT8 are best placed to accommodate growth as: they are an extension to existing housing area; are contained by landform; the green belt can be re-set, is close to A46, there is strong developer interest and new school can be provided.

127. Other comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
- Access would be dangerously close to a bend.
- Expansion east most sensible option
- Opportunity to provide a green corridor linking the Country park with Cotgrave Gorse.
- Will increase congestion through village (Bingham Road and Hollygate Lane junction)
COT9: Land south of Hollygate Lane (1)

128. **Taylor and Wimpey** (promoting COT9 and COT10) are suitable for 150 units. Highways reasons for refusal on COT 10 can be addressed through inclusion of COT9. Local highways access can be improved through the development of this site (i.e. Hollygate Lane /Colston Gate junction).

129. Other comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
   - Hollygate Lane is inadequate to take the increase in traffic. In addition to extra traffic from the colliery’s development and the A46.
   - It would provide easy access to the A46 and Stragglethorpe Road (avoiding the village)
   - The junction with Main Road/Colston Gate is already congested and dangerous.
   - Would increase traffic along Cotgrave Lane/Plumtree Road where traffic is already too high, particularly at rush hour.
   - Would be an intrusion into the countryside and a loss of rural character.
   - If sites must be allocated, COT9 or COT10 are the only suitable area. Close to/links existing housing, new development at the former colliery and employment.
   - Could provide part of a green corridor linking the Country Park with Cotgrave Gorse

COT10: Land south of Hollygate Lane (2)

130. **Taylor and Wimpey** (promoting COT9 and COT10) are suitable for 150 units. Highways reasons for refusal on COT 10 can be addressed through inclusion of COT9. Local highways access can be improved through the development of this site (i.e. Hollygate Lane /Colston Gate junction).

131. **Nottinghamshire County Council** state COT10 is an area of rough grassland and scrub which may have ecological value – NCC would suggest its omission unless it can be demonstrated that the site is of low ecological value.

132. Other comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
   - Hollygate Lane is inadequate to take the increase in traffic along Hollygate Lane in addition to extra traffic from the colliery’s development and the A46.
   - It would provide easy access to the A46 and Stragglethorpe Road (avoiding the village)
The junction with Main Road/Colston Gate is already congested and dangerous.

COT9 or COT10 is the only suitable area. Close to links existing housing, new development at the former colliery and employment.

Would not intrude significantly into open countryside - infill

COT11: Land south of Hollygate Lane (3)

133. Wickmere Nottingham Limited (promoting COT11) state that COT11 is: related to the former colliery development; could contain buffer; is close to the strategic road network and regular bus services; no ecological or heritage constraints and majority of site is not within a flood risk area. They disagree with landscape assessment which proposes buffer across 2/3 of the site.

134. Environment Agency advises that COT11 lies within flood zone 3 and so the flood risk sequential test will need to be undertaken. A site specific flood risk assessment will also be required.

135. Nottinghamshire County Council state within COT11 the relatively large pond(s) on the site should be omitted.

136. Other comments from residents highlighted the following issues:

- Hollygate Lane is inadequate to take the increase in traffic in addition to extra traffic from the colliery’s development and the A46.
- It would provide easy access to the A46 and Stragglethorpe Road (avoiding the village)
- The junction with Main Road/Colston Gate is already congested and dangerous.
- Least impact on Cotgrave but like the colliery, it is rather isolated
- Would join the village to the new homes on the colliery
- No development adjacent to the Grantham Canal which is a LWS and green corridor.
- Opportunity to provide a green corridor linking the Country Park with Cotgrave Gorse.

COT12 – Land south of Plumtree Lane

137. IM Land (promoting COT12) only supports COT12. COT12 could deliver the required 220 dwellings which could be accommodated within Cotgrave and development could commence immediately after removal from the GB. COT12 could deliver need without splitting sites and S106 money can be easily collected. Site supported by GB Review, LVIA, Vision Document, desk based assessment of archaeology, arboricultural assessment and phase 1
habitat survey. There is sufficient capacity within the local highway network to accommodate the scale of development proposed and no flood risk issues.

138. **The Canal and River Trust** state that site COT11 lies immediately south of the Grantham Canal and adjoins the canal towpath. Any development of this site should ensure that the character and appearance of the canal is appropriately protected. Consideration should be given to maintaining a landscaped area adjacent to the canal, to minimise the visual impact of development and to protect the ecological interest of the canal corridor.

139. Other comments from residents highlighted the following issues:

- Would increase traffic along Cotgrave Lane/Plumtree Road where traffic is already too high.
- Too far from the village centre
- Would be an intrusion into the countryside resulting in loss of rural character and adverse impacts on landscape.
- There are drainage/flooding issues already.
- Access would be on/close to a blind summit.
- Additional traffic levels on Plumtree Road are would worsen already dangerous road conditions. The road conditions are more dangerous because of the narrowness of the road and the hidden dips.
- Site is a designated crash zone for Tollerton airfield.
- These fields have an open aspect with a broad sweep of farmland. This green belt land is prime agricultural land of high quality.
- This intrude into the Greenbelt between Cotgrave and Clipston and blur the distinction between the two
- These fields also provide a recreational area for local residents to have easy access to walk in the countryside along the public footpaths which cross and border this area.
- There is also a wood The Brickyard Plantation at the southern end of site COT12 which is a haven for wildlife and nature. This wood would be adversely affected by development.

Any other location

140. **Gentry and Barnes** have submitted an additional site - Land west of Main Road and south of Gozen Lodge. The Land is located within the proximity of the Village Centre of Cotgrave and benefits from direct road access, and close proximity to major services.

141. **BT Hoyland** (promoting additional site East of Hollygate Lane) believe the additional site can accommodate some 116 dwellings, it would relate well to both the former Cotgrave Colliery development (and the facilities on site) and
the town centre, is accessible to A46 (reducing traffic impacts on the village), is adjacent to green burial site which will reduce wider landscape and Green Belt impacts (providing strong landscape screening). The Site’s southern boundary is formed by the Grantham Canal and opportunities exist for an extended area of informal recreation with an enhanced landscape buffer.

**East Leake**

142. The responses clearly indicate that there is overwhelming agreement with the Council’s position that no additional sites (beyond sites already granted planning permission) should be allocated. 333 respondents supported no further allocations, 32 did not support this position and 21 didn’t know.

143. East Leake Parish Council has highlighted evidence in the Neighbourhood Plan regarding infrastructure pressures and residents’ views. The Infrastructure Delivery which supports the Local Plan has not assessed infrastructure needs in East Leake over and above an extra 400 homes. Therefore further assessment needs to be done and infrastructure improvements made to accommodate the extra homes already allowed, let alone any further homes. Given the infrastructure deficiencies East Leake can no longer be considered a “sustainable” location for growth.

144. East Bridgford Parish Council did not agree however as they believe East Leake has access to employment and contains sufficient infrastructure to accommodate further development.

145. Costock Parish Council agrees as East Leake’s infrastructure cannot support further development. The council believes that consideration should be given to surrounding communities which share the resources and to the effect on traffic which accesses East Leake through Costock village. This is already heavily used, particularly at peak hour times and the A60 cross roads has been the scene of a number of accidents.

146. Barton in Fabis Parish Council agrees that no additional sites should be allocated.

147. Rempston Parish Council would like to see a moratorium placed on sites EL9 - EL14 until infrastructure issues have been addressed (i.e. schools are full; medical centre is overloaded; frequent storm water flooding; village centre car parking; employment opportunities; existing road network and loss of local identity).

148. The Borough Councillor for East Bridgford supported no further allocations however.
149. **Historic England** advises that additional sites at East Leake will need to be considered in relation to the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting. The Grade II* Manor House may be impacted upon by proposed development sites, and there is the potential for archaeology at sites indicated. In addition, EL12 indicates a high survival of field patterns. It is recommended that site assessments for additional sites are undertaken. This would inform the SA.

150. **Gladman** (promoting EL14) do not agree as the Core Strategy target of 400 is a minimum and further sites are needed in Key sustainable settlements, such as East Leake, to provide surety that the full OAN is delivered.

151. **N&B Wright** (landowners of EL12) do not agree. Further development in East Leake is not a departure from the adopted plan as it is a Key Settlement and part of the Council’s urban concentration strategy. As stated in Local Plan 2 there are no other locations around the main urban area which are suitable and the strategic allocation should not be extended. Key Settlements are therefore the next preferable locations, especially those that are beyond the Green Belt. EL12 could provide a new school and 235 homes, open space and GI. N&B Wright consider the accessibility (both to the school and housing areas) and impact on highways issues resolved.

152. Representatives of those who own or are promoting land elsewhere in the borough supported the Council’s position, as East Leake has accommodated a disproportionate amount of additional housing, is not on a main transport route, does not have a railway station, and further housing would undermine the objectives of sustainable and manageable growth.

153. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** agrees that no additional site should be allocated

154. **Nottingham City Transport** does not agree. They provide frequent bus services linking East Leake with Loughborough and Nottingham and believe that service can cater for further growth in the East Leake.

155. **CPRE** agree, however reassurances are sought that the excess 400 homes have been taken into account in calculating overall housing land supply.

156. **Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group** agrees, stating that efforts should be made to limit land take from the wider countryside by ensuring timely use of sites already identified. Existing identified sites should be sympathetically, but efficiently developed.
157. Residents of East Leake overwhelmingly agreed and confirmed that the village had reached saturation point in terms of infrastructure, services and facilities (200+ comments). Especially roads and parking (35+ comments), inadequate public transport (10+ comments), schools, doctors, other health facilities, shops and sewage and drainage (15+ comments). Residents stated that no more homes should be built (60+ comments) and that infrastructure should be place if new development takes place (10+ comments). Concerns were raised that East Leake had taken its ‘fair share’ and that village life will change as it becomes a town (60+ comments).

158. Residents highlighted a need for 2/3 bed family homes, housing for the elderly and affordable housing, not executive housing (25+ comments).

159. Environmental concerns included: loss of green field and countryside (15+ comments), increased traffic pollution, impacts on wildlife, loss of farmland.

160. Other comments suggested that development is focused within Nottingham on brownfield sites or spread more evenly across other settlements, that the Green Belt should be extended, and that the housing was only being built for developer profit (5+ comments).

161. Cumulative traffic impacts of development in East Leake, land South of Clifton and the military hospital were also highlighted (5+ comments).

162. Residents from other villages were evenly split between those who agreed with the Council’s position and those that didn’t. Those that agreed believed East Leake had reached capacity, that the rural character of the village had changed and new homes were only meeting the needs of commuters. Those that disagreed believed that due to its proximity to employment areas, its size and existing facilities, East Leake could accommodate further housing. They also highlighted East Leake’s location beyond the Green Belt and access to A453 and A60, Tram, East Midlands Airport and East Midlands Parkway as positive factors.

163. When asked whether there was support for any of the additional sites, the following responses were received:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes – all of site</th>
<th>Yes – but only part of site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EL9 – Land south of West Leake Road</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL10 – Land north of West Leake Road</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL11 – Brook Furlong Farm</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL12 – Land off Rempstone Road (north)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL13 – Land off Rempstone Road (south)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL14 – Land north of Lantern Lane (2)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

164. The responses show that consultees do not support the allocation of any further sites, except those that already have planning permission.

165. **East Leake Parish Council** has not commented on individual sites. They have referenced criteria policies H7 and E1 within the Neighbourhood Plan which should be used to assess sites.

166. **Costock Parish Council** oppose the allocation of EL9, EL10, EL11, EL13 and EL14 as they would create traffic issues for the village and are too far to walk from the village centre.

167. **Nottinghamshire County Council** advises that all of these sites lie within a MSA/MCA for underground gypsum. British Gypsum should be consulted on these allocations in terms of the history of mining in the area and any future potential.

168. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** opposes all additional sites.

169. **CPRE** state that suitable sites have already been allocated.

170. **Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group** considers EL11, EL12, EL13 and EL14 as further intrusions into the wider landscape.

171. **Trent Valley IDB** state that EL9, EL10, EL11, EL12, EL13 and EL14 will require the boards consent prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.
172. Representatives of landowners who are promoting sites in other villages did not support any of the additional allocations in East Leake.

173. In support of the Council’s position regarding further allocations in East Leake, residents considered the identification of further allocations as unnecessary.

EL9 – Land south of West Leake Road

174. **Southwell Diocese** (landowner promoting EL9) support the development of EL9 in East Leake as a small scale development of 50 dwellings.

175. Other comments on EL9 referred to:
- EL9 is an allotment (which is oversubscribed) (around 10 comments);
- Its location is over 1.25km from the centre (contrary to Neighbourhood Plan) (around 5 comments);
- It is next to a cemetery;
- The inadequate road access, and there is no safe pavement to the site; and
- Its development would destroy wildlife and affect the character of the village.

EL10 - Land north of West Leake Road

176. Comments on EL10 highlighted the following issues:
- EL10 is over 1.25km (around 5 comments);
- There is inadequate road access;
- It is not accessible by pavement and is contrary to Neighbourhood Plan policy E1;
- Is too close to sewage works;
- Its development would destroy wildlife; and
- It would affect the character of the village.

177. Supporting comments highlighted:
- Support for 2-3 bed homes rather than large executive homes; and
- EL10 was identified as the ‘least worst’ option

EL11- Brook Furlong Farm

178. Comments on EL11 highlighted the following issues:
• EL11 is over 1.25km from the centre of the village (around 5 comments);
• Is subject to flood risk,
• Access is inadequate (and used by school children);
• It has poor pedestrian access to the centre;
• Its location east of village merges East Leake with Costock
• It would result in the loss of green field land.

179. Positive comments highlighted:
• The sites proximity to the centre;
• The opportunity to provide retirement accommodation;
• The site could facilitate a new road link between Costock Road and Bunny Lane;
• Protection of Gypsum resources was encouraged.

EL12 – Land off Rempstone Road (north)

180. Comments on EL12 highlighted the following issues:
• EL12 has poor road access (around 5 comments);
• It would reduce traffic and pedestrian safety along Rempstone Road;
• It is too close to the dangerous cross roads;
• It is too far from the village centre (beyond 1.25km from the centre of the village) (around 5 comments);
• It would add too many houses to the village and place pressure on facilities; and
• Result in the loss of green field land.

EL13 – Land off Rempstone Road (south)

181. Armett (landowner promoting EL13) fully supports the allocation of around 120 homes on EL13. The landowner has already received interest from several developers in relation to this site.

182. The following comments were made on EL13:
• It is too far from the centre of the village (beyond 1.25km) (around 5 comments),
• It would set a precedent allowing development to flow over the ridge,
• It is contrary to neighbourhood plan policy that contains the built environment.
• It has inadequate road and pedestrian access and the safety of horse riders, cyclists and pedestrian on Rempstone Road will be reduced.
• It would dominate the skyline and impact on village form.
EL14 – Land North of Lantern Lane

183. **Nottinghamshire County Council** state that EL14 abuts a Local Wildlife Site (5/260) and is an extensive area of ridge and furrow grassland which may have ecological value – NCC would suggest its omission unless it can be demonstrated that the site is of low ecological value.

184. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** also notes that EL14 is adjacent to a LWS and green corridor. If developed the LWS should be buffered and S106 money collected to mitigate effects upon it.

185. The following comments were made on EL14:
   - It has inadequate and unsafe road access (which splits the primary school) (around 10 comments);
   - It is at risk of flooding;
   - It is too far from the village (beyond 1.25km) (around 5 comments);
   - It is above potential Gypsum resources;
   - Access is already congested by the schools and leisure centre and there is poor pedestrian access to the village centre;
   - Its development would result in loss of countryside
   - Impact on wildlife; and
   - Increase pollution.

186. A positive comment was suggested that it could facilitate a new road link between Costock Road and Bunny Lane.

187. The following alternative location in East Leake was suggested: Land adjacent to EL2 and EL3 (Rest of Manor Farm).

Keyworth

188. There was no overall consensus on the number of houses that should be built on greenfield sites in Keyworth. The majority of comments were received from the development industry and statutory consultees. There was only a limited response from members of the public.

189. **Keyworth Parish Council** is still of the opinion that 450 dwellings should be the amount for Keyworth.

190. **East Bridgford Parish Council** support some development in Keyworth.

191. The **Borough Councillor for East Bridgford** suggests Keyworth should take 1000, including land already allocated.
192. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** state that the Core Strategy minimum of 450 should not be exceeded.

193. **Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group** believes that efforts should be made to limit land take from the wider countryside by ensuring timely use of sites already identified. Existing identified sites should be sympathetically, but efficiently developed.

194. **CPRE** state that the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan has already allocated land 50 more homes than the target for the village. Any change to that should be agreed with Keyworth Parish Council and the people of the village.

195. **Davill and Cowell** (landowners promoting KEY14) state that: Keyworth has a full range of services and facilities and has easy access to Nottingham, Leicester and Loughborough; the west side of the village is favoured location for new housing; additional land should be identified for the release beyond 2028; and a reserve land suitable for further 400 dwellings is appropriate.

196. **Cliffe Investment Limited** (promoting KEY1) state that Keyworth is one of the more sustainable settlements in the district and is therefore capable of accommodating further growth to help meet shortfalls. It is considered that there is the potential to accommodate at least an additional 100 dwellings within the settlement to help meet the shortfalls in provision.

197. **David Wilson Homes** (promoting KEY2) state that Keyworth has the capacity to accommodate a minimum figure of 700 dwellings. Allocation of small and medium sized plots for residential development will increase plan’s flexibility and assist in the Council identifying a 5 year housing land supply. Core Strategy and NP minimum housing targets for Keyworth are too low – contrary to the NPPF which seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing. Keyworth is a more sustainable and accessible settlement than East Leake which has had permission granted for 800 homes, more housing should therefore be allocated in Keyworth.

198. **Miller Homes** (promoting KEY8) state that the 450 homes specified in LP1 should be seen as an absolute minimum.

199. **CEG** (promoting KEY4) state that as a sustainable settlement, with a wide range of accessible services and facilities, Keyworth is capable of accommodating a significant proportion of the 2,000 additional homes.

200. **Smeeton** (promoting KEY13) state that more houses should be built at Keyworth. There are plenty of amenities i.e. three primary schools, secondary
school/academy, large medical centre, library and leisure centre which can accommodate more residents.

201. Wilson (SHLAA site 363/577) states 450 new houses up to 2028 is a minimum figure for the village and the surrounding area. No planning applications have been submitted.

202. TABU state that Keyworth has significantly more services and facilities than the smaller villages being considered. Keyworth should expect to be required to provide a proportion of Rushcliffe’s requirement for 13,150 houses that is proportional to its size and population. As a settlement, a large number of additional houses would cause less impact.

203. Representatives of landowners promoting sites outside of Keyworth advise that there should be no arbitrary cap on level of new development. The final result should be based on housing requirements, 5 year supply, the capacity of each settlement to accommodate growth and suitability of sites within the village compared to elsewhere.

204. Other representatives of the development industry stated that no further allocations in addition to those proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan should be identified, development should be located adjacent to the main urban area, or other Key Settlements where there are more sustainable sites.

205. There was support for an increase of 25% above the Neighbourhood Plan which identifies land for 500 homes and two reserve sites.

206. Residents of Keyworth made the following comments:
   - 500 homes are unsustainable given the condition of local road network and lack of other infrastructure. Maximum capacity should be 450 in line with Keyworth NP
   - Should be limited to infill
   - Maximum of 500 houses
   - Sites close to centre should be developed with good access
   - Importance of limiting development in order to preserve village atmosphere.
   - Strongly opposed to development of any Green Belt site adjacent to Keyworth (x3).
   - Concern over impact of developing GF sites – hedgerows, wildlife, road network and visual impact of any new buildings on the landscape.
   - Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated (x3)
• Total new homes should be less than the minimum 450 proposed. Not a proper village centre, medical centre at capacity, local road network unsuitable, slow public transport.

207. Residents from outside of Keyworth highlighted the need to follow the recommendations of the Neighbourhood Plan (500) or risk changing Keyworth’s village feel. Tollerton’s residents highlighted additional congestion on A606 as a constraint.

208. Others suggested that as Keyworth is a larger settlement, close to Nottingham and has excellent facilities and transport links it could accommodate 500-750 new homes, provided impacts on existing facilities are evaluated and mitigated. It was suggested Keyworth should grow the same percentage as Bingham and East Leake (30%).

209. When asked whether there was support for any of the possible allocations, the following responses were received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes – all of site</th>
<th>Yes – but only part of site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KEY1 – Land east of Willow Brook</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY2 – Land off Selby Lane and Willowbrook</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY3 – Land south of Selby Lane</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY4 – Land off Nicker Hill</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY5 – Hill Top Farm, Platt Lane (1)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY6 – Hill Top Farm, Platt Lane (2)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY7 – Shelton Farm, Platt Lane</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY8 – Land between Platt Lane and Station Road</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY9 – Land north of Debdale Lane (1)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY10 – Land south of Debdale Lane (1)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY11 – Land south of Debdale Lane (2)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY12 – Land north of Debdale Lane (2)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY13 – Hillside Farm</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY14 – Land south of Bunny Lane</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other location</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
210. KEY13 and KEY10 are the only sites where support for the allocation of the whole site was greater than opposition. However when ‘yes - all of site’ and ‘yes - but only part of site’ are combined KEY4, KEY8 and KEY14 equal or outnumber those who opposed their allocation.

211. **Stanton on the Wolds** concerns regarding the cumulative impact of development if KEY1, KEY2 and KEY3 are allocated as the boundary between Keyworth and Stanton would be lost. KEY2 doesn’t affect anyone. KEY3 would only affect a few properties.

212. **Nottinghamshire County Council.** All of the sites lie within a MSA/MCA for underground gypsum. British Gypsum should be consulted on these allocations in terms of the history of mining in the area and any future potential. If KEY4 is allocated the LWS (5/2177) should be omitted. KEY10 & KEY11 are large ridge and furrow grassland which may have ecological value – NCC would suggest their omission unless it can be demonstrated that the site is of low ecological value.

213. **Nicker Hill residents** state that the following sites should be allocated for development – KEY 10, KEY 9, KEY12. They are better related to the highway network, have less landscape and visual impacts, and greater access to services in Keyworth.

214. **Nottingham Wildlife Trust** opposes all sites. KEY4 and KEY7 are adjacent to LWS, KEY10 and KEY11 contain ridge and furrow, KEY11 has a hedgerow on the northern boundary and KEY5 supports linear area of woodland adjacent to the BGS which should be retained for biodiversity and landscape reasons.

215. **Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group** state that: KEY1 has a stretch of ancient hedge running down Willow Brook which should be adequately buffered and protected; KEY4 and KEY 7 are adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site and should therefore be protected from development; KEY10 is an area of historical ridge and furrow and areas of woodland which should be conserved; KEY5 is a steep, narrow site above the brook and by a small area of wood and should not be developed; and KEY14 should ensure that the hedge around the Keyworth Wildflower Meadow is buffered. Other possible sites do not appear to have significant wildlife related implications and we therefore express no opinion on their possible allocation.

216. **Trent Valley IDB** state that KEY9, KEY10, KEY11. KEY12, KEY13 and KEY14 lie outside the Board’s district but within the catchment. The Board’s
consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the sites being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.

217. General comments from Keyworth residents state that:
   - Traffic assessment report produced for the Keyworth NP identified future development located to the east would have around half the impact on the village compared to development to the west. Important for the LP to identify if this has been referred to in deciding appropriate sites.
   - Keyworth NP should be processed as soon as possible.
   - Development of sites along Bunny Lane would have greatest impact visually on the village and could lead to sprawl. Instead, north east of the village should be developed where it can be contained by the railway line.
   - Keyworth NP should be disregarded as it is not a legitimate submission.
   - Smaller sites closer to the village centre should be developed.

218. A petition signed by 16 residents against the allocation of KEY9, KEY10, KEY11 and KEY12, and in support of sites west of Keyworth (on Bunny Lane) was submitted.

KEY1 – Land east of Willow Brook

219. **Stanton on the Wolds Parish Council** state that KEY1 is prone to flooding, is constrained by congestion at school times and the site would not make a significant contribution to meeting housing needs.

220. **Cliffe Investments Limited** (promoting KEY1) state that the allocation of land east of Willow Brook for residential development is supported. The site extends to some 1.46 hectares. At standard densities there is scope to accommodate some 40 dwellings on the site. A review has been undertaken using the Council's template, which scores the site as 9 (low).

221. The following positive comments on KEY1 were received from residents:
   - The site is relatively small scale;
   - It is well related to existing residential area; and
   - It would have less impact on traffic congestion.

KEY2 – Land off Selby Lane and Willowbrook

222. The following comments on KEY2 were received from residents:
   - It would merge Keyworth with Stanton on the Wolds;
   - The site is relatively small scale;
   - It is well related to existing residential area; and
It would have less impact on traffic congestion.

KEY3 - Land south of Selby Lane

223. David Wilson Homes (promoting KEY3) state that KEY3 is in a sustainable location – KEY2 is also in DWH control and it is intended to offer this for community use. No justifiable reason for inclusion of other sites instead of KEY3. Smaller sites such as this not reliant on significant infrastructure delivery. Less impact on Green Belt. Quicker build out than larger sites.

224. The following comments on KEY3 were received from residents:
- It would merge Stanton on the Wolds with Keyworth;
- The site is close to village centre;
- Less traffic flow along Selby Lane than Station Road;
- Is visually less intrusive;
- Is relatively small scale;
- It is well related to existing residential area; and
- Has less impact on traffic congestion.

KEY4 – Land off Nicker Hill

225. CEG (promoting KEY4) state that KEY4 is capable of accommodating 400 homes, but CEG also supportive of draft NP proposals for 200-25, and revised Submission Draft NP for 150. Initial investigations have been carried out by transport consultants. One main site access point can accommodate traffic for up to 450 dwellings. Secondary emergency access has also been identified to east of the site. CEG has carried out other technical work for a scheme of 200-250 dwellings that can be made available. Site has Parish Council support and is a preferable settlement for development. Low-medium Green Belt importance.

226. Nicker Hill residents believe KEY4 should be safeguarded if alternative sites cannot deliver the required number of dwellings. They state that KEY4 should remain Green Belt. It is poorly related to Keyworth, has poor sustainability credentials, merges with Stanton and is sprawl, no defensible boundaries, detrimental to the landscape, is a LWS, access point may compromise expansion of employment area, and NP has not been examined or been subject to referendum.

227. The following comments on KEY4 were received from residents:
- The site is too large;
- It should deliver a maximum 150 dwellings
- The site is significantly larger than NP submission, and
• It would greatly add to traffic congestion on Nicker Hill and Station Road.

KEY5 – Hill Top Farm, Platt Lane (1)

228. **Hogg** (promoters of KEY5 and KEY6) believes Hill Top Farm is suitable for development and is promoted through neighbourhood plan. Suitable for 80-130 dwellings for retirement. Distance to facilities not unacceptable. Walking distance of two village centres. Detailed transport work undertaken, together with green Belt and landscape work. Would not impact as much on existing housing.

229. The following comments on KEY5 were received from residents:
   • The site is too far from the village centre and facilities;
   • It would have significant visual intrusion;
   • Platt Lane is unsuitable for additional traffic; and
   • The site has amenity value for walkers

KEY6 – Hill Top Farm, Platt Lane (2)

230. **Hogg** (promoters of KEY5 and KEY6) believes Hill Top Farm is suitable for development and is promoted through neighbourhood plan. Suitable for 80-130 dwellings for retirement. Distance to facilities not unacceptable. Walking distance of two village centres. Detailed transport work undertaken, together with green Belt and landscape work. Would not impact as much on existing housing.

231. The following comments on KEY6 were received from residents:
   • The site is too far from the village centre and facilities;
   • It would have significant visual intrusion;
   • Platt Lane is unsuitable for additional traffic; and
   • The site has amenity value for walkers.

KEY7 – Shelton Farm, Platt Lane

232. **TABU** state that KEY7 would reduce the distance with Normanton. There are no settlements west of Keyworth and it would be easier for residents to access the less congested A60.

233. The following comments on KEY7 were received from residents:
   • The site is too far from village centre and facilities;
   • It would have significant visual intrusion;
   • Platt Lane is unsuitable for additional traffic; and
• The site has amenity value for walkers.

KEY8 - Land between Platt Lane and Station Road

234. **Sport England** state that KEY8 (Platt Lane) is adjacent to a cricket pitch. Consideration should be given to an impact assessment to ensure that there are no impacts from adjacent cricket, ball strike.

235. **Miller Homes** (promoting KEY8) support development of KEY8 but for an increased number of 200-240. Site with the lowest strategic Green Belt score for Keyworth. The site is clearly in a sustainable location and is preferable in terms of its connectivity compared to other sites within Keyworth. Allocation of the site wholly compliant with paragraph 182 of the NPPF. The site is available immediately with delivery of all units anticipated within 5 years. Site is identified in the Keyworth NP.

236. The following comments on KEY8 were received from residents:

- Maximum 150
- Too far from the village centre and amenities
- Traffic congestion and increased pressure on off-site parking
- Station Road not a suitable route out of the village for increased traffic (too narrow and congested) Bunny Lane more appropriate for any additional development.
- Dangerous junction at Park Road
- Flooding at junction of Normanton Lane, Station Road, Nicker Hill.
- Would prevent expansion of Platt Lane playing fields.
- Development would be incongruous
- Bus stops inadequate
- Coalescence with Plumtree and West Bridgford beyond
- Visually intrusive
- Overbearing impact on neighbouring properties
- Impact on traffic noise level
- Loss of agricultural land
- Loss of Green Belt
- Inclusion in Neighbourhood Plan at late stage contrary to Localism Act – not properly consulted on.
- Density out of keeping with surrounding area

KEY9 – Land north of Debdale Lane (1)

237. **Bloor Homes** (promoters of KEY9 and KEY10) support the development of KEY9 and KEY10. The suitability of the sites has been recognised at various
stages of the Neighbourhood Plan. A masterplan and planning statement supports the representation.

238. The following comments on KEY9 were received from residents:
   - Debdale Lane is too narrow;
   - Reasonably close to village centre;
   - Less traffic impact on Station Road

KEY10 – Land south of Debdale Lane (1)

239. Bloor Homes (promoters of KEY9 and KEY10) support the development of KEY9 and KEY10. The suitability of the sites has been recognised at various stages of the Neighbourhood Plan. A masterplan and planning statement supports the representation.

240. The following comments on KEY10 were received from residents:
   - Maximum 150
   - The exceptional circumstances required to take this site out of the Green Belt have not been demonstrated
   - Topography of the site – highest land in the area. Therefore one of the sites with most detrimental visible impact
   - Access – impact on Bunny Lane. Dangerous
   - Would increase general congestion on the main road to Nottingham (x3).
   - There are more appropriate sites – e.g. Platt Lane
   - Sites identified in the Neighbourhood Plan should not be promoted by the Borough Council due to flaws in that particular process that are being challenged legally.
   - Reasonably close to village centre and amenities
   - Less traffic impact on Station Road – avoids the village.

KEY11 – Land south of Debdale Lane (2)

241. Aldergate Properties (promoting KEY11) states that KEY 11 (South of Debdale Lane 2) can be developed in conjunction with KEY10 as illustrated on indicative masterplan provided.

242. The following comments on KEY11 were received from residents:
   - The exceptional circumstances required to take this site out of the Green Belt have not been demonstrated.
   - Topography of the site – highest land in the area. Therefore one of the sites with most detrimental visible impact.
Would increase general congestion on the main road to Nottingham.
There are more appropriate sites – eg. Platt Lane.
Sites identified in the Neighbourhood Plan should not be promoted by the Borough Council due to flaws in that process
Reasonably close to village centre
Less traffic impact on Station Road – avoid traffic through the village.

KEY12 – Land north of Debdale Lane (2)

243. The following comments on KEY12 were received from residents:
   - Debdale Lane is too narrow;
   - Too far from facilities;
   - Increased congestion on Station Road

KEY13 – Hillside Farm

244. Barratt Homes (promoters of KEY 13) state that KEY 10, KEY 13 and KEY 14 (Part) are the best sites. These could be supplemented by KEY 3 on the south eastern edge of Keyworth. Site KEY13 is capable of accommodating approximately 90 dwellings which should be acknowledged in a revised ‘potential capacity’ calculation. Site KEY 14 has been reduced by 30 dwellings reflecting the potential increase (in numerical terms) on KEY 13. Whilst Site KEY 13 can come forward for development on its own, it could form part of a comprehensive release south of Bunny Lane and be master planned accordingly. In locational terms, Site KEY 13, is the nearest of ALL the sites indicated around Keyworth. It is suitable and available for development and represents the most sustainable of (Green Belt) development options, in economic, social and environmental terms, around the settlement.

245. Smeeton (promoting KEY13) support KEY13 which is the site closest to the centre of the village and its associated amenities. Development of KEY13 would not be intrusive and would fit in well with the local surroundings. It has good sustainable credentials and good pathways into the village. The site is not in use and its development would enhance the surroundings. It has good access to the main Bunny Lane.

246. The following comments on KEY13 were received from residents:
   - It would increase congestion on Debdale Lane.
   - Close to amenities, relates will to existing village (x3), within walking distance of key facilities.
   - It would have less impact on Green Belt
   - It would have less traffic impact on Station Road and avoids traffic through the village.
• Should be subject to strict design criteria

KEY14 – Land south of Bunny Lane

247. Davill and Cowell (landowners promoting KEY14) have requested that land between KEY13 and KEY14 (owned by Davill) should be included within KEY14. They have requested that KEY14 is safeguarded.

248. Historic England KEY14 has the potential to impact on the Conservation Area and setting of Listed Buildings while other sites have the potential to impact on unknown archaeology. It is recommended that site assessments for additional sites are. This would add to the limited historic environment information included in the SHLAA and inform SA work.

249. The following positive comments on KEY14 were received from residents:
   • Reasonably close to village centre
   • Less traffic impact on Station Road and avoids traffic through the village.
   • Should be subject to strict design criteria

Other Sites

250. Wilson (SHLAA site 363/577) objects to: KEY14 due to prominence, restricted access and distance from facilities; KEY8 which is proposed to be safeguarded; and KEY6 and 10 due to their openness. SHLAA sites 363/577 are proposed as allocations.

251. Land south of Selby Lane was suggested as it is closer to the village and more sustainable. Borough Council needs to approach landowners.

252. Some representatives of landowners promoting sites outside of Keyworth have not supported any of the possible allocations in Keyworth.

253. Residents from outside of Keyworth have supported the Neighbourhood Plan allocations. Concerns that allocations should avoid increasing congestion at the Wheatcroft roundabout were raised.
Radcliffe on Trent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes-all of the site</th>
<th>Yes-part of the site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site RAD11 – North of Holme Lane (potential capacity around 115 homes)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site RAD12 – Land to the north of Shelford Road (potential capacity around 180 homes)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other location</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

254. There was no overall consensus on the number of houses that should be built on greenfield sites in Radcliffe. The majority of comments were received from the development industry and statutory consultees. There was only a limited response from members of the public.

255. **Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council** accepted a maximum of 500 dwellings up to the year 2028, acknowledging the Borough Council’s position in relation to the current housing shortfall. The figure of 500 was accepted on the basis that appropriate infrastructure was provided and any negative impacts on facilities were addressed and mitigated.

256. The development industry were generally supportive of including a higher minimum housing figure than the 400 stated in the Core Strategy. Alternative minimum housing figures suggested ranged from 600-700 houses. It was argued that an increasing of the minimum housing figure was needed to ensure the plan’s flexibility.

257. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** objected to an increase in the 400 minimum target. **CPRE** also objected to any increase, highlighting that infrastructure assessments that were undertaken at the Core Strategy justified that minimum figure and expressed concern that existing infrastructure wouldn’t be able to accommodate any additional housing e.g. health centre.

258. **East Leake Parish Council** were supportive of increases in the minimum housing targets for the key settlements in order to spread the housing more evenly across the borough, given the disproportionate growth at East Leake.

259. **Network Rail** support development in Radcliffe, recognising it is a village served by sustainable transport alternatives. They highlight however that the railway station has limited facilities and that increased patronage may create the need for upgrades to existing infrastructure. They state these should be paid for by developer contributions. In relation to allocation of sites, they
request that all transport assessments address railway infrastructure requirements.

260. Other comments received in relation to the housing figure recognised the village as a sustainable settlement and accessible settlement with a range of facilities that could accommodate more development (compared to more rural settlements).

261. The two sites consulted on (RAD11 and RAD12) received a similar level of support. Both sites had more objection than support. 17 respondents supported development of all of RAD11 (North of Holme Lane) with a further 6 supporting development of part of the site. 14 objected. 16 respondents supported development of all of RAD12 (North of Shelford Road) with a further 5 supporting development of part of the site. 22 objected.

RAD 11 (North of Holme Lane)

262. In relation to site RAD11, comments were received from Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council, Network Rail, CPRE, Historic England, Nottinghamshire County Council and members of the development industry, including Crown Estate.

263. Developers’ comments highlighted the importance of the site in relation to Green Belt and flood risk and also raised concern over the availability of access to the site. The Crown Estate referred to paragraphs 100 and 101 of the NPPF which state that land outside of flood risk areas should be prioritised for development, and development should not be allocated if appropriate sites are available for development which have a lower probability of flooding.

264. Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council objected to the site, highlighting the issue of flood risk, conflict with the Neighbourhood Plan (which includes the site within the Plan’s ‘leisure arc’) and the availability of sequentially preferable sites.

265. Network Rail recognises the proximity of the railway line to the site and highlights the need for them to be consulted on any future application. They state the requirement for a sufficient buffer to be provided in order to ensure residents’ amenity is protected and the future operation of the railway line is not restricted. They also identify the need for a sequential test to be undertaken due to the flood risk and identify the site is located on an aquifer where groundwater is sensitive to pollution.
266. **CPRE** refer to the importance of both RAD11 and RAD12 as a local amenity for recreation due to the location of both sites adjacent to the Trent Valley Way. They also highlight that development of RAD11 would obscure currently open views.

267. **Nottinghamshire County Council** recognise that the site lies within a MSA/MCA for sand and gravel. They state that any potential allocation should highlight this and the potential for prior extraction of this mineral.

268. **Historic England** highlight that the site has potential to impact on heritage assets and that heritage assessments should be undertaken in line with their guidance.

269. Other responses received objected to the loss of the site as a leisure area.

### RAD 12 (North of Shelford Road)

270. In relation to site RAD12, comments were received from **Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council, East Bridgford Parish Council, Shelford Parish Council, Historic England** and members of the development industry, including Crown Estate (the landowner).

271. **Crown Estate** consider the site suitable for residential development. They state that the land is not within an area of flood risk and is located within a wide part of the Green Belt which benefits from a large physical and visual separation between Radcliffe and Shelford. They also highlight that the site is accessible by public transport and the road network.

272. **East Bridgford Parish Council** stated that Radcliffe’s growth should be limited to the A52 corridor, not to the north in the direction of Shelford and highlighted the importance of preserving the Trent Valley landscape and associated vistas. **Shelford Parish Council** raised concern relating to increased traffic if the site was developed.

273. **Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council** objected to the site, highlighting the visual impact it would have due to its topography and the poor relation it has to the village compared to other sites. They concluded that the site would create an unnecessary extension of the village into the Green Belt. The Parish Council identified that the site was within Shelford Parish, and raised concern that this would mean CIL receipts from the site would be allocated to Shelford Parish Council, even though the effects of the development on facilities and infrastructure would be mostly impact on Radcliffe on Trent.
274. **RNCSIG** identify the neighbouring Local Wildlife Site and highlight that this could be adversely impacted by any potential development. They state that any S106 money should be spent on mitigating this impact.

275. **Nottinghamshire County Council** identify that the site lies within proximity of a site allocated for gravel extraction (MP2r – Shelford) but does not consider that this would conflict with any future housing allocation on the site.

276. **Historic England** highlight that the site has potential to impact on heritage assets (including Gallows Hill) and that heritage assessments should be undertaken in line with their guidance.

277. **PEDALS** highlight that neither site would benefit from the extended cycle way from A52 to Bingham.

278. Other responses objected to the loss of the site as a leisure area, impact of additional traffic on Shelford Road and the visibility of the site in terms of landscape.

**Other sites**

279. Developers and landowners also submitted representations supporting development at the other sites consulted on at Issues and Options. Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council referred to their previous comments made in respect of those sites at that stage.

**Ruddington**

280. In terms of whether sites should be allocated for more than 250 dwellings, **Ruddington Parish Council** are of the view that 250 should be the maximum number on greenfield allocations. A number of comments from the general public also support this view, although one comment states that it makes sense to increase the minimum target if there are issues with delivery on other sites, and another suggests that growth should be proportionate to that experienced by East Leake and Bingham. Another comment queries whether extra development at East Leake could lead to a reduction in the target at Ruddington.

281. **East Leake Parish Council** state that with the situation that has occurred at East Leake, it would appear that giving the same level of over-allocation to the other key settlements would more than cover the 900 home shortfall. Furthermore the Parish Council state that in principle, and without any particular local knowledge of the other settlements or sites, they would
support any of the proposed sites, to spread the housing more evenly across the borough.

282. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** refer back their answer to the housing land supply question and do not support development above the minimum target of 250 dwellings. Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation group state that every effort should be made to limit land take from the countryside.

283. **Nottingham City Transport** suggests that bus services could cope with an increase in housing in excess of 250 dwellings.

284. **PEDALS** suggest sites to the north would connect better with existing cycle network, and that better connections should be obtained between strategic allocation south of Clifton, the Country Park and Ruddington.

285. **TABU** considers that Ruddington has far more facilities that Tollerton to support growth, and that the A60 is much less congested at peak time than the A606, and that provision should be proportional to its size and population.

286. There is a general consensus amongst most developers and landowners that it would be possible for Ruddington to accommodate more than the minimum of 250 dwellings, with one suggesting that up to 600 may be possible. **William Davis** states that the evidence contained within supporting studies and sustainability appraisals would suggest that the minimum target could be increased. As with all of the settlements mentioned, the groups of developers and landowners represented by **Oxalis Planning and Featherstones Planning on behalf of various clients** suggest that there should be no arbitrary cap on the number of dwellings at a particular settlement. All options should be considered having regard to the housing shortfall and the suitability of sites and settlements to accommodate development. The view of Langridge homes however is that development should be limited in order to prevent coalescence. IM land suggest that more sustainable sites are available elsewhere.

287. A number of other comments were received in relation to the number of new dwellings that Ruddington might accommodate. There were general comments relating to maintaining the green belt to prevent urban sprawl, and that Ruddington should not merge with Nottingham. A number of comments relate to poor road infrastructure particularly in the centre of the village, poor parking in the village centre, congestion, the cumulative impact of development on road infrastructure. Another comment suggests that even existing bus services do not get people out of their cars. Some comments expressed concern in relation to pressure on schools and doctors. The locations of the schools are also cited as an issue, as they are not central. A
number of comments indicate that if there was to be any development, it should be in such locations that traffic will not pass through the village centre, and reference the reasons for refusal of two planning applications off Asher Lane.

288. One comment stated that the character of the village should be protected, and that the village should not become a town. Another suggested that Ruddington could support new development given its relationship to Nottingham. Conversely there were a number of views that stated that Ruddington already had had a number of recent developments therefore further development should be limited. Another comment raised concerns about the impact coming from the construction of new homes through noise dust and traffic. Some comments expressed support for smaller properties. Comments were also received querying whether another public exhibition could have been held in Ruddington for the further options.

289. In order to build upon site specific consultation that was undertaken at Issues and Options stage, a further four additional sites that have been submitted to the Borough Council as available for development were consulted upon. When asked whether there was support for any of the additional sites, the following responses were received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>Yes-all of the site</th>
<th>Yes-part of the site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUD11-Old Loughborough Road</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD12-Land to the East side of Loughborough Road</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD13- Land Opposite Mere Way</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD14-Croft House</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other location</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

290. In terms of comments about sites, **Ruddington Parish Council** do not support expansion north of Flawforth Lane in order to protect village character and coalescence. And development to the east may struggle to link with public transport. They prefer a number of smaller sites rather than one large development, and out of the 4 addition sites they support RUD13, whilst not supporting RUD11, RUD12 or RUD14.
291. Conversely, Bradmore Parish Council does not support the development of RUD12, 13 and 14 due to impact on traffic growth and pressure on the A60. In particular, they consider that the development of RUD13 could lead to further incursions into the green belt in the future.

292. Historic England states that the sites have the potential to impact on the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings and their setting (Easthorpe House GII and GII stables and animal pen). It is recommended that site assessments for additional sites are undertaken in line with the methodology and advice set out in Historic England Advice Note 3: The Historic Environment and Site Allocations in Local Plans.

293. Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust would prefer not to see encroachment onto the Fairham Brook or to the east of the A60. However RUD11-14 are more preferable to RUD1-10 as they are near a main road and compact, not affecting sites of known wildlife importance. Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group suggest that RUD12-14 further intrusion into the wider landscape, but express no opinion on their allocation as they do not appear to have significant wildlife value.

294. Trent Valley IDB state that whilst some sites lie within and some sites lie outside of their District, consent would be required from the board for any increases in surface water discharge that would end up in the Fairham Brook.

295. Nottingham City Transport supports all of the new sites. They have also commented that out of the original sites, RUD1, RUD2 and RUD8 are the easiest to serve with improved bus services.

296. The possibility of the cluster of sites to the south east of Ruddington (RUD13, -RUD14 RUD5 and RUD6) being allocated for development either individually or in combination with each other was supported by the various site promoters in the area. In addition, support was reiterated for sites involved in the previous round of consultation, including sites RUD1, RUD3, RUD5, RUD6 RUD7, RUD8, RUD12, RUD13 and RUD14.

297. In terms of comments from members of the public, one comment states that there is no point in allocating small sites for development as they do not make a valuable contribution towards a housing target. Another comment supports spreading development around the village. Another comment states that Loughborough Road is an attractive approach to the village with trees and hedgerows. Site specific comments are as follows:
RUD1: Land to the west of Wilford Road (South).

298. **Bloor Homes** support the development of the site with options of retaining or replacing the play area and playing field elsewhere.

299. **Sport England** states that in the case of RUD1 there is a need to consider the impact of loss of playing fields, the need for replacement and the outcomes of the playing pitch strategy.

300. Comments made regarding RUD1 were as follows:
- ‘Right’ side of the village for commuting not on a main road so not suitable for traffic.

RUD2: Land to the west of Wilford Road (North).

301. Comments made regarding RUD2 were as follows:
- Right’ side of the village for commuting
- Larger than the 250 units required
- Land acts as a floodplain for Greythorn Dyke and Fairham Brook

RUD3 Land adjacent to St Peters Junior School

302. The **Loughborough Road Consortium** consider that the site is suitable and available for development.

RUD5: Land south of Flawforth Lane

303. **Linden Homes (Landmark Planning)** reiterate their support for development at Ruddington and in particular to the south of Flawforth Lane

304. Comments made regarding RUD5 were as follows:
- No access other than Loughborough Road which is heavily congested at rush hour.
- Close to facilities and would not extend the village much.

RUD6: Land at Loughborough Road

305. **Mordecai (Chave Planning)** supports the development of RUD6. Criticism is made of the landscape and visual analysis being harsh, and the site should be suitable for development in the SHLAA

306. Comments made regarding RUD6 were as follows:
- No access other than Loughborough Road which is heavily congested at rush hour.
- Close to facilities and would not extend the village much.
- Within/adjacent to Conservation Area
RUD7: Land North West of Asher Lane

307. **Space Foods Limited** consider that the site is suitable and available for development, is in a sustainable location and can accommodate around 175 dwellings.

308. Other comments made regarding RUD7 were as follows:
- Not suitable given insurmountable issues in recent reasons for refusal of planning permission
- Viable if access could be achieved.

RUD8: Land West of Pasture Lane

309. **Harker and Groombridge (Aspburys)** (promoting RUD8) do not support RUD11-13 are located beyond the defensible green belt boundary of the A60.

310. Comments made regarding RUD8 were as follows:
- Green Belt is narrow and important for wildlife (next to Fairham Brook NR).
- Merge with Nottingham
- Poor pedestrian access – pavement is too narrow over the disused railway bridge
- Clifton Road is overloaded

RUD11 - Old Loughborough Road

311. **Simpson (Featherstones Planning)** (promoting RUD11) express support for RUD11. It states the site doesn’t fit in with standard approach to expansion of villages. The site is contained by existing built development. Site being promoted for self/custom-build. In addition whilst the wider area does perform an important green belt function, the site itself does not, and could be developed but remain washed over as is the case with other built development in this area of Ruddington. This approach has been taken at Saxondale, Hall Farm, Tollerton and at certain employment allocations.

312. Comments made regarding RUD11 were as follows:
- Prominent Green Belt site and development would be urban sprawl (x4)
- Visually separates the village
- Visible over a wide area
- Outlying area of the village/isolated from rest of village
- Loss of wildlife (bats, birds, badgers and amphibians) and impact on wider wildlife corridor
- Important to the amenity of the historic bridleway
- Evidence of Medieval ridge and furrow

184
- Congestion on Landmere Lane and Old Loughborough Road
- Reduced safety on Landmere Lane and Old Loughborough Road
- Poor/dangerous access onto congested A60 from Landmere Lane
- Dangerous route to school, across the A60
- Would merge Ruddington with Edwalton
- Supports a wide variety of wildlife
- Set a precedent for further loss of Green Belt in the area.
- A52 and A60 noise
- Would not contribute to congestion in the village
- Would increase congestion on A60/A52
- Impact on the rural character of the area.
- Reduced security in the area
- Construction noise and disruption within a quiet area
- Loss in property value – which must be compensated.
- Would affect tranquillity, the setting of Ruddington Hall and lead to ribbon development
- Better located and less likely to cause congestion in the village.

**RUD12: Land to the East side of Loughborough Road.**

313. The **landowner** of RUD12 considers that the site is suitable, available and achievable for development for reasons expanded upon in their original submission.

314. Comments made regarding RUD12 were as follows:
- Adjoins listed building and would harm its setting
- Prominent
- Would enclose Ruddington by removing a ‘rural link’ close to the centre of the village.
- Adjacent to conservation area
- Close to the centre of the village
- Would not force more traffic through the village
- Loss of wildlife
- Contributes to congestion on Flawforth Lane and Wheatcroft Roundabout.
- Children could attend new school at Edwalton
- Significant hedgerows and trees – noted in townscape appraisal

**RUD13: Land opposite Mere Way**

315. **William Davis** consider that the site is suitable and available for development.

316. Comments made regarding RUD13 were as follows:
• Could link with RUD5, RUD6 and Country Park Roundabout. Providing an alternative access onto Flawforth Lane.
• Proximity to public transport
• Proximity to centre of the village
• Well concealed/non-intrusive
• Intrudes into open countryside unchecked.
• Would not contribute to congestion in the village
• Children could attend new school at Edwalton
• Adjacent to conservation area
• Bounded by significant hedge
• Adjacent to Balmore House (local interest building) and RUD6 a positive open space.

Loughborough Road is already congested with traffic queuing to Bradmore and even Bunny.

**RUD14: Croft House**

317. **Mordecai (Chave Planning)** supports the development of RUD 14. They state that suitable access is available and important trees can be retained as part of the scheme.

318. Comments made regarding RUD14 were as follows:

• Would destroy country house and no road access.
• Proximity to public transport.
• Proximity to centre of the village
• Well concealed/non-intrusive
• Would not contribute to congestion in the village
• Children could attend new school at Edwalton
• Within conservation area
• Local interest building
• Significant trees and hedgerows.
• Precious green spaces should be preserved for people’s wellbeing and for wildlife.

**Other sites**

319. One member of the public supports the redevelopment of Orchard house for a number of dwellings.
320. **Andrew Grainger on behalf of the landowner** have put forward an additional site off North Road Ruddington, in the gap between Clifton and Ruddington as potentially suitable and available for residential development.

**Other villages**

**Aslockton and Whatton**

321. In terms of support for the Borough Council’s view that no further greenfield allocations should be made at Aslockton and Whatton, the following responses were received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support for Borough Council’s position for no further allocations for greenfield development as Aslockton and Whatton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

322. **Aslockton Parish Council** state that it has already undergone considerable expansion for a small village with so few facilities - and limited public transport. Expansion will already increase car-borne travel and the additional 75 houses and the village should only further accommodate very small individual developments such as conversions, annexes etc.

323. **East Leake Parish Council** supports proportionate growth as the settlement lies outside the green belt. It sites that the railway link to Nottingham contributes towards its sustainability.

324. **East Bridgford Parish Council** agree with the Borough Councils view that no further allocations should be made.

325. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** support the Borough Councils position, and sensitive features to development such as the River Smite and a large concentration of grasslands that have biodiversity value and rare in Rushcliffe. Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group state that every effort should be made to limit land take from the wider countryside, and don’t understand why existing sites cannot be encouraged to get a move on.

326. **CPRE** do not offer a view one way or another, however they comment that the landscape impact would be less here than at Cotgrave.
327. Some comments from the development industry primarily with sites around key settlements or the Principal Urban Area do not support development at other villages and question their sustainability.

328. **Davidsons Developments** support Land North of Abbey Lane, Aslockton as the site was turned down due to potentially compromising the spatial strategy, rather than the suitability of the site.

329. **Fox (NLP)** disagree with the Borough Councils position and that the position has changed that limits the Inspectors conclusions (North of Abbey Lane appeal) regarding Aslocktons sustainability, and promote SHLAA site 694.

330. **Breedon (Oxalis)** support further development at Aslockton as it has a range of facilities, public transport, and support a site at Cliffhill Lane.

331. **IBA planning** support development at Aslockton as it lies beyond the green Belt and is a sustainable location, and all non Green Belt options should be explored first.

332. As with other villages, **Featherstones planning** state that there should be no cap on development within villages and decisions should be based on overall housing requirements, suitability of sites and facilities within villages.

333. **Whipling FP** support greenfield development at Whatton and have put forward a site at Orston Lane, for reasons amplified in the submission, The site is well related to the village, is small scale and could be designed to protect existing residential amenity.

334. Comments received from the general public support the Borough Councils view. The existing permission at Abbey Lane will expand the settlement by 25% already and provides for enough development for Aslockton. The recent planning appeal at North of Abbey Lane also supports the position. Other comments state that there are not the facilities to support development, and that further development will alter the character of the village. In addition there is already limited public transport provision in terms of busses and trains.

**Development in Other Villages**

335. Overall, the level of support and no support for development at other villages was as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cropwell Bishop</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bridgford</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotham</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton Bonington</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tollerton</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other settlement</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General responses relating to development in other villages**

336. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** state that there would be a greater impact on biodiversity if development is located across other villages. Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group state that every effort should be made to limit land take from the wider countryside by ensuring timely use of sites already identified.

337. **Gotham Parish Council** state that whilst local needs is broader in scope than affordable housing on rural exception sites, this should be the starting point for villages for Gotham and similar settlements.

338. **Gotham Parish Council** also state that the Borough Council should undertake further work on the causes of the underperformance in house construction and an assessment of whether allocating extra land will of itself bring completions back on track, and that further work should be undertaken in relation to capacity of main urban area, in conjunction with the other Districts of Greater Nottingham. They also state that the spatial policy of the Core Strategy should remain in place and in particular that development in Gotham should be for local needs only.

339. Furthermore, **Gotham Parish Council** state that work on the Gotham Neighbourhood Plan will identify the correct number, type and location for housing to meet local needs in Gotham to meet local needs over the plan period to 2028, and that this can then feed into Local Plan Part 2 in relation to amending the Green Belt. They also state that local need is likely to be spread over the full plan period and so it would not be appropriate in any event to look to allocations in Gotham to meet a five year land supply shortfall.

340. **East Bridgford Parish Council** does not support any development at other villages, and reiterates the Community Plan survey responses. They do support rural exception developments supported by a needs survey, and support the need for small bungalows for elderly or single residents.
341. **East Leake Parish Council** state that unless there is a strategic reason to favour growing a particular village, spreading the growth as evenly as possible between the villages, with a full assessment of infrastructure impact.

342. **TABU** suggest that the strategic allocation to the north of Tollerton is enough development for the village, and that development at Gotham and Sutton Bonington has easy access to the upgraded A453, M1 and East Midlands Parkway. TABU also state that it is not clear why some SHLAA sites are now being considered for additional housing and others (e.g. in Bunny) are not. Bunny has a half hourly bus service.

343. **East Leake Parish Council** support spreading growth as wide as possible. They state that only one of the five settlements lie outside of the Green Belt so the initiative to deliver houses will be slow. They would prefer to see other settlements outside of the Green Belt included as suitable for development. Possible settlements include Kinoulton, Langar, Flintham, Willoughby and Orston amongst others.

344. The general view amongst the **development industry** in relation to the identification of sites for development at other villages was mixed and varied for all of the settlements identified, largely dependent on where land was being promoted across the Borough and in which type of settlement in the settlement hierarchy. In addition a number of other settlements have been suggested as possible locations for development.

345. **Southwell Diocese** support growth in other villages, in particularly on their landholdings at Gotham, Cropwell Bishop and East Bridgford. Terra Strategic also support growth in Cropwell Bishop given the facilities available.

346. **Newton Nottingham LLP** support additional development on land already removed from the Green Belt at its site at former RAF Newton.

347. **Tuttey (Pegasus Planning)** state that Stanton on the Wolds provides the opportunity for some limited growth to help address identified shortfalls in housing supply. It is close to Keyworth which offers a good range of services and facilities, and clusters of villages could provide for growth. Two areas of land at Stanton on the Wolds are being promoted.

348. **Wilson** supports the development of SHLAA sites 363 and 577 of Stanton on the Wolds.

349. **Mourtzi (John Church)** supports development at Bunny given the housing supply position, and reiterates representations made to the issues and options consultation in relation to their site.
350. Mr and Mrs Collington (Oxalis) state that Costock is a sustainable location for development, and their site is one that should be allocated. In addition the site is connected by a footpath along Leake Road to East Leake, which has a number of facilities. William Davis also support development at Costock on similar grounds.

351. Featherstones planning state that there should be no cap on development within villages and decisions should be based on overall housing requirements, suitability of sites and facilities within villages.

352. John A Wells supports the redevelopment of Lodge Farm, Wysall for residential development.

353. One site promoter queried why some facilities within East Bridgford were not in the additional settlements background paper.

354. One public response is of the view that the villages listed do not have the facilities to support growth. Another suggests that infill on brownfield sites would be acceptable but not Green Belt. Some comments state that allocating sites at other villages would be contrary to the policy contained within the Core Strategy. Another view is that all villages should have their fair share of housing development to reduce pressures on key settlements. Another common view in particular from Gotham residents is similar to the Parish Council view, insofar that local needs should be based on the results of individual housing needs surveys for villages. Another comment supports development at villages along main roads. Another common comment is that there needs to be more in relation to infrastructure capacity before decisions are made. Conversely one comment suggests that there is capacity in existing infrastructure to support new housing in Gotham, and that Gotham has not had any growth in recent years.

355. Several comments from the public support some growth at Cropwell Bishop as it has a range of basic facilities. Conversely some comments did not support development at Cropwell Bishop as it does not have the infrastructure and facilities to support growth.

356. East of Gamston Group state that there here is scope to extend the East Gamston strategic allocation to help address identified shortfalls in housing supply. This represents a more sustainable option that would have less impact on the Green Belt and would avoid the need for housing growth in Tollerton village.
357. **Taylor Wimpey** support a proportionate amount of development based upon their anticipated shortfall calculations, and that the shortfall would equate to around 231 homes for each of the five other villages contained within the consultation document.

358. Whilst not located within or adjacent to a village, **Bridge (Planning and Design Group)** have requested that the former pig farm (Willowbrook Farm) off the A52 is inset from the Green Belt to allow for redevelopment of the site for up to 20 dwellings.

359. Public comments are mixed. One comment supports development being focussed on edge of Nottingham. Another comment states that Gotham and Sutton Bonington in particular have good access to parkway, tram, A453 and M1. Other comments raise concerns in relation to pressure on services and roads.

**Cropwell Bishop**

360. In relation to the principle of identifying Cropwell Bishop as a suitable village for a limited level of growth, the majority of residents weren't in favour, but a significant number did support it. Of the leaflet responses, **40 were in favour**, **57 were opposed** and 5 were unsure.

361. There was no overall consensus on the number of new homes that could be accommodated on greenfield sites adjacent to Cropwell Bishop. The option of no growth received the most support from residents but there was also support from residents for some growth. This ranged from in the region of 10 units to 150. There was a relatively even distribution of support within this range.

362. Of those suggesting a low level of growth, the lack of appropriate infrastructure was frequently cited as the justification for limiting the number of new homes. Main concerns in relation to infrastructure were the capacity of the primary school, lack of adequate public transport (especially in regards to lack of service after 6pm), insufficient capacity at the sewage works and local traffic congestion. Other infrastructure concerns were the lack of local retail and employment opportunities, lack of off street parking, and insufficient capacity at the local doctors surgery. It was argued that the lack of accessibility was highlighted in both the Accessible Settlements Study and the Background Paper produced in support of this consultation. It was suggested that allocation of significant housing, beyond local need, was contrary to the Core Strategy policy.
363. The following other issues were raised by those objecting to any greenfield development:

- Loss of wildlife and fragmentation of GI networks;
- Loss of views;
- Loss of Green Belt;
- Loss of agricultural land;
- Loss of village character;
- Overall negative environmental impact which would reduce in a lower Sustainability Appraisal score.
- Amount of development would exceed local need;

364. Those residents supporting development argued that this was needed to help sustain village facilities. From the development industry, there was a degree of support for allocating sites in the village, although some argued more sustainable larger villages should be developed instead. Some cited the need for the overall level to be determined by infrastructure capacity.

365. **Cropwell Bishop Parish Council** suggested a maximum of 150 homes stating that this could be accommodated in the village providing the infrastructure is upgraded.

366. **Tithby and Wiverton Parish Council** suggested a maximum of 100 homes. They raised specific concern in relation to drainage capacity as this flows through their parish and any failure would impact on their residents.

367. **Sport England** highlighted the need for additional playing fields for the school to be provided if there was significant expansion in the village.

368. **Historic England** highlighted that the sites consulted on have the potential to impact on heritage assets and that heritage assessments should be undertaken in line with their guidance.

369. **CPRE** state that Cropwell Bishop is an unsustainable location as it has few facilities and poor bus services. Development would have an adverse impact on landscape and openness of countryside.

370. **Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board** identified that the Board’s consent would be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from any site being made to any watercourse.

371. **Nottinghamshire County Council** identified that all of the sites consulted on lie within a MSA/MCA for underground gypsum. They highlighted the need for
British Gypsum to be consulted in terms of the history of mining in the area and any potential future mining. The County Council would defer to the response of British Gypsum in terms of assessing any future allocations.

372. Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust objected to any allocations in the village on the basis that it was considered unsustainable.

373. Davidsons Developments support Cropwell Bishop as it is one such village that could support some housing growth without compromising the housing distribution strategy set out in the Local Plan Part 1 (Core Strategy), and has the required social infrastructure to support some development, some local businesses. It has strong road links via A46, and an hourly bus service.

374. When asked whether there was support for any of the additional sites, the following responses were received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>YES – all of site</th>
<th>YES – part of site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBI1 – Land to the south of Nottingham Road and east of Kinoulton Road</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI2 – Land north of Memorial Hall (1)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI3 – Land north of Memorial Hall (2)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI4 – Land north of Fern Road (2)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI5 – Land north of Fern Road (1)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI6 – Land north of Fern Road (3)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other location</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

375. The agent acting on behalf of the landowner (Hurst and Richards) state their support of the site area that was consulted on for 50 dwellings and also a larger site area that extends further to the south for 90 dwellings in total. Their submission includes indicative masterplans for both options.

376. Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust highlight that development would result in the loss of valuable grassland, hedges and ponds.

377. Other comments received in support of the site referred to:
   - Good access to the main road – traffic wouldn’t need to pass through village centre;
• More appropriate size of development - proportionate to size of village.

378. Other comments received in objection to the allocation of the site referred to:
• Negative impact of development on the character of the village due to the historic setting and proximity of older properties;
• Loss of public footpath;
• Loss of historic ridge and furrow;
• The lack of sewerage capacity west of the village.
• Identified capacity of the site not enough to deliver the required level of housing for the village;
• Impact of additional traffic on highways safety on Kinoulton Road/Nottingham Road,
• Unsuitability due to former gypsum mining;
• Poorer access to village centre;
• Loss of amenity value for walkers;
• Loss of picturesque approach to village and the importance of the site for rural character.

CBI2 – Land north of Memorial Hall (1)

379. The agent acting on behalf of the site developer (Davidsons Developments) state their support of the allocation of the site for around 120 dwellings. An indicative master plan and a range of supporting studies are provided as part of their submission.

380. Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust highlight the proximity of the Grantham Canal (a LWS) and consequent negative impact on local wildlife. RNCSIG also raise this issue. Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust also highlight the loss of Hoehill Pasture as a concern.

381. The Environment Agency identify that although the site lies within Flood Zone 1 (low risk of flooding), it is adjacent to a watercourse where a 10m easement must be required. They also state that development must not cause deterioration to the WFD quality of this watercourse.

382. Other comments received in support of the site referred to:
• Good access to the main road – traffic wouldn’t need to pass through village centre;
• Well screened;
• Natural extension to village;
• Appropriate size given size of settlement;
• Close to recreational facilities;
• Natural boundary formed by canal;
• Flat land;
• No flood risk.

383. Other comments received in objection to the allocation of the site referred to:

• Loss of high hedgerow that delineates the original historic field pattern;
• Lack of sewerage capacity west of the village;
• Distance from village centre which would increase likelihood of car usage;
• Development would result in disproportionate population increase of the village if taken with site CBI3;
• The importance of the area for local wildlife;
• Development would obscure views of Hoe View Wood, an important local landscape feature;
• Adverse impact on Local Wildlife Sites (Hoe Hill Pasture and Grantham Canal);
• Concern that the Council failed to recognise the importance of preserving the site for the canal and leisure activities in the area;
• Loss of Green Belt;
• Loss of footpaths and bridleways;
• Loss of amenity value of the site for walkers using the Grantham Canal;
• Poor access, especially in relation to Mercia Avenue;
• Surface water/drainage issues;
• Loss of views from Hoe Road;
• Inappropriate for development adjacent to area predominantly used for retirement bungalows and older people;
• Landscape importance due to topography of the site – leading to greater light pollution impact;
• Greater suitability of the site for leisure use, e.g more playing fields

CBI3 – Land north of Memorial Hall (2)

384. Nottinghamshire County Council state that if the site were allocated, the LWS (2/925) should be omitted.

385. Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust highlight the proximity of the Grantham Canal (a LWS) and consequent negative impact on local wildlife. RNCSIG also raise this issue. Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust also highlight the loss of Hoehill Pasture (LWS) as a concern.

386. The Environment Agency identify that although the site lies within Flood Zone 1 (low risk of flooding), it is adjacent to a watercourse where a 10m easement must be required. They also state that development must not cause deterioration to the WFD quality of this watercourse.
387. Other comments received in support of the site referred to:
   - Good access to the main road – traffic wouldn’t need to pass through village centre;

388. Other comments received in objection to the allocation of the site referred to:
   - the landscape and biodiversity value of the grassland and hedgerows,
   - the lack of sewerage capacity west of the village;
   - development would result in the village extending beyond the existing form of the settlement and encroach into countryside;
   - Development would result in disproportionate population increase of the village if taken with site CBI2;
   - The importance of the area for local wildlife;
   - Loss of Green Belt;
   - Loss of footpaths and bridleways
   - Loss of amenity value of the site for walkers using the Grantham Canal;
   - Poor access, especially in relation to Mercia Avenue;
   - Surface water/drainage issues;
   - Loss of views from Hoe Road;
   - Landscape importance due to topography of the site – leading to greater light pollution impact;
   - Greater suitability of the site for leisure use, e.g. more playing fields.

CBI4 – Land north of Fern Road (2)

389. The agent acting on behalf of the landowner (Southwell Diocese) state their support for the site, highlighting that it relates well to the settlement. They state that a masterplan and other supporting studies are currently being prepared.

390. Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust highlight that development would result in the loss of valuable grassland, hedges and ponds.

391. Other comments received in support of the site referred to:
   - More appropriate size for size of settlement;

392. Other comments received in objection to the allocation of the site referred to:
   - Proximity of village centre;
   - Identified capacity of the site not enough to deliver the required level of housing for the village;
   - Difficulties of achieving access to the site given the sharp bends and gradient on Fern Road;
Development would restrict ability for school to expand;
Visual impact for neighbouring properties – overbearing impact;
Flooding;
Negative impact of increased traffic on air quality;
Topography of site, on elevated land, would mean development would be more visible;
Large trees along site perimeter may cause drainage issues (problems with foundations);
Lack of suitable access.

**CBI5 – Land north of Fern Road (1)**

393. The agent acting on behalf of the developer (Terra Strategic) supported development, but for a smaller site area that was consulted on and for fewer houses (70 homes). They highlighted that the site benefits from good accessibility. An indicative masterplan accompanied the representation which includes a new car park and access to the school. A landscape appraisal and sustainability appraisal also accompany the representation.

394. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** considers the site to be unsustainable due to its large size and consider it would represent a major intrusion into the countryside resulting in the fragmentation of habitats at a landscape level. **RNCSIG** concur with this view.

395. Other comments received in objection to the allocation of the site referred to:

- Loss of wildlife;
- Loss of PROW;
- Difficulties of achieving access to the site given the sharp bends and gradient on Fern Road and Church Street;
- Requirements to upgrade and widen Fern Road and Nottingham Road up to A46 (current unsuitability of those roads to accommodate additional traffic);
- Additional traffic generated would have to travel through village centre;
- Western extremity of site represents last area of agricultural land in the centre of the village and should be preserved;
- Lack of off street parking areas in the vicinity;
- Development would restrict ability for school to expand;
- Impact on village character, views and amenity value;
- Scale of development proposed disproportionate to population and size of village;
- Risk of flooding from underwater springs;
- Proximity of sewage works;
- Light pollution due to topography of site;
- Loss of high quality agricultural land;
- Scale of development would be disproportionate to size of village;
- Topography of site means that development would be highly visible.

396. There was a degree of support from the public for allocating part of the site (i.e. western half).

397. Other comments received in support of the allocation of the site referred to:

- Potential for some development closer to the village, but not of the scale suggested;
- Within walking distance of village centre;
- Site with minimal impact on village;
- Good access to primary school;

CBI6 – Land north of Fern Road (3)

398. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** considers the site to be unsustainable due to its large size and consider it would represent a major intrusion into the countryside resulting in the fragmentation of habitats at a landscape level. **RNCSIG** concur with this view.

399. Other comments received in support of the allocation of the site referred to:

- Proximity to village centre which would incentivise non-car use.

400. Other comments received in objection to the allocation of the site referred to:

- Traffic impacts on Nottingham Road;
- Dependence of site on CBI5 coming forward – therefore unlikely to be deliverable in the current plan period;
- Lack of appropriate access given the steep gradient and sharp bends on Fern Road;
- Distance from village centre;
- Loss of wildlife;
- Loss of high quality agricultural land;
- Scale of development proposed disproportionate to population and size of village;
- Additional traffic generated would have to travel through village centre;
- Lack of capacity on Nottingham Road, Fern Road and Church Street to accommodate additional traffic;
- Drainage and flooding issues.
401. In relation to other sites, the Stackyard was frequently suggested by residents as an appropriate brownfield site for housing development, ideally for starter homes or affordable housing. A few respondents also mentioned land south of Nottingham Road as being suitable for 30 dwellings.

402. Other comments received that weren’t site specific included the need for affordable properties and a range of house types, including smaller properties.

**East Bridgford**

403. In response to the question regarding the number of new homes that should be built in East Bridgford up to 2028 (Question 20) the following comments were received.

404. **East Bridgford Parish Council** does not support any development in the green belt around East Bridgford.

405. **Shelford Parish Council** has raised concerns regarding traffic impacts on the parish.

406. The **Borough Councillor for East Bridgford** states that land should only be allocated in the Green Belt where it is not possible to locate the number of homes required adjacent to the 6 key settlement and West Bridgford.

407. **East Bridgford Community Plan Group** opposes the loss of green belt land without evidence of local need as set out in the as yet unpublished housing need survey. They also highlight local opposition, identified through consultation on the community plan, to the loss of green belt for development.

408. **Aldergate Properties** (promoting EBR6 and EBR7) have suggested that East Bridgford could accommodate 80-100 homes as it is a popular and sought after place to live has a good range of facilities including a primary school, medical centre, two village shops, public house, park, public transport which would be sustained by new development.

409. **Pickford** (landowner of an additional site in East Bridgford submitted during consultation) believes there should be no cap on the level of new development. The level of development should be determined according to housing requirements and the suitability of sites that are available compared to elsewhere.

410. **Taylor Wimpey** (promoting EBR3 and EBR4) believe 231 dwellings should be delivered within East Bridgford (based on their calculation of the five year supply position and the distribution of the additional dwellings within other
villages). They have highlighted the Sustainable Location for Growth Study which states East Bridgford is of medium suitability to accommodate growth and performs better than the remaining other villages.

411. **Nottingham Wildlife Trust** believes East Bridgford is an unsustainable location for additional housing.

412. **CPRE** state that East Bridgford bus services are better than other villages, but it is uncertain how long this currently marginally viable Trent Barton service will survive. There are few facilities in the village.

413. **Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group** opposes further land take on the edge of East Bridgford. Sites already identified should be developed first.

414. Representatives of the development industry/landowners who are promoting alternative sites that are not on the edge of East Bridgford stated that the number will depend on the housing shortfall, the suitability of sites and the capacity of the settlement to grow. They also highlighted the unsustainability of locating development beyond the main urban area and key settlements, surface water drainage issues and inadequate road infrastructure. The green belt was identified as a constraint, which, given the suitability of alternatives beyond the green belt, prevented removal of land as exceptional circumstances did not exist.

415. Residents highlighted the following as constraints which could prevent further housing in East Bridgford:
   - Inadequate services and facilities (around 25 comments);
   - Inadequate road infrastructure and parking (around 20 comments);
   - Flooding and surface water drainage (around 5 comments);
   - Loss of community and village life (around 5 comments);
   - Lack of housing for local people (around 5 comments);
   - Loss of Green Belt (around 5 comments); Impact on historic assets (around 5 comments);
   - Impact on wildlife;
   - Loss of agricultural land;
   - Disruption to villages; and
   - Impact on house prices as issues

416. There was limited support for infill development on brownfield sites and small scale allocations for local need. One representation identified new infrastructure, improved affordability, support for local businesses and S106 monies as indirect benefits of further housing.
417. Regarding numbers these ranged between zero and 250. There was support for limiting the number to between 50 and 100. 5 representations highlighted the evidence in the Housing Need Survey which identified a need for 20 new dwellings.

418. When asked whether there was support for any of the additional sites, the following responses were received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes – all of site</th>
<th>Yes – but only part of site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EBR1 - Land behind Kirk Hill (east)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR2 – Land behind Kirk Hill (west)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR3 – Land north of Kneeton Road (1)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR4 – Land north of Kneeton Road (2)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR5 - Land at Lammas Lane</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR6 – Closes Side Lane (west)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR7 – Closes Side Lane (east)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR9 – Land to the south of Springdale Lane</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other location</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

419. There was greater opposition against the allocation all the sites on the edge of East Bridgford than support. There was however greater support for the allocation in full or in part for EBR6, EBR7 and EBR8.

420. Responding to individual sites, East Bridgford Parish Council does not support any site on the edge of East Bridgford. In support of their position they highlight the Community Plan questionnaire which identified local opposition to further housing in East Bridgford, especially within the Green Belt. The parish council identifies inadequate sewage and drainage, limited school places, limited recreational space, traffic and congestion, important vistas and the setting of East Bridgford as constraints on further housing. However the council continues to support local needs housing on exception sites and development of brownfield sites.
421. The **Borough Councillor for East Bridgford** expressed support for EBR8, support in part for EBR7 and EBR2, but opposed the allocation of EBR1, EBR3, EBR4, EBR5, EBR6 and EBR9.

422. **Historic England** stated that all the additional sites have the potential to impact on the significance of heritage assets and their setting and should be appropriately assessed in relation to the historic environment. This would add to the limited historic environment information included in the SHLAA and current Green Belt Review and assist the Sustainability Appraisal.

423. **East Bridgford Community Plan Group** supports EBR1, 7 and 8 in part.

424. **CPRE** object to all the sites on the edge of East Bridgford.

425. Whilst **Nottingham Wildlife Trust** does not support any sites, they consider EBR4, EBR5 and EBR7 as the most logical ‘infill’. They would result in the loss of valuable grassland habitats however.

426. **Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group** identified EBR2 as adjacent to newly created woodland which should be protected; EBR3 and EBR4 represent a major intrusion into the countryside and landscape. Other sites do not appear to have significant wildlife related implications.

427. **Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board** stipulates that all the boards consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge to any watercourses other than designated main rivers.

428. General comments from the residents focused on:
   - The inadequacy of local infrastructure, services and facilities (6+ comments) to accommodate further housing. The capacity of the school and medical centre, and lack of recreational open space were specifically identified.
   - The poor road infrastructure, which cannot cope with increased traffic through the village and which is made worse by limited off-street parking, especially on Main Street. Wider congestion issues on roads into and out of Nottingham.
   - Cumulative impacts on services and infrastructure resulting from development at former RAF Newton.
   - Flooding and surface water issues.
   - Impacts on the landscape and setting of East Bridgford
- The need to build homes for young families and downsizing – not executive homes.
- Support for small scale brownfield development on infill plots.

EBR1 - Land behind Kirk Hill (east)

429. **South Diocese** (landowner of EBR1 and EBR2) support the development of land behind Kirk Hill which combined has capacity for around 85 homes. These sites are contained by Kirk Hill Road to the west and clear field boundaries to the east and already lie within an area where there is existing residential development along Kirk Hill. The site is well located near to the centre of the village and is the most sustainably located site for access to local services and facilities. The site can accommodate a full mix of house types and tenures.

430. Other comments on EBR1 highlighted the following issues:
- EBR1 is used by Scouts and Guides and there is no alternative location (around 5 comments);
- Its development would adversely the setting of the historic core of the village (around 6 comments);
- Its development would affect the ‘green’ entry to village;
- It contains a well-used footpath;
- It would result in the loss of Green Belt;
- Congestion on Kirk Hill Road at the Junction with the A6097 was identified is an issue (around 3 comments).
- There was limited support (around 2 comments) for this site as it would be easily accessible, have a low visual impact and is almost infill.

EBR2 – Land behind Kirk Hill (west)

431. **South Diocese** (landowner of EBR1 and EBR2) support the development of land behind Kirk Hill which combined has capacity for around 85 homes. These sites are contained by Kirk Hill Road to the west and clear field boundaries to the east and already lie within an area where there is existing residential development along Kirk Hill. The site is well located near to the centre of the village and is the most sustainably located site for access to local services and facilities. The site can accommodate a full mix of house types and tenures.

432. Other comments on EBR2 highlighted the following issues:
EBR2 raised similar concerns as EBR1 (impact on historic core and setting of village (around 4 comments), impact on right of way and loss of Green Belt);
Proximity to A6097 (noise and air pollution);
Intrusion into open countryside;
Loss of grade 2 agricultural land;
Surface water flooding;
Impacts on newly created woodland;
Congestion on Kirk Hill Road (around 4 comments);
Positive comments highlighted proximity to A6097 and avoidance of traffic through village and fewer disturbances to the village.

EBR3 – Land north of Kneeton Road (1)

433. Taylor Wimpey supports the allocation of EBR3 and EBR4 (which they are promoting) as they consider the sites are not constrained by flood risk issues, highways, ecological or deliverability constraints. A heritage impact assessment concludes a less than substantial impact on neighbouring listed buildings and conservation area can be achieved through mitigation.

434. Other comments on EBR3 highlighted the following issues:

- EBR3 is adjacent to the Manor and Manor Lodge;
- Overlooks and skylines above the Trent Valley (around 3 comments);
- Is important to the setting of the village;
- Is grade 2 agricultural land;
- The development of this site would be excessive;
- Impact on a well-used right of way;
- The site is too far from the village centre
- Kneeton Road is also congested at school times and rush hour.
- It was suggested that EBR3 should be considered infill and that combined with EBR4 it could provide housing and a new school.

EBR4 – Land north of Kneeton Road (2)

435. Taylor Wimpey supports the allocation of EBR3 and EBR4 (which they are promoting) as they consider the sites are not constrained by flood risk issues, highways, ecological or deliverability constraints. A heritage impact assessment concludes a less than substantial impact on neighbouring listed buildings and conservation area can be achieved through mitigation.

436. Other comments on EBR4 highlighted the following issues:

- EBR4 raised the same concerns as EBR3 (see above).
- If developed it would ruin rural views especially from the Trent (around 5 comments).
- It is too far from the village;
- It would increase congestion on Kneeton Road
- Result in the loss of farmland.

**EBR5 – Land at Lammas Lane**

437. Comments on EBR5 highlighted the following issues:
- EBR5 is located on Lammas Lane which is too narrow (around 6 comments);
- The site juts out into the open countryside;
- It is further from the village than other sites (around 2 comments);
- Lammas Lane is also prone to surface water flooding.
- There were limited positive comments that highlighted the screening of the site and reduced landscape impacts and its distance from the historic core of the village.

**EBR6 – Closes Side Lane (west) and EBR7 – Closes Side Lane (east)**

438. **Aldergate Properties** have promoted EBR6 and EBR7 as a single site and included a masterplan. They believe that the development of the site would create a strong landscaped edge to the village and that there are no impediments to delivery.

439. Comments on EBR6 and EBR7 highlighted the following issues:
- EBR6 and EBR7 were considered infill where limited development could occur (around 3 comments);
- Narrowness of the road;
- Overlooking of neighbouring properties;
- Loss of rural views;
- Proximity to listed and local interest buildings;
- Only accessible through the village.

**EBR8 – Land to the north of Butt Lane**

440. Comments on EBR8 highlighted the following issues:
- EBR8 protrudes into the open countryside
- Is close to the A46 (noise pollution).
- Its development would result in the loss of agricultural land
- Impact the wider landscape (around 2 comments).
In support one respondent considered the site an infill plot, another highlighted the access onto the A46 (avoiding the village) as a positive.

EBR9 – Land to the south of Springdale Lane

441. Comments on EBR9 highlighted the following issues:

- EBR9 extends beyond the village into open countryside resulting in landscape impacts (around 2 comments);
- It is accessed by an unsurfaced unadopted road;
- Is the last field with ridge and furrow (around 6 comments);
- Flooding issues;
- Impacts on local wildlife;
- Positive comments identified the potential to expand further, three access points, and its underuse agriculturally.

Any other location

442. **Pickford** (landowner of an additional site in East Bridgford submitted during consultation) oppose all identified sites, but promote land south of Butt Lane as it is in closer proximity to services within the village, can be accessed from Butt Lane and unlikely to have severe traffic impacts, is enclosed by hedgerow and woodland, and could increase parking for neighbouring medical centre.

443. Representatives from the development industry who are promoting alternative sites in other villages opposed EBR2 which extends towards the A690 (which is an important buffer for the village); EBR3 which is fundamentally constrained by Green Belt, important panoramic views and listed buildings, and flooding on Kneeton Road; EBR4 which would encroach into countryside, affect the setting of Manor Farm, and surface water flooding; and EBR5 which can only be access by a private unsurfaced road.

Gotham

444. In relation to identifying Gotham as a suitable village for a limited level of growth, more responses supported rather than opposed new development at Gotham, although answers were often qualified in relation to matters such as the number and type of new dwellings, the infrastructure required to enable development to take place, and the sites that are considered suitable. A minority of responses did not know whether new residential development
should take place on greenfield sites at Gotham. In total, having regard to responses to the document together with responses to leaflets given out at the exhibition undertaken in the village, 74 responses supported development on greenfield sites around Gotham, 59 did not support development on greenfield sites around Gotham and 24 responses did not know.

445. In terms of the actual number of dwellings that Gotham could provide, there was no overall consensus on the number of homes that Gotham could accommodate. The numbers of new homes suggested were spread from 0 to 200, with the most common response being up to 50 homes.

446. In terms of general issues raised relating to new development at Gotham raised by statutory consultees, specific consultees and developers and landowners, Historic England consider that it is not clear how heritage assets (designated and non-designated) have been assessed within Gotham and all of the other settlements. They also state that some of the additional sites have a high survival of field patterns which need to be considered appropriately as part of the plan. They recommend that site assessments for additional sites are undertaken in line with the methodology and advice set out in Historic England.

447. A neighbouring Parish Council is not satisfied with how sites have been selected for consultation. They suggest that there is a possible site at the end of Hill Road, which they believe does not have wildlife value and is a brownfield site.

448. CPRE state that Gotham has a better bus service and easier access to facilities in East Leake, but development could have adverse landscape impact on Gotham Moor and hills west of Gotham.

449. Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust do not support any of the developments, consider GOT1 particularly vulnerable as it supports good quality grassland/scrub habitat and is part of a well-defined green corridor, linking to Gotham Sandbanks SSSI. They state that GOT 5 and 7 are also undesirable as they are adjacent to Local Wildlife Site and represent a major intrusion into the landscape, with the loss of valuable grasslands, scrub, in-field and hedgerow trees and a loss of a dense network of hedges. All of the above comments are reiterated by the Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group, however they also state that other sites do not appear to have significant wildlife value.

450. Nottinghamshire County Council state that GOT1 is an area of grassland and scrub which may have ecological value, and suggest its omission unless it can be demonstrated that the site is of low ecological value.
Nottinghamshire County Council as Minerals Planning Authority also state the British Gypsum should be consulted in relation to mining legacy of the area and any future potential.

451. **East Leake Parish Council** state that with the sites to the south of Gotham would close the gap between it and East Leake, and suggest that the Green Belt be extended to prevent merging. They also state that development at Sutton Bonington would impact on East Leake medical practice, and that both settlements would feed into East Leake academy, and that this impact needs consideration.

452. **Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board** state that the site options Gotham lies outside of the Boards District, the Boards consent would be required prior to increases in surface water discharge into any watercourse, other than a designated main river.

453. **Nottingham City Transport** support development in general at Gotham. They do comment that sites GOT4 and GOT5 appear to split through the existing bus depot on Gotham Road. It would be impractical for NCT to sell only part of this site, and that this should be reflected if any site in this location was to be formally allocated for housing.

454. In terms of responses from the general public, the following general issues were raised in relation to new development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inadequate infrastructure or facilities (more than 15 times)</th>
<th>No 3 storey houses (2 times)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None on greenfield sites (more than 10 times)</td>
<td>Sewerage/drainage issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build on brownfield sites (more than 10 times)</td>
<td>Delay on larger sites should not mean more sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be affordable housing for young or elderly (more than 7 times)</td>
<td>Shouldn’t build on church land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure on facilities (7 times)</td>
<td>Don’t build on green belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood risk (more than 5 times)</td>
<td>High proportion of affordable housing should be provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use brownfield sites instead (more than 5 times)</td>
<td>Sewerage an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on wildlife (more than 5 times)</td>
<td>Sites to the west and south of the village if taken together together would turn a linear village into a nucleated village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic issues (more than 5 times)</td>
<td>Loss of views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority should be for affordable houses for the young and</td>
<td>Use infill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor quality roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New build homes not selling in village</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
elderly with local connection (more than 5 times)
- Parking an issue (4 times)
- Should not build on agricultural land (more than 3 times)
- Drainage an issue (more than 3 times)
- Use empty properties (more than 2 times)
- Renegotiate with Nottingham City (more than 2 times)
- Roads are poorly maintained (2 times)
- No three storey houses (more than 2 times)
- Would lose village character (more than 2 times)
- Devalue properties
- 25% should be affordable housing for local people
- Houses of higher value would benefit the village
- No executive homes

455. In terms of support for specific sites contained within the further options consultation document. The responses received were mostly negative about most of the sites. The only site that that gained more support than those that objected was GOT1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>YES-all of the site</th>
<th>YES-part of the site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOT1-Land to the rear of former British Legion</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOT2-Land North of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (West)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOT3-Land North of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (East)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOT4-The Orchards Leake Road</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOT5-Land East of Gypsum Way</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOT6-East of Leake Road</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOT7-Land East of Hill Road</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOT8-Land South of Moor Lane</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other location</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

456. General comments received in relation to where development could be located are as follows:
- Suggestion that there is another possible site suitable for development at the end of Hill Road.
- If all eight sites identified were developed it will change the whole nature of the village.
• Not happy with houses being built on greenfield sites, however GOT1, 2, 3 and 4 are more centrally located.
• GOT1, 2 and 3 can be better incorporated into the village.

GOT1: Land to the rear of the former British Legion

457. **British Gypsum** support the removal of all of their landholdings from the Green Belt, including GOT1. Furthermore they state that GOT1 should be allocated for affordable housing.

458. Other comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
• Should be developed in conjunction with the British Legion (5 comments).
• Should be developed for first time buyers and the elderly.
• Access poor, on dangerous bend and public footpath crosses the site.
• Brick Lane narrow and not suitable access.
• Easily incorporated into village
• Ideal for limited number of homes
• Development would be hidden
• If developed access to the countryside should be preserved for dog walkers and hikers
• Brownfield site
• Good wildlife habitat and is part of a green corridor stretching up to Gotham Sandbanks SSSI

GOT2 Land North of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (West)

459. **Wheeldon Brothers** (promoting GOT2) supports the development of GOT2. They state that the site is screened from the wider countryside. Whilst the site is in the setting of the old Gotham School, there is the ability to provide mitigation through design and layout against these impacts. In addition, there is interest from a local house builder.

460. Other comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
• Only green site within the village that is protected by green belt (5 comments).
• Impact on wildlife and wildlife corridor (3 comments).
• School traffic an issue (3 comments)
• Kegworth Road not suitable to accommodate more development. Issues with parking at school time (3 comments)
• Covenant on land.
• Ridge and Furrow
• Adverse visual impact if developed
• Ridge and Furrow

GOT3: Land North of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (East)

461. Comments from residents highlighted the following issues:

• School traffic an issue (2 comments)
• Covenant on land
• Site caused flooding to surrounding properties
• Brick Lane narrow and not suitable access
• Brownfield site
• Ridge and furrow. Historic asset
• Adverse visual impact if developed

GOT4: the Orchards, Leake Road

462. The landowner of part of GOT4 (Taylor) facing Hall Drive supports its development.

463. Comments from residents highlighted the following issues:

• Hall Drive is too narrow, overused and dangerous, particularly during the school run. (over 10 comments)
• Ridge and furrow, heritage asset (5 comments)
• Turned down over 50 years ago due to narrow access (3 comments)
• Impact on wildlife (3 comments).
• Devaluation of properties along boundary of site.
• GOT4 could be bought and used as an extension to the graveyard or as a memorial park
• Not brownfield
• Site floods
• Could be accessed from Gypsum Way
• Devaluation of properties
• Good access for school
• Has limited agricultural use

GOT5: Land East of Gypsum Way/The Orchards

464. Sinclair, the landowner of the northern part of GOT5 support its development, and that there are a range of facilities in Gotham that would support growth, together with good public transport and connections to the M1.

465. The agents acting on behalf of Woolley (Field House Nursery) support in full or in part the development of GOT5, however they consider that it could be bought forward as a standalone allocation. They state that the site could be
accessed from Leake Road or Gypsum Way, is close to facilities and the main bus route. It comes out well in the landscape assessment, has no notable constraints in terms of flood risk or heritage impact and could accommodate around 45 dwellings with on-going developer interest.

466. Comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
- Adjacent to wildlife site/impact on wildlife and major intrusion into wider landscape (2 comments)
- Access not suitable (2 comments)
- Only if access is via Gypsum Way
- Ideal for limited housing
- Away from facilities
- Too big
- Site floods
- Ridge and furrow

GOT6: East of Leake Road

467. Southwell Diocese support the development of GOT6, although they state that the extent of the site should run along the field boundary to the east of the extent of land identified in the further options consultation document.

468. Comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
- GOT6 church land
- Adjacent to wildlife site and major intrusion into wider landscape
- Too big
- Would transform approach to the village
- Narrow road
- No defensible boundary

GOT7: Land east of Hill Road

469. British Gypsum support the removal of GOT7 from the Green Belt. Furthermore they state that GOT7 should be allocated for employment and/or mixed use.

470. Comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
- Site floods (2 comments)
- Floods and has electricity pylons across it
- Good access without traffic having to pass through village
- Ideal for limited housing
- Too big
- Issue with powerlines
- Only if access is from Gypsum Way

**GOT8: Land south of Moor Lane**

471. The **prospective purchaser of GOT8** supports its allocation for housing for 15-20 dwellings that could deliver by 2019, **although no response was received from the present owner.**

472. Comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
- Ideal for limited housing
- Easily incorporated into the village
- Access problems, off blind bend
- Would not have a major impact
- There is a covenant on the land to prevent development
- Would be a danger to horse-riders
- Would cause conflict with heavy farm traffic

**Other sites**

473. **British Gypsum** have put forward two additional sites for development. They consider that their existing premises should be allocated for employment use, and that a further opportunity exists at the top of Hill Road which could be allocated for residential development.

**Sutton Bonington**

474. In response to the question regarding the number of new homes that should be built in Sutton Bonington up to 2028 the following comments were received.

475. **Nottingham Wildlife Trust** considers allocating sites in Sutton Bonington as unsustainable.

476. **Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group** believes every effort should be made to limit land take from the wider countryside by ensuring timely use of sites already identified. Existing identified sites should be sympathetically, but efficiently developed.

477. **Mather Jamie Ltd** (promoting an additional site on Pasture Lane) state that Provision of between 100-150 dwellings would represent a suitable level of growth which could be accommodated without any unacceptable impacts on local services and facilities, or damaging intrusion into the countryside. As a
settlement outside the Green Belt, Sutton Bonington provides the opportunity to provide additional housing to meet shortfalls.

478. Representatives of those promoting land elsewhere in the Borough either did not support allocating housing sites in Sutton Bonington or only allocate suitable sites which available. The majority believe that development should be located within and adjoining the Principle Urban Area, and Key Settlements.

479. The majority of residents who live within Sutton Bonington do not support any new homes within the village as they believe:
   - The village is too small and Infrastructure and facilities (Schools, Doctors and Shops) are insufficient (around 30 comments);
   - Public transport is inadequate (around 10 comments)
   - There are flooding issues;
   - Development should be focussed on places with facilities and services;
   - Brownfield sites should be prioritised;
   - Development would change the character of the village; and
   - Access to the site is dangerous.

480. Residents who supported some development suggested a range between 10 and 100. These would blend into the village.

481. Some residents support the development of small parcels of land, provided they are for first time buyers.

482. Another suggested that Sutton Bonington’s population is distorted by the number of students in the village. Its growth should therefore be less than East Bridgford or Cropwell Bishop.

483. Residents of the Borough who do not live in Sutton Bonington have suggested that the village should deliver between 150 and 500 homes as it is less remote than other rural settlements (East Bridgford). Others suggest it should be small scale for local need, rather than open market housing to meet the needs of the Borough

484. When asked whether there was support for any of the additional sites, the following responses were received:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes – all of site</th>
<th>Yes – but only part of site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUT1 – Land north of Park Lane</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

485. **Sutton Bonington Parish Council** believes that more information is needed in relation to housing density on the site and more information should have been available in relation to planning gain. Concerns were raised regarding the exhibition (specifically the sticker exercises and lack of detail on infrastructure).

486. **Historic England** recommends that site assessments for additional sites are undertaken. This would add to the limited historic environment information included in the SHLAA and inform the SA.

487. **Normanton on Soar Parish Council** believe Sutton Bonington has inadequate infrastructure to support the development of 140 homes.

**SUT1 – Land north of Park Lane**

488. **Nottinghamshire County Council** state that SUT1 lies within a MSA/MCA for sand and gravel. Any allocation of these sites should flag up the existence of the sand and gravel resource and highlight the potential for prior extraction of the mineral.

489. **Nottingham City Transport** has opposed SUT1.

490. **TABU** support the allocation of SUT1 as Residents can access Nottingham via the upgraded A453 and have easy access to a tram station and to East Midland’s Parkway station. These factors make this site more suitable for development than the more easterly sites for which travel to Nottingham requires use of the congested A606 or Radcliffe Road.

491. **Paget Estate** (promoting SUT1) is supportive of development of the site but for a significantly lower number of dwellings that the 140 identified in the consultation. The landowner would promote a sensitively designed scheme within a comprehensive and sympathetic landscape setting.

492. Representatives of those promoting land elsewhere in the Borough do not support the allocation of SUT1 as there are more sustainable sites available.
The following concerns regarding SUT1 were raised by residents:

- Coalescence - would reduce the distance between Sutton Bonington and Normanton on Soar (around 10 comments)
- Poor drainage on site. Prone to flooding. (around 10 comments)
- Object to loss of view and potential overlooking on neighbouring properties.
- Impact of construction on neighbouring properties (noise) (x1).
- Loss of house value for neighbouring properties (x1)
- Proposed housing density on the site is too high.
- Development would ruin approach to the village.
- Impact of additional development on infrastructure (x2)
  - School (x3)
  - Surgery (x3)
  - Local bus service (x1)
  - Sewerage system (around 15 comments)
- Access
  - Park Lane and A6006 - already congested at peak time (around 20 comments)
  - Park Lane and A6006 – accident black spot (around 20 comments)
- Local road system inadequate to cope with increased demand. Traffic would travel through village to access A453.
- No objection to development of part of the site providing that:
  - Density is restricted to 6 dwellings per hectare
  - Only half the site is developed
  - Off road parking is included
  - Mix of house types
  - Design is in keeping with village - similar to recent Rectory development (x2)
  - Consideration is given to relocating doctors surgery to the site (x1) or extension of surgery elsewhere (x1)
  - School capacity is capable of accommodating the development
  - Traffic calming measures needed on Park Lane
  - Drainage system is modernised
  - Development provides a high proportion of affordable housing, in a variety of sizes and variations for families and downsizing
  - Trees on Park Lane should be preserved.

Other Locations

Mather Jamie Ltd (promoting an additional site on Pasture Lane) states that the additional site is suitable for allocation and development. The site could accommodate some 28 dwellings. The site is well related to the existing settlement form with existing properties to the north and east of the site, and
to existing services and facilities within the village. The Environment Agency Flood Maps show the site as falling within Flood Zone 3 with an existing flood defence running along the rear of existing properties to the east of the site. As has been the case with neighbouring land, there could be a realignment of existing flood defences around the site enabling the site to come forward for development.

495. Residents suggested the following alternative locations:
- Land in the centre of Normanton (bounded by Back Lane, Far Lane, Main Street and the railway).
- Other side of railway line, off Hungary Lane
- Landcroft Lane opposite the University. Less impact on visual aspect of village. Not at flood risk.
- Land adjacent to bowls/tennis club area at top of Marle Pit Hill, facing university.

**Tollerton**

496. In response to the question regarding the number of new homes that should be built in Tollerton up to 2028 the following comments were received.

497. In response to the question regarding the number of new homes that should be built in Tollerton up to 2028 (Question 26) the following comments were received.

498. **Tollerton Parish Council** does not support any removal of land from the Green Belt. Exceptional circumstances have not been proven. Tollerton does not have basic levels of facilities – no GP and school is at capacity. Road capacity, safety, absence of cycle ways, pavements and limited public transport issues restrict further housing. The council believe that development should be located on the A543 and A52 corridors.

499. **Normanton on the Wolds Parish Council** have concerns regarding the loss of Green Belt, the pressure on the local highways and the effect on local watercourses.

500. **Borough Councillor for Tollerton** believes that Tollerton has taken its fair share and that congestion on the A606 and A52, at Wheatcroft and Nottingham Knights, is a major constraint. The councillor considers the A453 corridor a more suitable location for additional growth. They also raise concerns regarding the cumulative impacts of hospital traffic, noise, light, and air pollution.
501. **TASCforce** oppose additional allocations in Tollerton due to: the impact of industrial and commercial vehicles regularly using narrow lanes; increased traffic negotiating a number of bends in the road including a double bend on Tollerton Lane; the level of traffic congestion within Tollerton and surrounding roads; the increased level of traffic during peak periods in particular new junctions on the A52 and A606; likely damage to the environment; noise levels from heavy traffic particularly at night; the increased risk to children who access the primary school and play group; and failure to provide footpaths, cycle paths and public transport for existing residents.

502. **TABU** state that green field land has already been allocated for a housing development of 4000 houses in the parish of Tollerton. This is already a disproportionately high number, given the size of the existing community in Tollerton. No further green field land should be allocated.

503. **CPRE** states that Tollerton has some facilities and access to the main urban area. The bus service is currently only just adequate but with good potential for increased frequency given increased demand. However, any development to the east of the village would have an adverse impact on landscape and the current openness of the countryside.

504. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** believe that no allocations are required Tollerton. Further development would be unsustainable.

505. **Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group** state that every effort should be made to limit land take from the wider countryside by ensuring timely use of sites already identified. Existing identified sites should be sympathetically, but efficiently developed.

506. **Richborough Estates** (promoting TOL1) consider Tollerton a sustainable and accessible settlement which can accommodate 150 dwellings on an appropriate site. Development of this scale will ensure affordable housing contributions and more significant S106 contributions.

507. Representatives of those promoting alternative sites outside of Tollerton suggest development should be proportionate (as set out in the Settlement Background Paper). Therefore it should be less than other settlements. Some believed no additional sites should be allocated and that development should be located adjoining Nottingham or the Key Settlements. Small scale infill and small extensions may be appropriate.

508. Whilst some residents outside Tollerton suggested that if infrastructure and facilities are improved, more housing could be delivered due to the village’s
accessible location to Nottingham. The majority of residents however opposed any additional allocations on the edge of Tollerton.

509. Concerns highlighted:
- The unfairness of placing more housing within Tollerton, in addition to the 4,000 (80+ comments)
- The existing inadequate infrastructure which cannot cope (schools, doctors, shops and sewage system) (110+ comments).
- The change to the rural character and community of the village which would become a town (90+ comments)
- Road capacity on Tollerton Lane and Melton Road, speeding, congestion and safety concerns (160+ comments).
- Cumulative impacts of additional allocations and development of the strategic allocations at Tollerton/Gamston and Edwalton (50+ comments)
- Loss of Green Belt and countryside (40+ comments)
- Development on the edge of Tollerton could merge the village with Nottingham (70+ comments)
- Increased noise, dust and air pollution (15+ comments)
- Poor public transport - services do not enter the village (30+)
- Loss of agricultural land (5+ comments)
- Impact on wildlife (25+ comments)
- Landscape and visual impacts over a wide area (10+ comments)
- Loss of valuable recreational and leisure resource.
- Increased flood risks
- Need to progress strategic sites before allocating more (20+ comments)
- New homes will be poorly designed and not meet the needs of local people.
- Should focus development on brownfield sites and empty properties

510. There were limited suggestions of specific numbers of new homes that could be delivered within Tollerton. Most respondents believed no new homes should be built, however others suggested numbers between 10 and 200.

511. When asked whether there was support for any of the additional sites, the following responses were received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes – all of site</th>
<th>Yes – but only part of site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOL1 - Land at Burnside Grove</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL2 – West of Tollerton Lane and North of Medina Drive</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
512. The responses from consultees indicate that there is considerable opposition to the potential allocations which were identified on the edge of Tollerton within the LAPP Further Issues and Options.

513. **Tollerton Parish Council** oppose TOL1 due to the loss of open countryside and impact on village character, loss of Green Belt, increases in traffic through the village, excessive scale of development and overlooking of existing residents. The council opposes TOL2 due to the loss of important Green Belt, merging of Tollerton with Nottingham, impact on the historic settlement of Tollerton, merging of old and new Tollerton, limited access to public services, absence of cycleways and safe footpaths on Tollerton Lane, absence of shops in old Tollerton, proximity to Jubilee Wood and the presence of a well-used footpath across the site. The Council oppose TOL3 due to loss of open countryside and loss of long distance views from within the village, impact on Tollerton Lane which has properties of merit, impact on a right of way, it does not have defensible boundaries, and other than a single row of houses, development would be out of character.

514. **Historic England** recommends that site assessments for additional sites are undertaken. This would add to the limited historic environment information included in the SHLAA and inform the SA.

515. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** are concerned that if TOL2 were allocated, there is a danger that the village could merge with the large Gamston allocation to the north. This would be undesirable for the character of the village and would form a barrier to the movement of wildlife across the landscape.

516. **Nottingham City Transport** prefers that the development sites given favourable consideration have close proximity to existing regular bus services. They do not support TOL1, TOL2 and TOL3.

517. **CPRE** Object to all three sites due to impact on landscape and local amenity.

518. **Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group** considers TOL2 a major intrusion into the wider landscape which risks linking up with the Greater Gamston extension isolating woodland and creating a landscape scale barrier.
519. **TABU** does not support any of the sites due to congestion on the A606, Wheatcroft Roundabout, A52 and Tollerton Lane. Parking, absence of cycling routes, Trams and Rail Options are significant problems. The primary school is over subscribed. **TOL1** is open countryside that contributes to the rural character of Tollerton and, any development would be visible over quite a distance to the north, 2013 GB review stated it should remain as Green Belt, has a weak northern boundary, poor access, would deliver an excessive number of homes given undulating topography and significantly increase traffic in the centre of the village. **TOL2** has a high GB score and 2013 review stated it should remain GB, it would reduce distance to strategic allocation, is important characteristic of Tollerton old village, visible from a significant distance, the old village has a number of heritage assets which would be affected including the remains of Tollerton Mill, provides visual gap between old and new village, could flood old village, is poorly served by public transport, has no safe cycling or pavements, has no shops or services in the old village, is close to Jubilee Wood and contains a footpath. **TOL3** is open countryside, provides extensive views of from a relatively long stretch of Tollerton Lane, does not have defensible boundaries, it would be out of character with existing building to build houses other than as a single row, part of this site is owned by a landowner who has not been consulted, part of this site is required to remain as an access to the field to the east of the site, and it contains part of a footpath giving walking access to the countryside. Whilst TABU does not support housing development on TOL3, if any such development was to go ahead, it should be a single row of affordable ecohomes in keeping with neighbouring properties.

520. **Sharphill Action Group** opposes TOL2 as it would merge Tollerton with the Tollerton/Gamston Strategic Allocation. The group suggested that a medium sized infill off Burnside Grove (TOL1) might be a reasonable compromise.

521. **Pedals** have highlighted the need to improve cycle routes between the A606 and A52, provide a safe crossing of the A52 to link Edwalton and Tollerton, and the provision of cycle ways on both sides of the A52 between Gamston and Lings Bar. Paths should also link to a new cycle crossing of the Trent.

522. General comments from residents highlighted:
- Tollerton has already been allocated 4,000 new homes. 600 would be disproportionate. There should be no more (5+ comments)
- More development would destroy the village’s rural character.
- Tollerton could not accommodate the additional traffic. Congestion on Tollerton Lane and Melton Road is a significant problem, which will be made worse following completion of the hospital, and housing developments at Edwalton and Gamston/Tollerton.
- Tollerton cannot meet the need for more school places, a GP surgery, improved public transport and other facilities
- Development would necessitate expensive new infrastructure.
- New houses on these sites would be visible from a long way away.
- It is not appropriate to remove these sites from the Green Belt which has an important role to play in preventing urban sprawls.
- Development at Tollerton should be small scale for local need.

523. Representatives of consultees promoting land outside of Tollerton believe that there are more sustainable sites available within Rushcliffe.

**TOL1 - Land at Burnside Grove**

524. Richborough Estates (promoting TOL1) support TOL1 as it relates well to existing settlement pattern, is in close proximity to services and facilities, can accommodate approximately 150 dwellings and access achieved from the existing farm access of Burnside Grove. Richborough Estates object to TOL2 due to greater Green Belt impacts and impact on village character and TOL3 as it cannot accommodate the 50 units which are suggested, lacks defensible boundary and fragmented ownership.

525. Comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
- Is the highest point in the village and provides important countryside views (15+ comments).
- It has an indefensible rear boundary.
- Poor access (30+ comments)
- Would increase traffic through the village (parking on Burnside Grove exacerbates traffic issues) (20+ comments).
- Surface water runoff into properties on Burnside Grove and onto Tollerton Lane is a concern (5+ comments).
- The 2013 Green Belt review indicated that the site remains in the Green Belt (+5 comments).
- If developed properties should be lower than existing ground levels (as required at Oak Tree Court) to prevent overlooking and loss of light (10+ comments).
- The site contains locally important birds, newts, grass snakes and bats.
- Positive comments highlighted the sites infill status, would have the least impact on the village and Green Belt, and the possibility of linking Burnside Grove with Little Lane.
TOL2 – West of Tollerton Lane and North of Medina Drive

526. **Ryland** (promoting TOL2) support TOL2 as it is in single ownership with no legal constraints, access can be achieved without increasing traffic through existing residential areas (off Little Lane or Tollerton Lane), Tollerton has a reasonable range of facilities which would be supported and sustained by new development, it is close to strategic routes into Nottingham and public transport services, the site is not constrained, and the land is not large enough to constitute a viable agricultural holding.

527. Comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
   - Scores highly against Green Belt purposes (within both the 2017 and 2013 reviews) (around 5 comments).
   - Its allocation is not consistent with the Core Strategy Inspector’s conclusion that there was no need to remove land from the Green Belt in this area.
   - Is too big.
   - TOL2 would increase surface water run-off (around 5 comments),
   - Impact on wider views and landscape
   - Affect the historic settlement (merging it with the modern area of Tollerton) (around 15 comments),
   - Has weak boundaries
   - Limited access to public transport
   - Increase congestion at school times
   - Would reduce the gap between Tollerton and the Gamston/Tollerton allocation (Nottingham’s main urban area) (around 10 comments),
   - It has poor pavements and cycle routes
   - Is productive farmland and
   - Would affect Jubilee Wood, Wildlife and public right of way.
   - Positive comments suggested TOL2 should include land to the north east between Little Lane and Tollerton Lane, it could provide a new local centre, school and that it could link Burnside Grove with Little Lane and Old and new Tollerton.

TOL3 – Land east of Tollerton Lane

528. **Ceylon Tea Growers Association** (promoting TOL3) supports the allocation of land east of Tollerton Lane for a potential capacity of up to 70 homes. Up to 70 homes is suggested as detailed site capacity work has not been undertaken to establish the net developable area. There are no significant infrastructure issues to deliver short term growth and boost the short term housing land supply.
Comments from residents highlighted the following issues:
- Provides open countryside views of the Wolds (around 5 comments) and contains a well-used public right of way.
- Loss of Green Belt - It has no defensible boundary.
- A single row of housing may be appropriate provided a service road can be provided (rather than individual driveways).
- Traffic issues and increased congestion on Tollerton Road were highlighted (particularly at school times).
- Access will be required by the farmer
- Impact on wildlife
- Positive comments highlighted its location on the edge of the village close to the exit onto the A606 and would not impact so many existing homes.
- Land floods.

Any other location

530. **East of Gamston Group** (promoting land adjacent to the existing Tollerton Gamston Strategic Allocation) believes there is scope to provide some 500 dwellings north of Tollerton on land at Homestead Farm as a logical extension to the East Gamston strategic allocation. This represents a more suitable option for Green Belt release than other alternative sites at Tollerton.

531. **Longworth Associates** (promoting an additional site on behalf of unknown client) has submitted an additional site off Cotgrave Lane, at ‘The Paddock’.

532. **Cross** (promoting an additional site adjacent to TOL2) support the allocation of TOL2 and promote land west of TOL2 (including Jubilee Wood), which could increase the number of new homes north of Tollerton beyond 400 dwellings.

533. Other sites/locations which were suggested included within the City of Nottingham, the A453 and A52 corridor and the Key Settlements.

Other Issues

534. **Natural England** reiterates to the Borough Council its duty to protect nationally and internationally designated nature conservation sites from the impacts of development.
535. **Historic England** require assessments of all options should be undertaken in line with the recently adopted methodology and guidance, ‘Historic England Advice note 3’

536. **The Environment Agency** state that a number of sites are in areas at risk of flooding and the sequential test will need to be undertaken. Furthermore they state that if the sequential test is passed, then a site specific flood risk assessment will be required in order to satisfy the exception test, to support any formal planning application. In addition the SFRA needs updating to take into account new climate change allowances. In addition, 10 metre buffers should be provided to streams that is free from development. Certain open space functions could contribute to such buffers.

537. The **Home Builders Federation** state that the Borough Council should consider proposals set out in the recently produced housing white paper. These proposals include an up to date ambitious plan for housing based on an honest assessment of housing need; A standard methodology for assessing housing needs which will form the baseline for calculating 5 Housing Land Supply and housing and housing test; working with other authorities take difficult decisions; and review of Local Plans at least once every five years.

538. **Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board** recommends that proposed development should incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems that mimic greenfield conditions where feasible.

539. **Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group** wish to see funding pooled from developments in order to provide for compensatory habitat provision to mitigate impacts of new development.

540. **Sport England** state that development should have regard to active design principles developed in conjunction with Public Health England when they are masterplanned. In addition they state that the Borough Council should take into account the results of the playing pitch strategy in relation to playing pitch development.

541. **PEDALS** strongly urge development to contribute towards the provision of new cycle infrastructure around the West Bridgford, Ruddington, Wilford and Clifton areas.

542. **East Leake Parish Council** would like the plan to give consideration to Radcliffe on Soar power station, which is likely to close during the plan period. They also consider that the trajectories for the key settlements could be less relaxed if a number of sites around them are released from the Green Belt.
They also state that greater consideration should be given to the mix of housing on sites over that outlined in policy 8 of the Core Strategy, in particular to meet the needs of the elderly which is not occurring through the developer-led approach.

543. **Orston Parish Council** raise concerns in relation developer led schemes as with the appeal that has occurred at Aslockton, and proposes that the Local Plan contains a process to ensure that such schemes are subject to effective local consultation and all alternative available sites have been considered and rejected prior to application.

544. **Tollerton Parish Council** state that there has been no recognition of community priorities, local lists and designations in the review process and requests that the Borough Council have regard to parish plans and community conservation strategies as part of this process.

545. In addition they raise concerns in relation to national policy, which encourages development to proceed at the slowest rate possible so that local authorities are having to allocate significant areas of land for housing.

546. Comments have received supporting self and custom build schemes being provided for in the plan. Some have suggested smaller homes to use less land. Others are concerned that current developments are not providing enough affordable housing. Another comment suggests a positive stance in terms of the use of gardens as residential plots.

547. Some comments suggest that the issues and option consultation should have been run again with all sites in the round.
Appendix F: Local Plan Part 2 – Further Options, summary of exhibition responses

Introduction

Planning officers from Rushcliffe Borough Council organised ‘drop in’ exhibitions within the Settlements of Cotgrave (identified in the adopted Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy as a key settlement), and within the rural villages of Cropwell Bishop, East Bridgford, Gotham, Tollerton and Sutton Bonington.

One exhibition was held in each settlement and these occurred early within the consultation period. These exhibitions were promoted through various mediums as explained within each event summary.

Purpose of Events

In accordance with the Borough Council’s adopted Statement of Community Involvement, the exhibitions provided opportunities for local residents and others with an interest in development in the Borough to discuss further options for housing development within six rural villages with the Borough Council’s planning officers and those elected members who also attended.

Exhibition Material

The inclusion of tailored exercises for each settlement where the exhibition was held ensured residents were able to express their views and comment on the local issues identified and options proposed.

Exercises

Local Plan Part 2 Housing Sites

Within Cotgrave, Cropwell Bishop, East Bridgford, Gotham and Tollerton the exercises were the same.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exercises</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Settlement Issues</td>
<td>Using post-it notes, attendees identified issues which could affect the total of number of new homes that could be built within the village. These were grouped within four categories: community facilities; transport; built and green infrastructure; and other issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Number of new homes</td>
<td>Using sticky dots, attendees were asked to indicate whether they did not support any new homes (none), a low number (50), medium number (100), or high number (150). Within Cotgrave these numbers were increased to reflect its larger size (low (150), medium (275) and high (400))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Site Strengths and</td>
<td>Using post-it notes, attendees identified the individual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As only one site has been submitted to Rushcliffe Borough Council as a possible housing allocation in Sutton Bonington a 5th exercise was included at the exhibition in that village:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exercise</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5) Alternative sites</td>
<td>Using post-it notes and pens, attendees were asked whether they believed any alternative locations existed to locate new housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To assist members of the public, response forms were created for each event, these included the specific questions on each settlement within the Further Options consultation. These could be completed at the exhibition, or at home and posted back to the Borough Council in pre-paid envelopes that were provided at each event.

Information regarding the consultation on the Draft Green Belt Review and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was also included as part of the exhibition material.

Additional Sites in Key Settlements

As the further options consultation sought views on additional sites (previously not consulted upon) on the edge of the Key Settlements of East Leake, Keyworth, Radcliffe on Trent and Ruddington, a limited display identifying these additional sites was included at the exhibition. This display focused on the nearest Key Settlement to the exhibition. For example the Tollerton exhibition included information on additional sites on the edge of Keyworth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exercise</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Site Selection</td>
<td>Using sticky dots, attendees were asked to whether they supported the allocation of each site, in full, part of the site, or not at all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exercises**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strengths and weaknesses of each potential development site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4) Site Selection | Using sticky dots, attendees were asked to whether they supported the allocation of each site, in full, part of the site, or not at all. |
Rushcliffe Green Belt Review: Assessment of Additional Sites in Key Settlements and Other Villages

The Green Belt review assesses the performance of land submitted for development against the 5 Green Belt purposes and is an important element of the evidence base.

In order to inform the selection of allocations on the edge of the other villages (non-Key Settlement) and assess the additional sites on the edge of the Key Settlements (submitted after consultation on the Green Belt Review (January 2016) in February and March 2016), a further review is required.

The assessment of land around each of the villages was displayed at each exhibition. An explanation of the scoring system was provided and attendees were asked whether they agreed with the assessment.

Community Infrastructure Levy

Consultation on the CIL focused on the financial charge which should be applied to new developments and also the types of infrastructure which should be funded by the charge.

Events Schedule

The following exhibition schedule was organised:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 March 2017</td>
<td>2pm until 8pm</td>
<td>Tollerton</td>
<td>Parish Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 March 2017</td>
<td>2pm until 8pm</td>
<td>Cropwell Bishop</td>
<td>Old School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 March 2017</td>
<td>2pm until 8pm</td>
<td>Gotham</td>
<td>Memorial Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 March 2017</td>
<td>2pm until 8pm</td>
<td>Cotgrave</td>
<td>Cotgrave Futures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 March 2017</td>
<td>2pm until 8pm</td>
<td>Sutton Bonington</td>
<td>Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 March 2017</td>
<td>2pm until 8pm</td>
<td>East Bridgford</td>
<td>Village Hall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tollerton

Location: Parish Rooms

Date and Time: 2 March 2017, 2pm until 8pm

Exhibition Exercises

The adopted Core Strategy does not identify a minimum number of new homes that should be delivered within Tollerton.

The further options consultation identifies 3 potential housing sites which could contribute to the borough’s housing supply. These sites were taken from information contained within the Borough Council’s Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and responses from developers and landowners to the Local Plan Part 2: Issues and Options Consultation.

Exercise 1: Village Issues

Task: Before determining the number of new homes that should be built in Tollerton we would like you to identify the issues (positive or negative) that will influence this number. These could include the capacity of existing community facilities, environmental constraints, or transport issues.

Post-it note responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Facilities</th>
<th>Transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• No doctor/dentist facilities in the village</td>
<td>• Parking on Burnside Grove slows busses and cars. It is a rat run.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x17 comments)</td>
<td>• Speeding on Tollerton Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of school places</td>
<td>(x4 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x23 comments)</td>
<td>• Narrow footpaths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No nursery</td>
<td>(x2 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of shops. Needs new village centre</td>
<td>• ‘Smart traffic lights’ have not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x14 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing facilities are not adequate and would be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overloaded further</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x10 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of community centre which could accommodate indoor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sports/social events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x3 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of recreation/amenity facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x3 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The north of Tollerton has no facilities at all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilities should be built before the new homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Amenities already under increasing pressure from nearby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwalton development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would require more than 100 homes to fund required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Congestion on Melton Road and Wheatcroft Roundabout at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rush hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x17 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Village roads too narrow/inadequate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x20 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impossible getting onto Tollerton Road – which is a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lane and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • ‘Smart traffic lights’ have not

231
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Inadequate</strong> (x16 comments)</th>
<th><strong>Addressed congestion on Tollerton Lane/Melton Road.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Not sufficient public transport services (x15 comments) especially within the village beyond the A606 (2x comments)</td>
<td>• Cars cannot turn right onto A606.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of parking near schools and on small roads (x12 comments). Children’s safety at risk.</td>
<td>• School bus services will need improving to serve other schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cumulative impact of development at Cotgrave, Edwalton and Gamston. Roads will not be able to cope (x9 comments)</td>
<td>• There must be joined up thinking between RBC/highways/developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Roads already congested during rush hours (x6 comments)</td>
<td>• Increased pollution from static traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No cycle paths out of Tollerton (x4 comments)</td>
<td>• Traffic will reduce opportunities to get to shops and schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access and traffic infrastructure is inadequate (x4 comments)</td>
<td>• Railway Bridge over A606 should be retained as it creates a boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access and traffic infrastructure is inadequate (x4 comments)</td>
<td>• Bus prices should be reduced. They should also be more direct to Nottingham.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Natural and Built Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Tollerton will cease to be a village. It will become a town (x25 comments)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Build within Lings Bar, not outside</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Further loss of Green Belt/green field should be prevented (x21 comments)</td>
<td>• Cumulative impacts with other developments (Gamston allocation) on the environment (x4 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Views across countryside are a characteristic of the village and should be preserved (x10 comments)</td>
<td>• Little Lane wood is home to wildlife (x2 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clear boundary-buffer between Tollerton and Gamston should be maintained (x8 comments). Integrity should be protected.</td>
<td>• Loss of wildlife (x3 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build on brownfield sites in Nottingham and other settlements (x10 comments)</td>
<td>• Boundary between Nottingham and the other villages needs to be maintained at the A52.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Loss of farmland which is need to provide food (x4 comments)</td>
<td>• High water levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased pollution from cars (x7 comments)</td>
<td>• Not sustainable location for more houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Drainage is not sufficient to cope with water run-off. Increased risk of flooding. (x4 comments)</td>
<td>• Overlooking of properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited green spaces in Tollerton. Areas around Tollerton provide recreation for children and benefit people’s health (x4 comments)</td>
<td>• Buffers between new and existing housing must be incorporated into the design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build housing for the aging population to release family housing</td>
<td>• Wildlife corridors (hedgerows and field boundaries) should be maintained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Only needed due to delays on</strong></th>
<th><strong>Integrity and safety should be</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
agreed sites. Council should enforce Core strategy (x4 comments). Why would these additional sites be quicker? Will end up with half-finished sites
- Build at Barton and Thrumpton (access onto A453)
- Little local work opportunities
- Site housing targets (exercise 3) are unrealistic.
- How would you (the planners) feel if we spoiled your environment?
- Number of new homes makes no sense in relation to size of the village. Numbers game.
- No jobs for new residents

protected.
- Houses below Burnside Grove should not block views or overlook properties.
- Tollerton needs properties to downsize into, otherwise the population will age.
- How will infrastructure be increased?
- Spread development across all villages/towns
- Sites are not integrated with the village or roads. Not part of community
- Loss of community identity
- Council should look at alternative options – space above shops and empty housing stock.

Exercise 2: Number of New Homes

Task: Having thought about the issues that influence the number of new homes, we would like you to identify the quantity of new homes that would be appropriate.

Sticky-dot responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low (50)</th>
<th>Medium (100)</th>
<th>High (150)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exercise 3: Strengths and Weaknesses

Question: We have identified some potential strengths (positives) and weaknesses (negatives) for building new housing on each of the 3 sites shown. Do you agree or disagree?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOL1</td>
<td>- None (x20 comments)</td>
<td>- Extra traffic on roads, including Burnside Grove, which are already congested (x8 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Least visual change to the village</td>
<td>- Loss of agricultural land (x6 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Most appropriate site to build some houses and keep village enclosed</td>
<td>- Poor/inadequate access onto Burnside Grove (x6 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Elevated position with extensive views (x3 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Housing will dominate the skyline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Rising land increases overlooking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>occurring (<strong>4 comments</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Access onto Tollerton Lane and A606 is inadequate (<strong>2 comments</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural boundary to the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Merging with Gamston strategic allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL2</td>
<td>• None (<strong>20 comments</strong>)</td>
<td>Tollerton Lane cannot take any further traffic (<strong>19 comments</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not unreasonable to link the old and new parts of the village (<strong>3 comments</strong>)</td>
<td>Large site and significant increase in the size of the village – impact on village character (<strong>10 comments</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Investment companies will make lots of money and be happy.</td>
<td>Loss of Green Belt of high importance (<strong>8 comments</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dangerous bend on Tollerton Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Melton Road congested at peak times (<strong>5 comments</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would destroy important views of the village and wider countryside (<strong>5 comments</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural land should not be developed (<strong>3 comments</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A606/Tollerton Lane junction is inadequate (<strong>2 comments</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Footpath on site is not mentioned (<strong>2 comments</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on wildlife (<strong>2 comments</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Merging with Gamston development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pollution levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oil pipe runs under the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changes approach to the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible location of Tollerton Mill archaeological site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL3</td>
<td>• None (<strong>12 comments</strong>)</td>
<td>Tollerton Lane cannot cope with further traffic (<strong>11 comments</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Already housing south of Tollerton Lane.</td>
<td>Footpath crosses the site (<strong>6 comments</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Least impact on village (<strong>5 comments</strong>)</td>
<td>Impact on views to Hoe Hill and wider countryside (<strong>6 comments</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dangerous junction near school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(x4 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cumulative traffic impacts with Gamston development (x4 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of Green Belt (x3 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Poor/dangerous access onto Tollerton Lane (x3 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact on wildlife (Roe Deer) (x2 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Density of 50-80 homes is too dense – will be two deep.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sensitive landscape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dangerous crossing Tollerton Lane for school children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of agricultural land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unacceptable extension to the village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Only stretch of Tollerton Lane which has an open character</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Would destroy the historic edge of Tollerton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Farmer will require access to the fields</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A606 is already congested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sold down the river by the ‘planner’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Build on brownfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contrary to policies in the Community Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inadequate infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exercise 4: Housing Site Selection**

Question: Do support housing development at...

**Sticky-dot responses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes – all of site</th>
<th>Yes – part of site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOL1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An additional comment was submitted that no further housing should be put forward without a cohesive plan to address improvements to the road network, schools and doctor’s surgery.
Additional Sites in Keyworth

As the nearest Key Settlement where additional sites are being consulted upon within the Further Options document, the following exercise was included for residents of Keyworth and other interested individuals.

Question: *Do you support housing development at…*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes – all of site</th>
<th>Yes – part of site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KEY1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An additional comment considered Keyworth ‘over-built’ and suggested that if homes must be built they should be for older people to enable them to downsize. A higher average age is not good for long-term public mental health. Mixed ages work best.

Green Belt

Comments were invited to be made on the draft Green Belt assessment of sites adjacent to Tollerton. The following table provides a summary of the comments received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments received in relation to draft Green Belt review of sites around Tollerton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• All Green Belt is sacrosanct and should be protected – whatever the grade/importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What is the point of Green Belt if we build on it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use all brownfield site first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build on the airport first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Misleading changing labels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Removal of green belt will result in more housing and infrastructure is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TOL1 and TOL2 should not be built on because of high Green Belt importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If the proposed Gamston development goes ahead Tollerton will not be a separate village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Loss of TOL1 and TOL2 will mean very little separation between West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments received in relation to draft Green Belt review of sites around Tollerton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not good enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tollerton will become a district of Greater Nottingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Legislate against/restrict premises left empty for extended periods. Fill the houses we have. 250,000 empty properties in East Midlands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agree that TOL1 is of high greenbelt importance as it preserves the old village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development will double the number of homes – haven’t you done enough damage!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promised there would be no new housing at the bottom of Tollerton Lane. Why have you lied?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Why not create a new village to meet housing need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use land of the A46 since there has already been much investment there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TOL1 and TOL2 should be treated together. They should have the same score. If you retain only TOL1 and build on TOL2, buffer protecting Tollerton as a village would be eroded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgford/Gamston.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TOL1 – location classed rural will disappear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Visual impact on TOL3 is huge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TOL4 – unsuitable as the land sits very high and development would be overbearing and oversee adjoining housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TOL3 is graded too low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TOL3 – offers views of the Wolds and Hoe Hill. Keeps Tollerton rural.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TOL3 – 5 bungalows were not built to downgrade Green Belt status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Roads cannot cope, Tollerton Lane is a rat run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would destroy the village feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Downsizing properties should be built to free up larger houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• De-valuing properties which paid premium for Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Loss of footpath access to Gamston by building on TOL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Why is TOL1 different to TOL2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How many times can the Green Belt be reviewed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Green Belt cannot be replaced once built on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TOL 3 provides amenity value – access to the countryside.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cropwell Bishop**

**Location:** Old School

**Date and Time:** 6 March 2017, 2pm until 8pm

**Exhibition Exercises**

The adopted Core Strategy does not identify a minimum number of new homes that should be delivered within Cropwell Bishop.

The further options consultation identifies 6 potential housing sites which could contribute to the borough’s housing supply. These sites were taken from information
contained within the Borough Councils Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and responses from developers and landowners to the Local Plan Part 2: Issues and Options Consultation.

**Exercise 1: Village Issues**

Task: *Before determining the number of new homes that should be built in Cropwell Bishop we would like you to identify the issues (positive or negative) that will influence this number. These could include the capacity of existing community facilities, environmental constraints, or transport issues.*

Post-it note responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Moderate expansion would be welcomed. Recent development at Hoe View road has helped sustain village and facilities have coped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Primary school is at capacity <em>(x44)</em>. May restrict opportunities for children from outlying villages to attend if priority given to the new children from any proposed development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Secondary school capacity an issue at Toot Hill and South Notts <em>(x3)</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No local secondary school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Health centre already at capacity. Would need to be expanded and capacity increased <em>(x29)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broadband</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Broadband needs to be improved <em>(x4)</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sewage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Loss of village character <em>(x14)</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Road improvements would be needed to improve traffic flow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilities in general insufficient to support new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Insufficient car parking for the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Retail options insufficient <em>(x7)</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Post office should re-open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Village only has limited retail opportunities (pubs, co-op, butcher) – other retail needs to be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Public transport is inadequate in terms of number of buses and frequency <em>(x26)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Congestion in the village and surrounding roads <em>(x29)</em> e.g. Nottingham Road and Kinoulton Road, Church Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Currently inadequate car parking <em>(x8)</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Too many bends on main roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Congestion/parking would worsen on Fern Road and Nottingham Road. <em>(x2)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hoe View Road already used by motorists avoiding Nottingham Road. <em>(x2)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Speeding an issue along Hoe View Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General road safety issues – unsafe for cyclists and children and elderly <em>(x3)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Main T-junction by the church has visibility issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cumulative impact of additional housing development in Cropwell Bishop with Cotgrave Colliery – access onto A52 already an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Properties on Fern Road already have poor site lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Traffic congestion into Nottingham and QMC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Safety – no road crossings at busy places e.g. co-op, Nottingham Road public house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider a one way system on Hoe View Road, Church Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Traffic flow – currently very congested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- On street parking makes access difficult (x4). Narrow roads (x2).
- Access to the school would be worsened if CBI2 or CBI3 are built on.
- Mercia Avenue is too narrow to have traffic flowing through.
- Parking outside school already an issue (x5).
- Pedestrian crossings often broken and repairs
- Increase in traffic pollution (x2).

Around co-op, dairy. A larger store relocated to a larger site could improve this.
- Narrow pavements (x2)
- HGV traffic (x2)
- Village used as a short cut for Bingham residents commuting to Nottingham.
- CBI2 and CBI3 – access an issue. Shouldn’t use cul-de-sac as access.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural and Built Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wildlife</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Local wildlife will be adversely affected (x3) – e.g. newts and badgers (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CBI1-CBI3 would damage permanent pasture of wildlife (historic value).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to countryside</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bridleways and footpaths should not be altered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Importance of bridleways (x3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact of construction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Noise and dust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewers, drainage and flooding</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sewers and drains are not adequate enough, on Nottingham Road, on Hoe View Road, flash flooding on Church Street (x13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Nottingham Road drains collapsing due to HGV traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Slope of land behind CBI1 and 2 would cause drainage issues (x2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Object to loss of greenfields (x4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Green Belt land should not be developed for housing (x3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Amenity value of surrounding countryside – walking. (x5) E.g. CB15 – walking path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Object to loss of countryside landscape (x2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Object to loss of hedges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More green space needed in the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wildlife and habitats (badgers, Hoe Hill Wood, birds of prey) has already been adversely affected by the dualling of the Fosse (A46).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Visual impact of new houses behind the school would be lesser as the land is lower.
- Pollution will increase due to additional traffic
- Importance of the historic context of the properties around the Lime Kiln in respect of the design of the village.
- Drainage
- Additional footpaths needed to improve accessibility.
- Canal is a historic site.
- Higher ecological value of the fields adjacent to the canal.
- Food security - agricultural land needed to grow crops.
- Significant flooding already an issue
- Trees/hedges help absorb water – reducing flooding issues.
- Important amenity value of canal for walkers.
- Hoe View Wood important habitat for birds.
- Choose sites that have lower wildlife value.
- Tranquillity of village would be lost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Should build new villages and towns instead of additional homes in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Substation at capacity – power cuts (x2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Infrastructure in general couldn’t cope.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
existing villages.
- Adverse impact on safety of village living on vulnerable and disabled.
- More resources and investment needed into public services
- New housing should be built in larger villages, not smaller (x2). Eg Bingham
- Housing development should be spread out amongst all villages.
- Not a sustainable location – should develop more at the Colliery instead.
- Larger population would require greater police presence (x2).
- House prices will fall for existing properties (x5).
- New housing should be distributed more evenly among surrounding villages
- Increased noise (x2)
- Overintensive for a small village.
- Should prioritise brownfield sites in cities – more environmentally sustainable (x2)
- Envelope of village should not change.
- Lower quality of life due to less access to countryside.

Exercise 2: Number of New Homes

Task: Having thought about the issues that influence the number of new homes, we would like you to identify the quantity of new homes that would be appropriate.

Sticky-dot responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Low (50)</th>
<th>Medium (100)</th>
<th>High (150)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exercise 3: Strengths and Weaknesses

Question: We have identified some potential strengths (positives) and weaknesses (negatives) for building new housing on each of the 6 sites shown. Do you agree or disagree?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBI1</td>
<td>• Appropriate infill site (x5)</td>
<td>• Creates additional traffic along already congested Nottingham Road (to amenities) – road safety (x11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good vehicle access off Kinoulton Road and pedestrian access to Nottingham Road</td>
<td>• Impact of new development on historic character of cottages along Nottingham Road (x6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Smaller scale developments would fit into village more appropriately</td>
<td>• Junction of Nottingham and Kinoulton Road is already busy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No flood risk</td>
<td>• Roads and pavements on Nottingham Road are already in disrepair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No access issues.</td>
<td>• Amenity value of the site for walking (x3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lowest impact on village (x2).</td>
<td>• Parking issues- flow of traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Not close to village centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Old pasture – rich biodiversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Site is too small for significant development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Former use of the land as a quarry would make land difficult to redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Kinoulton Road couldn’t cope with more traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Congestion along Kinoulton Road (x2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Attractive views across the site (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Poor access (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Adjacent to ridge and furrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Wildlife - hares, tawny owls, barn owls (x3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Too close to park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Would lead to village sprawl (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Keeps traffic out of village centre (x4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Canal would form a natural boundary and could have canalside housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Development would be contained within boundaries – other sites could sprawl (x3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Least worst option</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Could improve access to play park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good access from existing roads (x2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CBI2 and CBI3 may assist in the restriction of the Grantham Canal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Greater proximity to recreational facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lower visible impact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bridleway can be protected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Well drained site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public transport more accessible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enlarges boundary of existing estate – good site for expansion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides access to paths, canal and wood (x2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bridleway prone to flooding (x2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of bridleway (x9) – these are protected by law. Other bridleways closed recently with newly built A46.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nottingham Road already congested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Safety of children using park if this site is developed for housing (x3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wildlife on site – newts and badgers (x4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Methane test needed – used as a dumping site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concern over access from Mercia Avenue – too close to children’s playground, number of elderly residents (x2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of open views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unsuitable for 135 homes to be accessed through an existing cul-de-sac</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Destroy the tranquillity of the canal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact on adjacent bungalows on Mercia Avenue (x3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• School is at the opposite end of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• May assist in the restoration of Grantham Canal.</td>
<td>• village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Poor drainage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Flooding – difficulties of obtaining house insurance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Too close to playing fields and bridleway (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Should be retained as possible sports fields for Memorial Hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Archaeological importance of the fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Roundabout needed for all four directions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI3</td>
<td>• May assist in the restoration of Grantham Canal.</td>
<td>• Road safety – children accessing park (x2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Extends boundary of existing estate</td>
<td>• Visual impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Proximity of A46 – less through traffic.</td>
<td>• Underground spring – flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Wildlife (x4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Canal habitats (x4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Local Wildlife Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Badgers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Amenity value for local groups and walkers (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of footpath and bridleway and access to countryside(x5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Not easy to integrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Views (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Proximity of neighbouring school – safety concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Too far away from school – will disincentivise walking and lead to more traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Drainage (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Access would be needed from CBI2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Road safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase in traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase in crime levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Greater impact on natural environment – Hoe Hill Woods (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Access from Mercer Close inadequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Noise levels will increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lower house price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI4</td>
<td>- Access would need to be considered as top of Fern Road is quite steep.</td>
<td>- Road safety – dangerous bends (x7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Close to the school so less additional traffic</td>
<td>- Poor access (x6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Small site – infill. Contained boundary.</td>
<td>- Increase of traffic through village centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Footpath needs to be protected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Bus stop not ‘opposite’ site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Too close to school (x3) would overlook classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Infrequent bus service (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Ecological importance of woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Fields soaks up run off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Visible due to steep land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI5</td>
<td>- Lowest impact out of all the sites in terms of landscape impact.</td>
<td>- Insufficient service provision (x5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Could improve road access arrangements to the school.</td>
<td>- On-street parking (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Proximity to school.</td>
<td>- Proximity of school and village centre not a strength as already congestion here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Road safety (x3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Traffic congestion (x14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Access (x5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Open views to landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Flash flooding (Church Street) (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Lack of drainage, impact on neighbouring residential areas (x5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Site too large (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Loss of footpaths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Loss of agricultural land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Loss of greenfield (x4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Proximity of sewage farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Scale would adversely affect dynamic of village (x6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Retain boundary hedgerows and incorporate buffers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Query logistics of Church Street requiring a roundabout (x3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- No defensible boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Proximity of school- safeguarding issue (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI6</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Traffic congestion (x3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Road safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Loss of footpaths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Impact on village community feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Extends village too far (x2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exercise 4: Housing Site Selection

Question: Do support housing development at...

Sticky-dot responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes – all of site</th>
<th>Yes – part of site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBI1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Sites in Radcliffe-on-Trent

As the nearest Key Settlement where additional sites are being consulted upon within the Further Options document, the following exercise was included for residents of Radcliffe-on-Trent and other interested individuals.

Question: Do you support housing development at…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes – all of site</th>
<th>Yes – part of site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAD11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cotgrave

Location: Cotgrave Futures

Date and Time: 14 March 2017, 2pm until 8pm

Exhibition Exercises

The adopted Core Strategy does not identify a minimum number of new homes that should be delivered beyond approximately 470 homes on the former Cotgrave Colliery.
The further options consultation identifies 12 potential housing sites which could contribute to the Borough’s housing supply. These sites were taken from information contained within the Borough Councils Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and responses from developers and landowners to the Local Plan Part 2: Issues and Options Consultation.

**Exercise 1: Village Issues**

Task: *Before determining the number of new homes that should be built in Cotgrave we would like you to identify the issues (positive or negative) that will influence this number. These could include the capacity of existing community facilities, environmental constraints, or transport issues.*

**Post-it note responses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Facilities</th>
<th>Transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor health care facilities – doctors, dentist, maternity is already too busy (x23 comments)</td>
<td>Aldi or Lidl should be built on Colston Gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New medical centre will be too small if new homes are built (x3 comments)</td>
<td>Sewage system is at capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of school places for primary school and long distance to secondary school – will new schools be built (x22 comments)</td>
<td>Cotgrave should remain a village – thus poor infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery will be stretched (x2 comments)</td>
<td>Library often busy for the current population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough leisure, play facilities or access to green space</td>
<td>Not enough quality/variety of shops - only two small supermarkets (x9 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough police (x2 comments)</td>
<td>No banks (x2 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More facilities required</td>
<td>Shopping centre should have been done in phases. No national chain - RBC backtracking on the deal (x3 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No new facilities provided as part of the 2014 development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor narrow roads which cannot cope (x15 comments)</td>
<td>Cotgrave is used as a cut through (x4 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion (x4 comments)</td>
<td>Reduce speed limit on Stragglethorpe Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in roads exiting Cotgrave to Nottingham is needed – nightmare at rush hour (A52) (x6 comments)</td>
<td>Traffic controls at junction of Cotgrave Lane at Shepherds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build a by-pass – Link Melton Road with A46 and/or link A52 to A46 via Stragglethorpe Road.</td>
<td>Potholes (x3 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner of Hollygate Lane and Colston Gate very dangerous (x2 comments)</td>
<td>Pollution (x2 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvements to pavements and cycle ways – should be part of new developments (x2 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lorries turning of Plumtree Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Natural and Built Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor parking in precinct and around post office/Sainsbury’s (x6 comments)</td>
<td>Expansion onto Daleside Estate would cause more problems with traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No rail links – link to Radcliffe</td>
<td>Too far to walk from sites to amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate/infrequent public transport (x13 comments). Would need improving to serve new residents.</td>
<td>Parked cars and speeding – dangerous (x4 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Tram</td>
<td>Off-street parking needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No electric charging points</td>
<td>Impact on Tollerton Lane – new hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion onto Daleside Estate would cause more problems with traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on wildlife / reduction in habitats (x5 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joining Cotgrave with Tollerton/West Bridgford. Will become a suburb of Nottingham (x2 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of village feel/character. Dormitory town (x2 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why expand the poorest South Notts village.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Belt should be protected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased light pollution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain Cotgrave country park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood risk at Mensing Fields</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owthorpe Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate drains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No sewage capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprawl south of Plumtree Road encroaches onto countryside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Hollygate Park to the rest of Cotgrave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotgrave is big enough already</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to protect green spaces, village feel, ecosystems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More pollution (x2 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More potholes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding (x5 comments):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprawl south of Plumtree Road encroaches onto countryside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Hollygate Park to the rest of Cotgrave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotgrave is big enough already</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to protect green spaces, village feel, ecosystems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More pollution (x2 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More potholes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only two supermarkets with inadequate parking (x2 comments)</td>
<td>Rural nature / countryside character of the village (x2 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate infrastructure, facilities, services (x5 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses are only for rich people not affordable for residents (x2 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why not Radcliffe, Keyworth, Bingham? (x2 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken promise that Cotgrave would not be targeted for more development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social housing required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor public transport (x2 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural nature / countryside character of the village (x2 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green wedges extend into the village, proving accessible countryside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a ‘Gig’ economy – who is providing mortgages?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming measures required near the school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happened to the complete redevelopment of the precinct?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New housing has not brought new facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of food producing land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No more houses – enough is enough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotgrave too big already</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exercise 2: Number of New Homes

Task: Having thought about the issues that influence the number of new homes, we would like you to identify the quantity of new homes that would be appropriate.

Sticky-dot responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Low (150)</th>
<th>Medium (275)</th>
<th>High (400)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those that believed there should be no further homes highlighted the lack of infrastructure, services and facilities, increased congestion and loss of green belt as justification.

Respondents who supported a low number identified the need for these to be affordable for younger people, for bungalows and for them to be accompanied by improvements to infrastructure.

Those that supported a medium number highlighted the opportunity to link the former colliery development with the existing village, the need to improve infrastructure, service and facilities, and provide affordable homes.

The sole supporter of a high number referred to the shortage of homes and need for affordable housing.

Exercise 3: Strengths and Weaknesses

Question: We have identified some potential strengths (positives) and weaknesses (negatives) for building new housing on each of the 12 sites shown. Do you agree or disagree?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COT1</td>
<td>• Would link parts of the town together</td>
<td>• Only remaining empty space around these houses – part develop only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sensible in-fill – not extending the village</td>
<td>• Next to Country Park, wildlife corridor (x4 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fills hole between existing areas</td>
<td>• Loss of views – impact on neighbouring houses (x3 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Traffic congested on Bingham Road, Hollygate Lane and Colston Gate (x2 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Dangerous junction at Colston Gate and Hollygate Lane (x2 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact on Hollygate Lane – poor access (x2 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      |           | • Minimal parking  
|      |           | • How will the site be accessed? Existing roads are too narrow (x2 comments)  
|      |           | • Infrastructure cannot cope now  
|      |           | • Loss of food producing agricultural land  
|      |           | • Possible Saxon/Bronze age site  
|      |           | • Not low Green Belt importance  
|      |           | • Restrict development to the open field not the footpath to the woods/country park from Mill Lane  
| COT2 | • Fewest current houses impacted by building work | • Far out from the village – outside boundary of the village (x2 comments)  
|      |           | • Stretches town too far north.  
|      |           | • Would impact on already difficult junction in the centre of the village  
|      |           | • Too near to country park – would become a town park  
|      |           | • Impact on wildlife  
|      |           | • Agricultural land (x3 comments)  
|      |           | • Loss of Green Belt  
| COT3 | • Not many houses impacted | • Fracking and flood risk issues – not suitable  
|      |           | • Road cannot take traffic – increased traffic  
|      |           | • Village is too big already (x2 comments)  
|      |           | • Possible Saxon / Medieval village  
|      |           | • Poor access onto busy road (x2 comments)  
|      |           | • Well used public footpath  
|      |           | • Next to solar farm  
| COT4 | | • Established hedgerow and wildlife sanctuary  
|      |           | • Close to sewage works (x2 comments)  
|      |           | • Extends into open countryside towards Nottingham/Tollerton/Gamston reducing important area of Green Belt (x4 comments)  
|      |           | • Woodgate Lane would need to be adopted by highways  
|      |           | • Flooding  

248
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fracking issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skylarks nest in the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site of Medieval Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased traffic congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of agricultural land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT5</td>
<td>• Seems a reasonable site</td>
<td>Increased traffic congestion (x2 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fields regularly flood (x3 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor access into Mensing Avenue and Daleside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Access and Traffic = Nightmare (x2 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plumtree Road will need widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of agricultural land (x2 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of residential views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Save the hedgerow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT6</td>
<td>• Area used by local drug addicts</td>
<td>Adjacent to woodland – one of few dense habitats in the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dangerous road – increased traffic down Owthorpe Rad/Scrimshaw Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Difficult junction at bottom of Owthorpe Road – would need change in road layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on schools on Owthorpe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plumtree road would need widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased congestion through the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Absolutely bonkers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Derelict 18&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Century building would be refurbished/retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flooding (x2 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on many houses – removal of residential views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Too far / Isolated from the centre (like former colliery) (x2 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Save the hedgehogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor transport links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Encroachment into the green belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT8</td>
<td>• Would link existing new houses with the original</td>
<td>Too far from the village – no transport services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>village</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Expands the village boundaries too far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Flood risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What will happen to the dyke behind Firdale that stops flooding?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This should not be built on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Subsidence – no insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Poor infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT9</td>
<td>• Close to new development at the Colliery</td>
<td>• Poor infrastructure and facilities (x2 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Makes sense – provided Colston Gate/Hollygate Lane junction is fixed</td>
<td>• Save the hedgehogs and sparrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Could provide connecting road from Hollygate Roundabout up to Colston</td>
<td>• Poor transport links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gate at Ring Lees.</td>
<td>• Already in midst of large building programme in Cotgrave – facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>over subscribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Houses need to be built on floating foundations in the event of a flood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Public footpath passes through COT9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT10</td>
<td>• Seems sensible to fill in the village boundaries, rather than make it</td>
<td>• Too small to provide adequate public open space for proposed 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bigger (x2 comments)</td>
<td>units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will link the existing new houses with the original village</td>
<td>• Access on either road is an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Most sensible site</td>
<td>• Poor infrastructure already</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Do not agree with low landscape and visual impacts – site sits above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>surrounding built form and would adversely impact neighbours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hedgerows should be protected for wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Affordable homes and bungalows should be built.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Any building will affect in a detrimental way this quality of life in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cotgrave which has had more than its fair share.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT11</td>
<td>• Brings Hollygate development more into the town – more connected</td>
<td>• Walk down Hollygate Lane towards the canal will lose its green and open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>aspect. Building should be restricted to COT9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• All homes on Hollygate Lane are too expensive. Attracting people from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>out of Cotgrave. First time buyers cannot afford (x2 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Land is right out of the village and borders the canal which is a natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|        |                                                                           | habitat already disturbed by the development on the pit site. Need to retain some of our beautiful places in the village  
• Too far from the village centre  
• Dead people as neighbours – no thank you.  
• Flooding, fracking and subsidence risks  
• Keep the Green Belt  
• Another field will be filled later |
| COT12  |                                                                           | • Too much extra traffic on the roads (x4 comments)  
• Plumtree Road would not be able to cope with this.  
• Disagree that access to Plumtree Lane is acceptable (x4 comments)  
• Loss of wildlife (x3 comments)  
• Save the bees  
• Save the harvest time  
• Clay ground - fields flood (x5 comments)  
• Needs a bus stop  
• Get infrastructure sorted first – no new homes (x2 comments)  
• Loss of agricultural land (x5 comments)  
• Poor public transport services  
• Access to facilities severely limited (x3 comments).  
• Expansion too far into current farmland/green belt (x2 comments)  
• Area of natural beauty – used for recreational walking (x2 comments)  
• Preserve the green belt (x2 comments)  
• Area used as ‘crash cover’ for Tollerton Airport (x2 comments)  
• Access onto Daleside would be dangerous – small residential road  
• Homes better built on the east and north side  
• Loss of amenity for residents  
• Homes next to the woods would be dark and unhealthy  
• Loss of hedgerow  
• Needs new secondary school with
Exercise 4: Housing Site Selection

Question: Do support housing development at...

Sticky-dot responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes – all of site</th>
<th>Yes – part of site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COT1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green Belt

Comments were invited to be made on the draft Green Belt assessment of sites adjacent to Cotgrave. The following table provides a summary of the comments received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments received in relation to draft Green Belt review of sites around Cotgrave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Green Belt is sacrosanct and must be protected (x5 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Merging with Nottingham (x4 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Merging with neighbouring towns/villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Destruction of rural aspect of Nottingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need suitable services and facilities (x5 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build a new town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expand existing towns with existing facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessment says “nowhere”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build on brownfield first (x9 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Retain village community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need farmland to produce food (x2 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Green Belt/space is essential for mental health, play and wildlife (x3 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• RBC is failing residents – don’t sweep streets unless requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Traffic management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lowest grade land should be built first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Town is sprawling south and east</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sutton Bonington

Location: Village Hall

Date and Time: 16 March 2017, 2pm until 8pm

Exhibition Exercises

The adopted Core Strategy does not identify a minimum number of new homes that should be delivered within Sutton Bonington.

The further options consultation identifies 1 potential housing site which could contribute to the Borough’s housing supply. This site was identified from information contained within the Borough Councils Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and responses from developers and landowners to the Local Plan Part 2: Issues and Options Consultation.

Exercise 1: Village Issues

Task: Before determining the number of new homes that should be built in Sutton Bonington we would like you to identify the issues (positive or negative) that will influence this number. These could include the capacity of existing community facilities, environmental constraints, or transport issues.

Post-it note responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Existing school at capacity (x41) extension of school buildings required, lack of funding available to expand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of capacity at surgery - New doctor’s surgery required (x33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local shops needed (x12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General lack of services and facilities to support any new development (x11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Insufficient capacity at secondary school in East Leake – cumulative impact of developments in East Leake, Gotham and Sutton Bonington. (x5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Broadband (x3) not available in all parts of the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is capacity at village school – numbers are falling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New playing field as part of any potential development (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community centre needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recent developments in East Leake haven’t led to improvements in infrastructure e.g. health centre, roads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transport
- Public transport is inadequate (x33) (especially Nottingham service which stops in Long Eaton) (x9)), and non-existent after 6pm/7pm and on Sundays (x12) and length of journey 90+ mins (x8)
- Road safety (x3) Dangerous road junction to A6006 (x14), traffic calming needed
- Traffic congestion/increased traffic through village (x12) Rempstone Road, A6006 (x8)
- Lack of off street parking (x11) eg Orchard Close (x2)
- School traffic and lack of parking near school (x8)
- Poor maintenance of roads, too narrow (x7)
- Speeding traffic (x7)
- Poor access to site (x4)
- Increased traffic due to increasing number of online deliveries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural and Built Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing inadequacy of sewers (e.g. at capacity/age of system) (x31), cost of upgrading this £1 mill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased risk of flooding on existing houses (x18). Low lying area that holds water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor drainage on SUT1 (x8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of high quality agricultural land (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritise brownfield land (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of retaining trees along Park Lane (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of greenfield land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat segregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Green Belt between Sutton Bonington and Normanton.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable smaller properties needed, not large properties. (x13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of character of village (x9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disproportionate increase in number of properties if this site is developed (x8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of keeping with character of the village (x3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No buy to let (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for police (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent new development of larger houses changing the village character (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development needs to integrate with the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More information on type of new housing needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of employment opportunities (other than university)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of social housing on crime rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable bungalows for the elderly needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalescence with Normanton on Soar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of development on amenity of neighbouring properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritise development in other villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for a public meeting to discuss detail of proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern area of village towards university more suitable for development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exercise 2: Number of New Homes

Task: Having thought about the issues that influence the number of new homes, we would like you to identify the quantity of new homes that would be appropriate.

Sticky-dot responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low (50)</th>
<th>Medium (100)</th>
<th>High (150)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exercise 3: Strengths and Weaknesses

Question: We have identified some potential strengths (positives) and weaknesses (negatives) for building new housing on the site shown. Do you agree or disagree?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUT1</td>
<td>• None (x2)</td>
<td>• Flooding (x30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will provide opportunity housing for young families who want to stay in the village, if properties are affordable</td>
<td>o already an identified issue of run off onto this field (x2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve the design of the immediate area</td>
<td>o Drainage ditch runs along Charnwood Field. (x3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Most appropriate area in the village</td>
<td>o Drains poorly – standing water at lower edge. (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Small well designed development will provide visual interest from roadside.</td>
<td>o Impact of increased run off on existing properties. (x3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved viability for local shops, post office etc</td>
<td>• Access (x30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Commuting traffic from the site would not need to travel through village</td>
<td>o In general (x4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sewers can be upgraded</td>
<td>o Safety concerns of increased access on Park Lane/A6006 (x27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Congestion at this junction (x15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Visual impact of development at entrance to village, currently a soft tree lined approach to village (x8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Need to extend and adhere to 30 mph speed limit (x8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Site is too far from facilities in the village centre (x3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of greenfield site (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact on the character of the village with new development (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Coalescence with Normanton (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• This area of the village has weak broadband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Danger of neighbouring railway line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential requirement of a roundabout would increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Exercise 4: Housing Site Selection**

**Question:** *Do support housing development at...*

**Sticky-dot responses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes – all of site</th>
<th>Yes – part of site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUT1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**East Bridgford**

**Location:** Village Hall

**Date and Time:** 17 March 2017, 5pm until 8pm

**Exhibition Exercises**

The adopted Core Strategy does not identify a minimum number of new homes that should be delivered within East Bridgford.

The further options consultation identifies 9 potential housing sites which could contribute to the Borough’s housing supply. These sites were taken from information contained within the Borough Councils Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and responses from developers and landowners to the Local Plan Part 2: Issues and Options Consultation.

**Exercise 1: Village Issues**

**Task:** *Before determining the number of new homes that should be built in East Bridgford we would like you to identify the issues (positive or negative) that will influence this number. These could include the capacity of existing community facilities, environmental constraints, or transport issues.*

**Post-it note responses:**

---

**Site** | **Strengths** | **Weaknesses**
---|---|---

likelihood of field opposite also being developed
- Proximity of A6006 increases likelihood of burglaries.
- Overlooking of neighbouring properties due to gradient of site
- Loss of view for adjacent properties
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Facilities</th>
<th>Transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• School is at capacity – no room for more pupils and cannot expand (x39 comments)</td>
<td>• Newton’s School may provide places for new pupils (x2 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Medical Centre is at capacity (x11 comments)</td>
<td>• No facilities for more houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilities are sufficient at present but will struggle to cope with more development (x5 comments)</td>
<td>• Consider ‘one-way’ system through East Bridgford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilities and services should be in place before new houses are built (x3 comments)</td>
<td>• Limited shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Newton’s School may provide places for new pupils (x2 comments)</td>
<td>• Past expansion has kept the facilities we have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No facilities for more houses</td>
<td>• Two pubs (again) would be good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider ‘one-way’ system through East Bridgford.</td>
<td>• Need affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilities are sufficient at present but will struggle to cope with more development (x5 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilities and services should be in place before new houses are built (x3 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Newton’s School may provide places for new pupils (x2 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No facilities for more houses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider ‘one-way’ system through East Bridgford.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited shops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Past expansion has kept the facilities we have</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Two pubs (again) would be good.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need affordable housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Newton’s School may provide places for new pupils (x2 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No facilities for more houses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider ‘one-way’ system through East Bridgford.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited shops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Past expansion has kept the facilities we have</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Two pubs (again) would be good.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need affordable housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural and Built Environment</th>
<th>Transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• East Bridgford should remain a village and not become a town (x20 comments)</td>
<td>• Lammas Lane and Cherryholt Lane are single rack roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It should retain the sense of a village community (x6 comments)</td>
<td>• Trent Lane/A6097 junction is unsafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No more executive homes – 2/3 bed affordable homes (x6 comments)</td>
<td>• Kirk Hill/A6097 junction is dreadful at rush hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Any development would detract from the existing natural/countryside environment (x6 comments)</td>
<td>• Roads to Nottingham already overloaded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Character of the village is established through the open natural environment within which it is set. Should not build within it (x4 comments)</td>
<td>• Road capacity of A6097 is an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is already overdeveloped (x3 comments)</td>
<td>• Need communal car park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Natural environment is needed for the benefit of good health and well-being (x2 comments)</td>
<td>• No parking at Lowden or Bingham if travelling by train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Loss of grassland habitats, important for wildlife (x2 comments)</td>
<td>• Additional traffic on Shelford Road will endanger cyclists commuting to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop brownfield sites first</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Setting of conservation area to the North West and south west should be protected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Village requires bungalows for villagers to downsize.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conservation of trees and hedgerows must have serious consideration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Area east is the only appropriate location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Exercise 2: Number of New Homes**

Task: *Having thought about the issues that influence the number of new homes, we would like you to identify the quantity of new homes that would be appropriate.*

Sticky-dot responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Low (50)</th>
<th>Medium (100)</th>
<th>High (150)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three additional comments suggested between 0-50 homes, but no more. Another questioned whether the homes would be executive homes of affordable homes.

**Exercise 3: Strengths and Weaknesses**

Question: *We have identified some potential strengths (positives) and weaknesses (negatives) for building new housing on each of the 9 sites shown. Do you agree or disagree?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EBR1</td>
<td>• Reasonable/best options <em>(x5)</em></td>
<td>• Scout’s field should be left for the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site Strengths

**Comments**: Other sites have agricultural/habitat constraints.
- Small site
- Close to the centre of the village
- Close to main road. Avoids congestion within the village

### Weaknesses

- Village (4 comments)
  - Road access is not good/dangerous (3 comments).
  - A6097 is too close and very busy (2 comments).
  - Kirk Hill too narrow and busy
  - Village loses its identity if it is too close to the A6097.
  - Will adversely affect the setting of the conservation area, church and windmill.
  - Insufficient infrastructure services
  - Loss of rural identity. Heritage will be lost.
  - Village character will change
  - Small estate would not fit in with the existing village
  - Not sufficient room for 15 homes

### EBR2

- Half of the site, nearest Rectory, may be suitable. Otherwise congestion on Kirk Hill would be very busy.
- Ideal area for development of 50 homes.
- Opportunity to improve access to the village, including by foot.
- Weaknesses are not insurmountable

### Weaknesses

- Ribbon development
  - Too close to the A6097 (2 comments). Pollution.
  - Village appraisal found that a majority wish to keep this area free from development.
  - Village loses its identity if it is too close to the A6097
  - Poor/dangerous access onto Kirk Hill, especially with the traffic lights (5 comments)
  - Traffic impacts (4 comments)
  - Too many (70), too large (3 comments)
  - Visually attractive site (2 comments)
  - Best rural approach to the village (2 comments)
  - Loss of agricultural land
  - Not integrated with the village.
  - Noise from A6097
  - Close to historic core of the village. Development would adversely affect setting (2 comments). Keep old and new separate.
  - Hedgerows need preserving.

### EBR3

- Traffic impacts on Kneeton Road
- Weaknesses outweigh benefits
- Scale of development is too big
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(x12 comments).</td>
<td>• East Bridgford would no longer be a village <em>(x2 comments)</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Outside ‘shape’ of the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Attractive site <em>(x4 comments)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ruin rural setting of the village <em>(x3 comments)</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Important buffer between the Trent Valley and village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of Green Belt/countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Wide landscape and visual impacts across the River Trent <em>(x6 comments)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Spoil skyline <em>(x2 comments)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Popular public footpath crosses the site <em>(x2 comments)</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Roads could not cope with the numbers proposed <em>(x13 comments)</em> especially Kneeton Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Congestion at school times <em>(x3 comments)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Speeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Would require major infrastructure investment <em>(x5 comments)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Too far from public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Too far from centre of the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Flooding/drainage issues on Kneeton Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Impacts on wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR4</td>
<td>• Weaknesses are not insurmountable</td>
<td>• Would cease to be a village <em>(x3 comments)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Would require major infrastructure investment <em>(x4 comments)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Scale of development is too big <em>(x11 comments)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Too large an extension of the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Roads could not cope with the numbers proposed, especially Kneeton Road <em>(x17 comments)</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Speeding issues on Kneeton Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Business park has already impacted adversely on traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Dangerous for walkers, cyclists and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>horse riders (x2 comments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Narrow pavement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trent Lane crossroads already busy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of countryside which is popular for walking and provides enjoyment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and relaxation for residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Too far from centre of the village (x4 comments), including the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Too far from public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wide landscape and visual impacts across the Trent Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural aspect/setting of the village would be lost (x2 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urbanisation of ridge towards Kneeton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flooding/drainage issues on Kneeton Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of agricultural land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East Bridgford would no longer be a village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Important buffer between the Trent Valley and village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urbanisation of ridge towards Kneeton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flooding/drainage issues on Kneeton Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of agricultural land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East Bridgford would no longer be a village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Important buffer between the Trent Valley and village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detrimental to the peaceful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR5</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Poor access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site is screened and unobtrusive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weaknesses are not insurmountable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lammas Lane is narrow and has a blind bend (x12 comments). Would require</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>expensive upgrade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety of walkers, cyclists and horse riders (x6 comments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40 homes is too many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on hedgerow and verge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local roads are not adequate for level of traffic (x6 comments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic will go through the village to access the A46 (x3 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Insufficient infrastructure and services (x3 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field used by villagers for walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development would extend beyond Lammas Lane, a recognisable village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>boundary (x4 comments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detrimental to the peaceful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|        |                                                                           | character of the village *(x4 comments)*  
|        |                                                                           | • Loss of valued and enjoyed part of the village  
|        |                                                                           | • Site of Old Bridgford Hall is in a conservation area of high importance and value *(x2 comments)*  
|        |                                                                           | • Should not build in a Conservation Area.  
|        |                                                                           | • Impact on wildlife  |
| EBR6   | • Infill plot that doesn’t extend into rural surroundings  
|        | • More sensible sized plot  
|        | • Could provide co-ownership (shared ownership) housing  
|        | • Decent roads  
|        | • Hidden away from well-walked paths  
|        | • Doesn’t encroach on existing properties  
|        | • Sensible/good proposal *(x3 comments)*  
|        | • Would not affect character/feel of the village  
|        | • Good access  
|        | • Incorporate hedgerows  
|        |                                                                           | • Increased traffic congestion *(x2 comments)*  
|        |                                                                           | • Parking on Cross Lane  
|        |                                                                           | • Cherryholt is a single lane highway  
|        |                                                                           | • Wrong side of the village – only access is through the village *(x2 comments)*  
|        |                                                                           | • No natural boundary to prevent further sprawl *(x2 comments)*  
|        |                                                                           | • Difficult access – via residential development or single lane road *(x2 comments)*  
|        |                                                                           | • Impact on residents of Fosters Close *(x2 comments)*  
|        |                                                                           | • Impact on Mulberry Court which is listed.  
|        |                                                                           | • Impact on privacy of residents on Cherryholt Lane  
|        |                                                                           | • Inadequate infrastructure  
|        |                                                                           | • Heart of conservation area  
|        |                                                                           | • Impact on setting of conservation area  
|        |                                                                           | • Destroys views of the countryside  
|        |                                                                           | • Destroys local wildlife – hedgerows  
|        |                                                                           | • Loss of countryside  
|        |                                                                           | • Loss of Green Belt  
|        |                                                                           | • Beyond village curtilage  |
| EBR7   | • Sensible/realistic proposal  
|        | • Appropriate size *(x2 comments)*  
|        | • Natural continuation of existing housing  
|        | • Only if rear of EBR6 is followed  
|        | • Low visual impact  
|        | • Extension of existing  
|        |                                                                           | • Increase in traffic through the village *(x4 comments)*  
|        |                                                                           | • Extends boundary further Fosters Close (which residents opposed)  
|        |                                                                           | • Would destroy views of countryside  
|        |                                                                           | • No boundaries to stop further expansion  
<p>|        |                                                                           | • Parking on Cross Lane is used by patients of the Doctor’s. Increased |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development</td>
<td>congestion on junction with Main Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Contribution to increased surface water run-off. Drainage not sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Don't need new homes. Last house on Fosters Close was on the market for one year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of farmland (x2 comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Inadequate infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Too much infill already</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Access through Fosters Close would be dangerous for children and the elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR8</td>
<td>• Traffic does not have to travel down Main Street to access the village (x4 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Housing should be similar in appearance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reasonable small development (x4 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Preferred/best site (x4 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Traffic calming would be a benefit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduction in speed is a positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• East of the village creates least impacts of all the sites (x2 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Homes for older people, near doctors (x2 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Possible infill site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adverse effects on the character of the village when approaching along Butt Lane (x2 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Overloading of traffic capability (x3 comments), particularly on Main Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Poor access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Speeding vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Too small to make a meaningful contribution, should be extended north to Holloway Close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ribbon development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Site is within the most undisturbed parts of the village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Encroachment towards Bingham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR9</td>
<td>• Site is tucked away</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Would help improve the lane (x3 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No flooding issues (x2 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unused area (x3 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to A46 without using Main Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Least important Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Near BT exchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Outside of village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Intrusive block of housing in the landscape (x2 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact on recreational users of the green lane (x10 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Poor access via Springdale Lane (x14 comments). The single lane is private restricted byway and not suitable for increased traffic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rural character of the track spoilt (x2 comments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good site for 30 homes (<strong>2 comments</strong>)</td>
<td>• Inadequate infrastructure (<strong>4 comments</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact on wildlife (<strong>5 comments</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of open countryside (<strong>4 comments</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Protrudes into the Green Belt (<strong>2 comments</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Encroachment towards Bingham, and Newton (<strong>2 comments</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Flooding issues on Springdale Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of Green Belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Views of open countryside spoiled (<strong>3 comments</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ridge and furrow (<strong>2 comments</strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Colony of Grass Snakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Would be ‘apart’ from the rest of the village</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exercise 4: Housing Site Selection**

**Question:** Do support housing development at...

**Sticky-dot responses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes – all of site</th>
<th>Yes – part of site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EBR1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One respondent identified land on the junction of Brunt’s Lane and Springdale Lane as an additional location for housing.

One respondent identified further land either side of Butt Lane as possibly suitable for housing.

**Additional Sites in Radcliffe-on-Trent**
As the nearest Key Settlement where additional sites are being consulted upon within the Further Options document, the following exercise was included for residents of Radcliffe-on-Trent and other interested individuals.

Question: *Do you support housing development at...*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes – all of site</th>
<th>Yes – part of site</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAD11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Green Belt**

Comments were invited to be made on the draft Green Belt assessment of sites adjacent to East Bridgford. The following table provides a summary of the comments received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments received in relation to draft Green Belt review of sites around East Bridgford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Green Belt should protect the countryside. Once built upon, a valuable resource for food production and wildlife will be lost forever.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Open views from Lammas Lane and Closeside Lane deserve a higher score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would be sad to see Green Belt removed – provides recreational walks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• East Bridgford is enhanced by its conservation area and adjacent Green Belt particularly EBR6 and EBR7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EBR9 would make a good site for housing as its Green Belt is low-medium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EBR1 and 2 – score is too high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• East Bridgford cannot support more homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• RBC has not established a sound case for using Green Belt land around East Bridgford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EBR5 is open countryside. Score of 13 is not high enough. Impact on conservation area and urban extension beyond settlement edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EBR6 and EBR7 – planning condition recommended no adjacent development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EBR6 does not reflect proximity of adjacent listed building and Mulberry Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EBR6 and 7 – lack of defensible boundary and potential for further sprawl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• De-valuing house prices – people bought homes because of the Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Scoring matrix/Assessment criteria? What a load of rubbish. It is our countryside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EBR6 – Grass Snake colony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EBR6 – score is too low.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gotham

Location: Memorial Hall

Date and Time: 9 March 2017, 2pm until 8pm

Exhibition Exercises

The adopted Core Strategy does not identify a minimum number of new homes that should be delivered within Gotham.

The further options consultation identifies 8 potential housing sites which could contribute to the borough’s housing supply. These sites were taken from information contained within the Borough Councils Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and responses from developers and landowners to the Local Plan Part 2: Issues and Options Consultation.

Exercise 1: Village Issues

Task: Before determining the number of new homes that should be built in Gotham we would like you to identify the issues (positive or negative) that will influence this number. These could include the capacity of existing community facilities, environmental constraints, or transport issues.

Post-it note responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Facilities</th>
<th>Transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Primary school at capacity Contributions required to expand</td>
<td>- Local facilities at capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- East Leake academy would need to expand. Contributions required</td>
<td>- Young couples need access to school, GP, nursery, playground. Elderly require access to GP, social support, transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Doctors cannot cope</td>
<td>- Not enough facilities in the village for larger population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Need larger surgery if more than low level of houses built</td>
<td>- A large number of houses would swamp facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More doctors would be required</td>
<td>- Need to think about parks and playspace for the additional houses and influx of young families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No shops/lack of larger convenience store</td>
<td>- Facilities must precede housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Limited quality of dental practices in area</td>
<td>- Facilities require some development to support them, but not at a level to alter the character of the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hall Drive narrow road for development x13</td>
<td>- Traffic levels already too high/increased traffic volume. Main roads too busy, cannot cross road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Busses ok but cars along Leake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Road a problem. Effectively single track road due to parking.
- Leake Road too congested leading to difficulty for busses and horse riders.
- Main roads at maximum capacity/ too much traffic passing through from East Leake
- A453 improvements hasn't lessened the amount of traffic through Gotham.
- Increased traffic on Moor Lane will be dangerous. Access from the corner will be lethal
- Any development needs parking as Leake Road is narrow with current housing.

If Spar is to support more dwellings, then casual parking outside of it will become a problem
- Kegworth Road congested when people picking up and dropping off at school
- Pinchpoints on Nottingham Road bends
- Bus service insufficient at peak times to get to and from work.
- Gypsum way needs resurfacing
- If GOT4, 5 or 7 goes ahead, make access via Gypsum Way to minimise traffic through the village.
- Access issues for GOT4, 5 and 1
- Divert through traffic around Gypsum Way
- Essential to have pedestrian and cycle access through the village to allow new residents to integrate with the village.
- Area to the rear of properties on Leake Road could provide off-street parking for existing residents who park on the road at present.

Natural and Built Environment

- Village would lose its small rural character.
- Some nominated sites unsuitable
- Would make sense to consolidate GOT1 and British Legion land in order to create an access to it.
- Noise
- Wonderful views from back of Pygall Avenue
- Effect on flood risk increased. Gotham flooded significantly in 2016.
- Enough development going on in the locality at East Leake and proposed to the north
- Need starter homes for young ones
- Houses that are not cramped would be nice.
- All houses in the village are very different. It would be a shame to lose that character.
- Housing should be in keeping with the village

- GOT6. There are hares, owls and bats frequenting the site.
- Destruction of animal habitats
- GOT4 Ridge and Furrow
- GOT7 floods a lot and GOT 4,5 and 6 also affected.
- Should use brownfield land at Hill Road
- Use brownfield sites first.
- Housing need in Gotham has already been identified
- Large scale development would change the feel of the village
- Effect on house prices that border sites
- Loss of rural views
- Effect on wildlife
- Ridge and furrow at the end of Hall Drive and elsewhere
- The village would just become a large housing estate if too many houses are built
15-30 houses  
Type of housing  
Low should be 20-30  
Housing should be starter homes/less expensive homes for the young and homes for the elderly for local need  
No three storey houses. Out of character with village

Parish Council identified a need for fewer houses that the scenarios. 21 homes  
Number of sites would double the size of the village if all build and be disproportionate  
GOT7 flood issues  
Don’t let the houses be second homes to rent out  
Thought you couldn’t build on church land  
Farmland under threat

- Strongly disagree with large amounts of Green Belt disappearing/shouldn’t use Green Belt.  
- Sewage works would be OK if storm drains are separated from sewage system.  
- Devaluation of house prices  
- Need to understand why large sites not delivering before looking at other green belt land  
- What about previous refusal s in relation to archaeological interest  
- Community spirit will suffer eg as what has happened at East Leake

- Sewage/drainage system cannot cope with existing development  
- Use brownfield before greenfield/ no brownfield land mentioned. Builders are holding back on strategic sites  
- Need to clean out ditches, storm drains, sewage drains and culverts in order to prevent further occurrences of flooding.  
- Is there a covenant on the field next to the school  
- Covenant on GOT8 therefore not deliverable  
- Speak to Parish before nominating sites  
- Missed brownfield sites in village  
- Priority should be for sheltered housing for the elderly

Exercise 2: Number of New Homes

Task: Having thought about the issues that influence the number of new homes, we would like you to identify the quantity of new homes that would be appropriate. The options put forward was a no growth scenario, a ‘low’ growth scenario (around 50 dwellings), a ‘medium’ growth scenario (around 100 dwellings) and a ‘high’ growth scenario (around 150 dwellings).

The majority of the public supported either the no or low growth scenario, with low growth being more popular. In addition, a number of people caveated their selection and supported growth scenario of between 20-30 dwellings and a small number of people supported growth of between 50-100 dwellings. A couple of people supported infill only.
**Exercise 3: Strengths and Weaknesses**

**Question:** We have identified some potential strengths (positives) and weaknesses (negatives) for building new housing on each of the 8 sites shown. Do you agree or disagree?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| GOT1 | • Site most suitable but houses should blend in and not be 3 storey.  
      • Far most appropriate site  
      • Development here could be absorbed into the village.  
      • Need to combine with British Legion site and build on both, and to enable suitable access.  
      • Logical infill/within village envelope Was brownfield so go ahead  
      • Wasted land. Do it!  
      • Matches approximate housing need for the village | • Use British Legion instead  
• Putting hard-standing in this location may cause more water to run-off  
• Ensure integrity to open lane to Gotham nature reserve and hill tracks  
• Hedgerows need to be protected  
• Existing access dangerous (on a bend) |
| GOT2 | • Good choice. Natural infill  
• Would not affect many people in the village  
• Good access and location  
• Small impact on residents and overall size of village boundaries  
• Suitable for a few houses but not a whole estate | • Asset to have a green area within the village  
• School traffic bad on Hall drive/Kegworth Road junction  
• Ridge and Furrow. Fled a heritage asset  
• Previously refused planning permission due to Ridge and Furrow.  
• More noise in a quiet setting  
• Integrity of old railway path at threat if gardens back onto it. |
| GOT3 | • As with GOT1, seems to be logical infill  
• Would complement GOT1.  
• Drains badly. New houses might help if drains are improved  
• Best site with least impact  
• Would be OK if taken with British Legion and gypsum site | • Flooding is an issue. Although ditches are now cleared still issue with waterlogging  
• Poor access from Kegworth Road  
• Need to know what is happening with adjacent British Legion site  
• Integrity of old railway path at threat if gardens back onto it.  
• Access difficult off bend  
• Ruins peoples views.  
• 20 homes would be crammed in |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOT4</th>
<th></th>
<th>GOT5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Easy safe access to school and village facilities.**  
**Secondary access to bypass.**  
**Housing on two sides**  
**Reasonable for a small number of homes. Not too dense.** | **Gardens of Pygall avenue would lose their view**  
**Hall Drive too narrow for access/not suitable for more traffic/in poor state of repair**  
**Traffic issues relating to school**  
**Landscape and visual sensitivity.**  
**Site floods**  
**Gardens on Pygall Avenue flood**  
**Site helps drainage**  
**Ridge and furrow.**  
**Effect on wildlife/bat population**  
**Disruption to elderly inhabitants on Pygall Avenue**  
**Houses on Pygall Avenue bungalow style. 3 storey houses would massively overlook**  
**If it does happen, only two storey houses**  
**Devaluation of existing properties**  
**Hedgerows on site**  
**Loss of privacy for existing residents**  
**Blocked drainage on Gypsum Way**  
**Loss of greenfield site**  
**If site developed must be sympathetic to current residents**  
**Site named wrong. Not the Orchards (that is the field to the south). Should be called by a different name.** | **Least disruption to residents** | **200 too many for the site**  
**Good site but too many homes**  
**Do not need this number of homes/too big for the village**  
**If goes ahead link footpaths through the site to the railway walk**  
**Access via Eyres Lane not practicable**  
**Ancient barn in bus depot needs to be preserved**  
**Adverse effect on Leake Road**  
**Just because it is within Gypsum Way does not mean it should not be protected**  
**Floods. Needs new culvert at NCT depot** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOT6</th>
<th>Logical extension to village and could mirror ribbon development across the road</th>
<th>Property values could fall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Could incorporate flood prevention measures which also benefit the residents on the west side of Leake Road</td>
<td>Could affect current residents amenity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lowest level of disruption to village residents</td>
<td>Access would be problematic due to parking on Leake Road. Leake Road too narrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serious effect on outlook from properties the other side of Leake Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Too narrow for frontage development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flood risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree with no significant highways problems comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No defensible Green Belt boundary. Current road forms a good boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant landscape/visual impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Too many houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of farmland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would require off road parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOT7</th>
<th>Would allow for the widening of Leake Rad to allow for flowing traffic</th>
<th>Concerned about pylons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easy access to main road away from school.</td>
<td>Would need roundabout at bottom of Hill Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Probably most logical but 160 too many.</td>
<td>Could Hill Road be made an adopted road (could be strength or weakness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good access and traffic could use Gypsum Way</td>
<td>5 6 and 7 would disrupt lorry traffic which would come through the village again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most suitable site</td>
<td>Vehicle access should be off</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exercise 4: Housing Site Selection

In summary, the only site where there was significant support for the development of all or part of the site was GOT 1 (to the rear of the British Legion). In addition the majority of respondents to sites GOT7 and GOT 8 (Land East of Hill Road, and Land South of Moor Lane) supported development of all or parts of the sites as opposed not supporting development. For the remaining sites, the response was largely negative. In addition, British Gypsum was identified as a potential housing site by several respondents, Plus a field to the north-east of Grassmere Gardens.

Green Belt

Comments were invited to be made on the draft Green Belt assessment of sites adjacent to Gotham. The following table provides a summary of the comments received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments received in relation to draft Green Belt review of sites around Gotham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Unclear over why sites have greater or lesser green belt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Importance when assessed.  
| ---  
| • Need to protect Green Belt. Cannot grade it/build on it/ remove it.  
| • Need to protect the area between Gotham and Clifton to maintain village.  
| • Building on Green Belt would lead to loss of wildlife.  
| • Leake Road should be medium-high not low-medium as would close the vista.  
| • All Green Belt important  
| • Biodiversity protected by green belt most important  
| ---  
| • GOT4 (Hall Drive (referred to incorrectly as the Orchards in the further options consultation document) will affect residents the most. Also is a heritage asset as is ridge and furrow so is historic.  
| • Green Belt is valuable agricultural land  
| • Do not agree with scoring.  
| • British Legion site scores too high given that it is a former brownfield site.  

**East Leake**

As East Leake is the closest key settlement to Gotham, a dot exercise was carried out for sites EL9-EL12 as contained within the Further Options consultation document. Overall, the overwhelming majority of participants did not support development on any of the sites, With EL9-EL11 having no support at all.
Appendix G: Local Plan Part 2 – Preferred Options, summary of consultation responses

Introduction

1. 1,584 individuals and organisations responded to the Preferred Options Consultation. These comments were received online, by email, by post and through comments on exhibition leaflets.

2. The Council received comments from the following town and parish councils/meetings: Aslockton; Bradmore; Bunny; Costock; Cropwell Bishop; East Bridgford; East Leake; Elton; Gotham; Hawksworth; Holme Pierrepont and Gamston; Keyworth; Langar cum Barnstone; Normanton on the Wolds; Plumtree; Radcliffe on Trent; Rempston; Ruddington; and Sutton Bonington.

3. Comments were also received from the following statutory consultees: Environment Agency, Highways England, Historic England, Natural England, Rushcliffe Borough Council (as a landowner of a preferred allocation), Nottinghamshire County Council, Melton Borough Council, and Sports England.

4. In addition to statutory consultees, comments were received from a variety of local and national interest groups, and representatives from the development industry (including landowners, house builders and their agents).

5. A significant number of residents made representations, particularly those who live within Cotgrave (95), Cropwell Bishop (68), East Bridgford (68), Gotham (49), East Leake (20), Keyworth (195), Radcliffe-on-Trent (101) and Ruddington (833). The holding of public exhibitions within these settlements and the use of leaflet responses (with the exception of East Leake) increased the representations within these settlements. Representations from residents within Ruddington were significantly increased by two pro-forma letters, one which objected to the scale of development and another specifically opposing the allocation of site RUD11 (Old Loughborough Road, Ruddington).

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?

6. In response to the question whether respondents agree with the Borough Council’s assessment of the present housing supply situation and that enough land will need to be identified by Local Plan Part 2 to accommodate at least
2,000 new homes. **63 agreed** and **87 disagreed**. 12 respondents stated that they did not know.

7. Although the development industry were in support of identifying land for new homes to acknowledge the current housing shortfall, several responses from this sector stated that 2,550 homes is not enough to achieve a 5 year housing land supply. They state that the Council’s proposed buffer is welcomed however it is still considered insufficient to deal with the under delivery of housing on the strategic sites. This response was based upon the slower than expected rate of delivery currently experienced in the borough, principally in relation to the strategic sites.

8. Of those from the development industry who disagreed with the proposed figure, several alternative suggestions were made. These suggestions ranged from 3,000 to 5,761. Responses stating that the proposal should be for ‘at least 4,000’ suggested that the figure could actually be much higher to increase flexibility in the plan. Suggestions of adding a buffer onto the figure were also suggested to accommodate any future uncertainty regarding additional shortfall. The suggested buffer figures in responses from the development sector ranged from 20% to 25%. Another suggestion made by members of the development industry stated that the wording should be changed from ‘around’ to ‘at least’. They believe this would ensure greater flexibility over the plan period, so 2,550 homes should be a minimum, not a target.

9. It is suggested by some members of the development industry that the Council should take more pragmatic approach to the delivery of housing. It is suggested that the experience in Cotgrave and East Leake should be followed as it is a good example of how new houses can be brought forward quickly, when there are significant permissions granted on a number of different sites. It is believed that this experience can be replicated in other villages across the borough, especially as Rushcliffe is a very strong market area so demand will not be a constraint for delivery rates.

10. There were a small number of responses from developers which agreed to the proposed identification of 2,550 new homes with its buffer of 500 additional homes. These stated that this figure is appropriate given the shortfall situation and that Green Belt land is appropriate to be built on to deliver housing. It is also agreed that allocating sites in a range of settlement types and sizes gives greater flexibility in delivering housing.

11. Other suggestions from members of the development industry stated that Local Plan Part 2 should identify safeguarded (reserved) sites to ensure any future shortfall can be met and that brownfield land should be prioritised over Green Belt land.
12. In relation to the 5 year housing land supply many of the respondents from the development industry disagreed with the Council’s calculation. Some also provided their own calculations as part of their representations. It is suggested that the Council’s calculations are flawed as they should have included a lapse rate of 10% for both large and small sites. It is also stated that they overestimate delivery of the Key Settlements as well as the large strategic sites allocated in the Core Strategy which will result in a failure to address the 5 year housing land supply shortfall. To make up for this, it is suggested in the majority of responses from the development industry that more sites for housing should be allocated in ‘other’ villages.

13. **Nottinghamshire County Council** agrees that Local Plan Part 2 should identify enough land for around 2,550 new homes.

14. **Aslockton Parish Council** are concerned that the allocations in less sustainable rural settlements contravene the Core Strategy which states housing should be delivered through urban concentration. They state that Rushcliffe Borough Council (RBC) should address the delivery issues with the strategic sites before any new allocations are made.

15. **Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council** acknowledges the need for new housing, particularly affordable housing for young families and elderly people. They state that increasing delivery on the strategic sites should be more of a priority before allocating housing in villages.

16. **Ruddington Parish Council** states that if 2,200 new homes are allocated then a total of 14,250 homes will have been built by the end of the plan period. This is more than the target of 13,150. Rather than allocating new sites in Key Settlements, Ruddington PC say pressure should be put on the developers of the large sites which are currently failing to deliver.

17. **Elton Parish Meeting** do not support the identification of land for 2,550 new homes as it believes there is not enough infrastructure and services to support this figure. It states that too many large executive homes are being built rather than smaller affordable homes.

18. **Sport England** appreciates the need for new housing and encourages proposals which promote active lifestyles through the use of the Active Design Guidance by Sport England and Public Health England. Playing pitches should be protected in line with the NPPF, especially as the Council’s Playing Pitch Strategy identifies there are deficiencies. Sport England also has concerns that the population increase as a result of new housing will put pressure on existing facilities, so contributions would be required to improve these.
19. **Nottingham City Transport** supports the proposal for new housing. It states Rushcliffe is a large enough borough and has sufficient Green Belt land that could be made available without unacceptable environmental impact.

20. **Historic England** agrees that Local Plan Part 2 should identify enough land for around 2,550 homes but this should be subject to consideration of the historic environment. It welcomes the supporting Heritage Assets Assessment.

21. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** objects to additional housing being allocated and state that the causes of delay should be looked at closely and solutions should be found urgently. Allocating smaller villages will lead to habitat fragmentation, unsustainable travel patterns and it is against Core Strategy Policy 3 which focuses development through urban concentration. It states that proposed developments should avoid damage to SSSIs, Local Wildlife Sites, Local Nature Reserves and green infrastructure/wildlife corridors.

22. **Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group (RNCSIG)** states that the Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy emphasises the importance of avoiding any further loss or damage to wildlife capital and the network of green infrastructure should be maintained. All allocated sites should have significant buffering and mitigation and any loss of wildlife should be kept to a minimum.

23. Other comments received from the general public include:
   a. Too many houses are proposed (5 comments).
   b. Objection to any greenfield development due to the environmental impacts.
   c. The need for additional housing is not proven (5 comments).
   d. Reduced immigration, Brexit and other demographic changes mean housing demand will decline (3 comments).
   e. Developers should use quicker building techniques; it is suggested that pre-fab is considered.
   f. Habitat fragmentation will occur if housing is distributed over a wide area.
   g. The council needs to provide reasons why the strategic sites are not delivering (3 comments).
   h. Infrastructure to support this level of development does not exist (11 comments).
   i. One single settlement with all the housing should be considered.
   j. The proposed figure is over-providing by 550 (3 comments).
   k. Development in smaller villages will ruin the rural character.
   l. Housing studies should be taken in each village to inform their required housing mix.
m. No more large executive houses (4 comments).

n. The council should work with developers to deliver the strategic sites.

o. RBC should not be pressured to meet unrealistic government housing targets.

p. Lots of empty homes in and derelict land in and around Nottingham which should be used first.

q. Large construction vehicles will damage small village roads when accessing sites across the borough.

r. Concerns about the impact on traffic and parking.

s. Any site which has a flood risk should not be allocated.

t. The shortfall situation is giving developers an excuse to build on unsustainable land they wouldn’t usually be allowed to develop.

u. Alternate options such as brownfield and higher-density inner city developments should be considered before Green Belt is released (2 comments).

24. Other comments received from the general public who are in support of the proposed figure for new homes:
   a. Appreciate the national requirement for more housing and agree Rushcliffe should do its part (2 comments).
   b. New affordable housing is needed (8 comments).

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?

25. In response to the question whether respondents agree with the Borough Council’s view that around 50 new homes should be developed on the Abbey Road Depot site, **59 agreed**, whereas **32 disagreed**.

26. The majority of responses received from the development industry objected to the proposal as they believe it is not deliverable as the Council currently has no alternative site for the depot. Many also suggest it is more sustainable to build in the Key Settlements rather than this site.

27. **Nottinghamshire County Council** state that there are significant pressures for places at primary schools within West Bridgford and there are indications of growing pressure at secondary schools. The expansion of existing schools is not possible and there are limited options to address DfE guidelines. The County Council would welcome further discussion on education infrastructure and timescales for delivery.
28. **Aslockton Parish Council** state that priority should be given to brownfield sites such as the Abbey Road Depot.

29. The **Environment Agency** state that a large part of the site is in Flood Zone 3 (high risk) and the remainder of the site is in Flood Zone 2 (medium risk) so would therefore be subject to a flood risk sequential test and a flood risk assessment (FRA). The surface water flood risk should also be assessed.

The Greater Nottingham Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (GNSFRA) data model shows flooding on the site in the event of a 1 in 100 year 30% climate change breach of defences scenario. The GNSFRA also shows flooding on the site in the event of a 1 in 100 year 50% climate change scenario due to overtopping of the Trent defences.

30. **Historic England** advise that the sewage pumping station on the site is a non-designated heritage asset which should be retained and incorporated into the scheme. Policy should be used to address this, either: site specific policy, separate policy or clearly stated in supporting text.

31. **RNCSIG** support the proposed development on site WB01 as it is brownfield.

32. Other comments made by respondents include:
   a. Making use of brownfield sites like this is more sustainable (3 comments).
   b. Support the development as long as the key concerns are taken into account (2 comments).
   c. It would cost the Council too much to re-locate the depot (2 comments).
   d. The area around the site currently has parking issues (3 comments).
   e. The local schools are already over-subscribed (2 comments).
   f. Extra safety measures put in place when construction vehicles are accessing and leaving the site as this is a route regularly used by school children.
   g. 50 dwellings is too many (3 comments).
   h. The land may be contaminated from its previous waste management use.
   i. Affordable homes would be ideal on this site (3 comments).
   j. Open space which is wildlife friendly is needed.
   k. There is an active hedgehog community which needs considering:
      covered drains, gaps in fences and hedgehog homes within gardens (2 comments).
   l. The mature trees on the site should be retained (2 comments).
   m. No more than two storeys, to prevent overshadowing existing homes and gardens.
   n. No more than three storeys, to compliment surroundings.
   o. Important local history on site: pumps and tram depot buildings.
p. The 50 homes delivered here should be part of the Local Plan Part 2’s total housing requirement (4 comments).
q. The council should develop this site themselves to provide social housing (2 comments).

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?

33. In response to the question whether respondents agree with the Borough Council’s view that no sites adjacent to the main urban area should be allocated in the Local Plan Part 2, **56 agreed** whereas **61 disagreed**.

34. There was a mixed response from respondents from the development industry. Several developers are in support of this proposal as they believe additional housing adjacent to Nottingham will result in a continued delay of the strategic sites, so it would not solve the shortfall issues. Those in support also state that a variety of locations for growth within different market areas will significantly strengthen deliverability. They also state that small and medium scale sites in villages have fewer infrastructure requirements so would make an immediate significant contribution to the housing shortfall.

35. Other respondents from the development industry, who objected these proposals, state that all options which will help to meet the housing requirement need to be considered. It is also stated that developing sites closer to the main urban area will provide them with good access to public transport and employment in addition to having much less impact on the Green Belt. They state that the impacts of developing away from the Main Urban Area are generally much higher than sites directly adjacent to it.

36. **Aslockton Parish Council** believe that additional sites should be found adjacent to the main urban area in preference over unsustainable sites in rural areas.

37. **RNCSIG** agree that no sites adjacent to the main urban area should be developed as all greenfield development should be kept to a minimum.

38. Comments received from the general public highlighted several issues:
   a. More justification is needed for why Simpkins Farm is unsuitable.
b. It is important not to build adjacent to the Main Urban Area as it reduces
the Green Belt separation between the urban area and other settlements
(3 comments).
c. When approaching from the south, development at the South of Clifton
would be very visible.

39. Members of the public who object to the proposal also comment:
a. These sites are closest to areas of employment in the city so development
should be increased (3 comments).
b. Infrastructure, services and facilities already exist for sites near the urban
area (6 comments).
c. Expanding existing urban areas seems a logical choice.
d. Sites adjacent to the urban area have more substantial road networks.
e. The tram can be utilised by new developments adjacent to the urban area
(2 comments).
f. Brownfield sites should be exhausted before allocating greenfield sites.
g. More sites near the main urban area should be developed. Land should
be taken from developers who are currently failing to deliver sites adjacent
to the main urban and given to others who will deliver.
h. Land between the Gamston allocation and water sports centre should be
considered.

Comments from additional site promoters adjacent to the Main Urban Area:

40. **Ryland** (promoting site TOL2) state that it would be more sustainable to build
closer to the main urban area where public transport is much better and a
greater range of employment opportunities is available.

41. **Rockspring Barwood Gamston Ltd** (off the A52/A6011 junction, Gamston)
state that the plan must be flexible and therefore should include land adjacent
to the Main Urban Area. Land north of the Tollerton/Gamston strategic
allocations should therefore be allocated as it could accommodate 2,000 to
2,500 dwellings. As an extension, within clearly defined boundaries it would
have less impact on the Green Belt. It is not dependent on the neighbouring
strategic allocation and access can be achieved off the A52.

42. **Davidsons** (promoting land adjacent to the Gamston strategic allocation) state
that their land could provide an additional 500 units in a sustainable location.
There is no evidence to support the position that additional sites adjacent to the
main urban area would not address the shortfall. Site is separately owned and
could have a separate access of the A52 that would connect with the
employment area is the strategic allocation. Submission is supported by a
positive access and movement strategy and landscape appraisal.
43. **Croft** (promoting Simkins Farm (HOL01), Adbolton) state that the MUA is the most sustainable location and HOL01, adjacent to the MUA is also wholly sustainable location with an abundance of facilities and amenities within walking distance, including bus services.

44. **Wells** (promoting land west of the Edwalton strategic allocation) state that the justification for not identifying further land at west of the Edwalton strategic allocation is flawed, as it does not consider the circumstances of the land and the development that is proposed. Retirement housing on this land can be delivered in the early part of the plan period.

**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?

45. In response to the question whether Local Plan Part 2 should not allocate sites adjacent to Bingham for housing, **53** agreed and **25** disagreed.

46. **Nottingham County Council** state there is an existing planning permission, and the S106 agreement provides for delivery of a new primary school. Delays in the transfer of the site/school building are causing difficulties addressing demand for places. The County Council supports no further housing sites being allocated adjacent to Bingham.

47. **Aslockton Parish Council** believes that expanding the strategic sites at Bingham should be prioritised over development in ”other villages” that have fewer facilities and poorer transport links.

48. **Historic England, RNCSIG, Elton** (promoting land off Landcroft Lane, Sutton Bonington), **Langridge Homes Ltd** (promoting COT03), **Collington and Robinson** (promoting land at Costock), **IM Land** (promoting COT12), **Bridge** (promoting Willowbrook Farm, Bassingfield), **Mosaic Estates** (promoting RAD01), **Simpson** (promoting RUD11) and **Ruzicka** (promoting COT05) all agree that no further sites should be allocated adjacent to Bingham.

49. **Bridge** states that development has leapfrogged the Green Belt to Bingham which is comparatively isolated location.

50. Residents made the following objections:
• Bingham has a good transport network, with links to the A46 and A52, and as long as schools are resourced this would have less of an impact than other locations.
• There are less flooding issues in Bingham.
• Greenfield sites should be built on and there is potential for further infill development in Bingham

51. Residents made the following comments:

• More housing would place severe pressure on the health and education services available. Bingham is also the 'hub' to the surrounding villages.
• A52 can’t cope with more traffic.
• Further development is contrary to the Core Strategy and the focus on the main urban area.

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?

52. In response to the question whether Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for housing development at Cotgrave for around 350 homes in total, a significantly greater number disagreed. 77 disagreed and 30 agreed.

53. Cotgrave Town Council is aware that some land will be required to build new houses and accept that Cotgrave does have some land available.

54. East Leake Council would support more of the 14 sites released for developed. Regeneration and capacity within the new medical centre and schools support further growth.

55. Aslockton Parish Council supports the allocations in Cotgrave as it is an area undergoing regeneration and has good transport links to Nottingham.

56. Historic England state that preferred sites should consider the impact on the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting and noting impact on Green Belt sensitivity.

57. Education & Skills Funding Agency are concerned that locations for the additional schools required have not been identified and therefore suggest that the Local Plan sets out the mechanism through which school sites will be identified and secured.
58. **Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group** disagrees and believes that no sites adjacent to Cotgrave should be allocated in LP2 as the use of green field sites should be kept to a minimum.

59. **CPRE** oppose the allocation of land for 350 homes as any further Greenfield allocations at Cotgrave would encroach into open countryside and detract from the attractive, intact Cotgrave Wolds.

60. The majority of responses from those promoting sites in Cotgrave believe that Cotgrave could accommodate additional development beyond the 350 homes proposed. **Barrett Homes** (promoting COT01), **Langridge Homes** (promoting COT03), **Wickmere Ltd** (promoting COT11a and COT11b), **BT Hoyland** (promoting COT14), **Southwell Diocese** (promoting COT04), **Ruzicka** (promoting COT05) and **Taylor Wimpey** (promoting COT09 and COT10) state that Cotgrave is a Key Settlement with a range of services and facilities, including good public transport. It is therefore a sustainable location where current regeneration should be capitalised upon through the allocation of more housing. There is disagreement that education constraints exist (have are justified) or that they cannot be addressed either through S106 improvements to the existing school or by meeting pupil demand elsewhere. Consequently an increase in housing of between 400 and 700 dwellings has been proposed.

61. **Parker** (promoting COT10) and **IM Land** (promoting COT12) support the allocation of land for 350 homes. Three representations from promoters of land outside of Cotgrave also support this housing target.

62. Residents highlighted the following objections to the allocation of land at Cotgrave for 350 homes:

- Services and facilities are inadequate and the level of housing is therefore unsustainable. The schools, medical centre, nurseries are at capacity and the limited regeneration of the town centre will not address these issues.
- The existing road infrastructure cannot cope with existing traffic levels. Congestion has increased following the development of the former colliery, improvements to the A42, the absence of local employment, increased commuting and limited off-street parking. Bingham Road/Main Road, the junction of Hollygate Lane and Colston Gate, Plumtree Road, Scrimshaw Lane are highlighted as routes which are congested or dangerous.
- There are inadequate bus services (especially to places other than Nottingham).
• The Green Belt and greenfield sites should be protected. Brownfield sites should be developed first and empty properties brought back into use.
• Resident’s views have not been taken into account and it is unclear why sites have been selected.
• Cotgrave community will change as commuters increase.
• Limited demand within the town, this will reduce further following Brexit.
• Proposed sites a disconnected from the village, like Hollygate Park.
• Further housing at Cotgrave would risk delivery of the Core Strategy and the focus of development within/adjacent to the main urban area.

63. Residents made the following positive comments:

• Development could meet demand for affordable, downsizing and single occupancy properties. Should not be executive homes.
• New homes should be better designed, enabling home working and be environmentally sustainable.
• Development of former Colliery is a good example of new housing — not too intensive.
• 350 is a small amount providing infrastructure can cope.

**Question 6:** Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following sites at Cotgrave:

64. The following representations were received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COT01</td>
<td>Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COT09, COT10, COT11a</td>
<td>Land south of Hollygate Lane (1); Land south of Hollygate Lane (2); and Land south of Hollygate Lane (3)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

65. **Cotgrave Town Council** request that the developments contain affordable homes for first time buyers and social housing. They highlight the need to include green spaces (similar to Hollygate Park). The junction of Hollygate Lane/Bingham Road is also identified as a constraint on these sites, as is school capacity (primary and secondary).

66. **Nottingham County Council** state that the pupils from 350 dwellings could be accommodated in Cotgrave, subject to S106 contributions being agreed.
67. **Barratt Homes** (promoting COT01), **Taylor Wimpey** (promoting COT09), **Parker** (promoting COT10), **Wickmere Ltd** (promoting COT11a) and **Rushcliffe Borough Council** (COT01) support their allocation.

68. **Langridge Homes** (promoting COT03), **Southwell Diocese** (promoting COT04), **Ruzicka** (promoting COT05), **IM Land** (promoting COT12), **Whitt** (promoting COT06) and **BT Hoyland** (promoting COT14) consider their sites should be allocated. COT03 is closer to the village and impacts on heritage assets are negligible (with contradictions in the SA, GB Review and heritage assessment); COT04 can be developed without harming heritage assets and would enhance linkages to the centre (providing open space along these footpath links); COT05 relates to existing settlement, does not extend into the Green Belt (infill) and can be accessed of Bakers Hollow (providing traffic calming); the brick kilns and rifle range on COT06 have gone and been damaged, the Brickyard has been set on fire twice and the site is brownfield and naturally screened; COT12 is the most sustainable location for growth at Cotgrave; and COT14 is close to the town centre and employment and would enhance connectivity between the town and Hollygate park.

69. These alternative site promoters highlighted archaeological and highways (new road required) as constraints on the preferred sites. Concerns regarding site selection methodology were also raised.

70. **Barratt Homes** (promoting COT01) support the addition of COT11b as they believe it is a logical extension and would meet the increased target they propose. Adverse impacts can be mitigated though design and layout.

71. Three promoters of land outside of Cotgrave suggested that more appropriate sites existed around the village. **Peveril Homes** (promoting land to the north of Tollerton) suggest that these sites should be re-allocated at Tollerton.
72. **Historic England** state there is the possibility for buried archaeology at this site. This is not known at this stage and further evaluation should be undertaken prior to taking this site forward for allocation in order to determine whether the site is capable of being developed or not, and/or what mitigation may be required.

73. **Environment Agency** highlight the site’s proximity to the Canal which is within Flood Zone 3 and that the surface water risk should be assessed. The watercourse through the site should be buffered as part of the development. The Canal (a local wildlife site) must be protected from harm.

74. **Rushcliffe Borough Council** (acting as a landowner of COT01) state that site could deliver 200 dwellings and is of low green belt and landscape/visual importance. Geophysical surveys indicate that the site has high archaeological potential within the western area of the site. Consequently an archaeological protection area is proposed.

75. Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust and Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy Implementation Group (RNCSIG) request that adequate buffering of the Country Park should be provided.

76. **Barrett Homes** (promoting COT01) state that the site is both suitable and available for development as well as being developable and deliverable within the next five years. A comprehensive approach can be adopted towards site development and implementation through Masterplanning. **Barrett Homes** consider that 350 homes could be delivered. 170 would not constitute an efficient use of the land.

77. **Wickmere Ltd** considers the access to COT01 from Hollygate Lane constrained due to their party ownership. COT11b should be allocated as it is deliverable and would improve connectivity between the town and Hollygate Park.

78. Residents submitted the following objections to COT01:

- Overlooking of neighbouring bungalows.
- Access of Hollygate Lane is not safe or sufficient for 180 homes. Hollygate Lane is congested.
- Less homes should be built
- Setting of Country Park/Bluebell Spinney should be protected.
- Archaeology
- Rights of way and access to Country Park should be retained.
• Rotational land slip of colliery waste – embankment should be reinstated.
• Flooding issues
• Loss of productive farmland.

79. Residents made the following positive comments:

• Single storey bungalows would preserve privacy and provide downsizing opportunities.
• Development could provide a link between the town and Hollygate Park
• Views of the village should be preserved by creating a park at the top of the site.
• Site has low Green Belt and landscape/visual sensitivity.

COT09, COT10 and COT11a – Land south of Hollygate Lane

80. Historic England state that whilst much of the ridge and furrow has been lost as a result of intensive arable farming, it is recommended that archaeological investigations/evaluation are required as part of any development proposal should the site be taken forward for allocation.

81. Environment Agency highlight the site’s proximity to the Canal which is within Flood Zone 3 and that the surface water risk should be assessed.

82. The Nottinghamshire Wildlife Site and RNCSIG (761557) state there must be adequate buffering to protect the wildlife and green infrastructure value of the Grantham Canal.

83. Residents submitted the following objections to COT09, COT10 and COT11a:

• Development would extend into open countryside and Green Belt
• Local services and facilities could not accommodate 180 homes

84. Residents made the following positive comments:

• Boundaries with existing properties on Colston Gate should be protected.
• Development would provide an opportunity to link Hollygate Lane and Colston Gate, reducing congestion at the existing junction and increasing safety.
• Site has low Green Belt and landscape/visual sensitivity.
Residents submitted the following comments on the alternative site options (not identified as preferred housing sites):

- Brownfield land east of COT01 should be allocated.
- Sites west of Cotgrave would be better as residents can exit the town without travelling through the village.

East Leake

**Question 7:** Do you agree with our proposal that only sites EL01, EL02, EL04, EL05 and EL08 should be allocated for housing development at East Leake?

86. When asked if there is support for only allocating sites EL01, EL02, EL04, EL05 and EL08 for housing at East Leake, the majority of responses are in favour of the proposal. 41 support the proposal to allocate only five selected sites whereas 22 object.

87. **Gladman Development Ltd** (promoting EL01 + EL11) state that Rushcliffe Borough Council should not be seeking to limit housing numbers in East Leake as this was only a minimum figure. Of all of the allocated Key Service Centres, East Leake is the only settlement located out of the Green Belt so should therefore be considered the most appropriate location. In addition, they state that there is no robust evidence that East Leake cannot support further development.

88. Gladman Development support housing development in East Leake and promote two sites at the settlement. (1) *Land North of Lantern Lane (EL01)* which can deliver several benefits including open space, a housing mix and green infrastructure planting. (2) *Land off Stonebridge Drive (EL11)* which has no significant issues identified at the site selection stage, but was labelled as ‘uncertain’ for delivery due to no representation being received – however, Gladman Development state this is incorrect.

89. **Peveril Homes** (promoting land to the north of Tollerton) object to the proposed allocation of housing in East Leake and consideration should be given to re-allocate some or all of these dwellings for sites at Tollerton.

90. **East Leake Parish Council** strongly object to any additional housing in East Leake above those which currently have planning permission and wish to see all other allocations in the plan delivered without delay. They highlight concerns that the minimum target for East Leake is 400; however, this figure has now reached 1064 new dwellings since the start of the plan process.
91. **Aslockton Parish Council** support development in key settlements but believe East Leake has already met sufficient allocations for its size.

92. **Rempstone Parish Council** agree that no further planning permission should be granted for East Leake for several reasons: schools are full, medical centre at capacity, frequent storm water flooding, car parking issues, lack of employment opportunities and a loss of local identity.

93. **Nottingham County Council** state that local primary schools have no capacity or potential for expansion to accommodate further housing growth beyond what already has planning permission. Whilst the Local Authority would support the proposals that no further housing is allocated, the implications of the allowed appeal should be taken into account.

94. NCC also state that sites EL01, EL02 and EL04 are located within the Gypsum Minerals Safeguarding and Consultation Area. EL01 is also within 300m of the Marblaegis Mine and the permitted development should not sterilise this facility.

95. The **Environment Agency** have several comments regarding the sites proposed in East Leake:

   **EL01:** This site is in Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and the surface water risk should be assessed. A number of drains run through the site which may house protected species which would need protecting. East Leake bridleway verges are in close proximity and it is expected that these will be enhanced.

   **EL02:** The northern part of this site is located within Flood Zone 3 (high risk) as well as an area within Flood Zone 2 (medium risk), therefore the site is subject to a flood risk sequential test and a flood risk assessment (FRA). The flood risk is from Kingston Brook which is not managed by the Environment Agency. The surface water flood risk should also be assessed.

   **EL04:** The north-eastern edge of this site is within Flood Zone 3 (high risk) and Flood Zone 2 (medium risk), therefore subject to a flood risk sequential test and a flood risk assessment (FRA). The source of the flood is an ordinary watercourse not managed by the Environment Agency. Sheepwash Brook runs along the northern boundary of EL04 and it should not be culverted. The brook should have a 10m buffer zone as part of any proposals with no footpaths, lighting or gardens within it.

   **EL08:** This site is in Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and the surface water risk should be assessed.
96. Elton, Simpson (promoting RUD11), Ruzicka (promoting COT05) and Collington and Robinson (promoting land at Costock) question whether the position regarding East Leake is out of date given the recent appeal decision.

97. Historic England state that the development proposals will need to consider impacts on views to and from Listed Buildings and ensure that any key vistas are incorporated into the site masterplan, e.g.:

   EL02: Grade II Baptist Church
   EL04 + EL05: Grade I Church of St Mary

98. RNCSIG agree, stating that greenfield allocations must be kept to an absolute minimum and damage or loss to wildlife capital should be avoided.

99. In terms of additional responses from the general public, the following comments were received in relation to allocating five sites at East Leake:

   - Services and facilities are already at capacity, especially the schools and health centre (13 comments).
   - Roads and junctions are already at capacity and in need of repair (13 comments).
   - East Leake is experiencing too much development (12 comments).
   - Increased traffic from housing will result in greater risk of danger to pedestrians and increased air pollution (6 comments).
   - East Leake is an easy target for developers as it is not in the Green Belt (5 comments).
   - The drainage and sewerage system can’t cope (3 comments).
   - Concern that there was no public consultation event in East Leake (2 comments).
   - EL01 should not be included as it will add to the danger for users of nearby schools.
   - Lantern Lane bridleway needs protecting.
   - Support the housing allocations as long as the affordable homes are required, not negotiable.

100. Other comments received mentioned that the nearby Stanford Hall development will also increase traffic and suggestions were received stating that a village bypass road is needed to alleviate traffic issues.
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?

101. In response to the question whether Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for around 580 homes at Keyworth, a significant number of respondents supported the proposal. **154 agreed** whereas **82 objected.**

102. **Plumtree Parish Council** state that the best direction for Keyworth to expand is to the west. They state it will have a less adverse landscape impact, generate less traffic impact on neighbouring settlements and it provides better access to services and facilities.

103. **Aslockton Parish Council** believe Keyworth should have more than 580 houses allocated as it is a Key Settlement near Nottingham. They suggest the housing numbers at Keyworth should be similar to those at Bingham, East Leake and Radcliffe.

104. **East Leake Parish Council** state that Keyworth has three primary schools, not two as stated in the assessments. They state that these are 77% full so are able to support around 670 houses without needing to expand.

105. **Nottinghamshire County Council** state that a review of the existing school sites, number on roll and projections indicates that pupils from an additional 130 dwellings in Local Plan Part 2 could be accommodated, but no more than that figure. This would be subject to S106 developer contributions.

106. **British Geological Survey** objects to residential development at neighbouring sites (KEY08 and KEY04a). They state the noise disturbance from their industrial uses is incompatible with housing and that it will prevent BGS from expanding in the future. They also have concerns for the increased security risk, the increased traffic impact and the disruption it will cause to employees.

107. **Sport England** have concerns over the allocation of greenfield sites for development and seek to ensure no playing fields are allocated. They encourage developments to be designed to promote active lifestyles through, for example, walkable communities and connected footpath and cycle routes. The level of population increase in Keyworth will increase further demand for sporting facilities which will need to be considered.

108. **Historic England** state that preferred sites should consider the impact on the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting, noting impact on Green Belt sensitivity. They also state that Keyworth has lost the majority of ridge and
furrow it previously had so any remaining should be preserved. They recommend advice is sought from the local archaeological curator for each individual site.

109. **CPRE** oppose the allocation of land for 580 homes as the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan has already allocated land. They state that any change to the NP should be agreed with the Parish Council and the people of the village.

110. **RNCSIG** state that greenfield site allocations should be kept to an absolute minimum. They also state that damage and loss to the local wildlife capital should be avoided.

111. **Hogg** (promoting KEY5 + KEY6) states that Keyworth is capable of accommodating a greater number of dwellings so more sites should be allocated.

112. **David Wilson Homes** (promoting KEY3) commented to say Keyworth can accommodate more than 580 new homes. They state that insufficient primary school places is not a justification for restricting growth at Keyworth and that it is a more sustainable location than other similar sized settlements that have higher housing targets (e.g. East Leake). They also say that the new method of calculating housing supply announced by Government would result in a higher total of 828 houses being proposed.

113. **Davill N** (landowner of part of KEY14, KEY11 + KEY10) supports 580 as a minimum figure and states that sites to the west of Keyworth are more sustainable in terms of access to the village centre. They state that additional land can be allocated to the south of Bunny Lane, parts of which are identified in the Local Plan as KEY14.

114. **Peveril Homes** (promoting land to the north of Tollerton) object to the proposed housing at Keyworth. They state consideration should be made to re-allocate some, or all, of the dwellings to sites at Tollerton.

115. **Barratt Homes** (promoting KEY13) welcome the revised housing figure for Keyworth, and suggest that it should be used as a ‘minimum’ rather than a target. They state that due to the slow delivery of Local Plan Part 1 allocations therefore a flexible approach should now be taken by the Council to ensure houses are delivered swiftly.

116. **Langridge Homes Ltd** (promoting COT03) support the allocation of land for 580 homes.
117. **Simpson** (promoting RUD11), **Ruzicka** (promoting COT05) and **Elton** (promoting land at Sutton Bonington) state that Keyworth is capable of accommodating a greater number of dwellings.

118. **Aldergate Properties** (promoting KEY11) state that Keyworth is capable of accommodating a higher number of dwellings and the lack of education capacity has not been adequately demonstrated so should not be used to limit development as this can be mitigated through financial contributions. They state that the Council should make provision for safeguarded land to ensure there is a sufficient supply to use in the event of any future shortfall if delivery rates are overestimated.

119. **CEG** (promoting KEY4) support the proposal for 580 homes as a minimum as they believe Keyworth is a sustainable settlement for several reasons. They state these reasons are a good range of facilities, BGS is a large local employer looking to expand and good transport links. They also say that further housing development can be built beyond the plan period if land is safeguarded at Nicker Hill.

120. **Hogg** (promoting KEY5 + KEY6) say that Keyworth is a sustainable settlement which is capable of accommodating a higher number of dwellings than those proposed.

121. **Cliffe Investments** (promoting KEY1) support housing development in Keyworth. They state that it is capable of accommodating a greater number of dwellings and financial contributions can be used to improve education facilities.

122. **Miller Homes** (promoting KEY8) are in full support for the development of 580 homes at Keyworth.

123. **Pickford** (promoting EBR10) and **Hurst and Richards** (promoting CBI01) state that Keyworth is able to accommodate more dwellings than currently proposed.

124. **Collington and Robinson** (promoting land at Costock) are in full support of the proposal for Keyworth.

125. In response to the question asking if greenfield land should be allocated for 580 homes, the general public raised these comments:
   a. The number of housing in Keyworth should be restricted to 450 as stated in the Neighbourhood Plan (12 comments).
   b. Several responses stated that they support the three sites KEY4a, KEY8 and KEY10, but object to KEY13 (5 comments).
c. Services and facilities, such as the medical centre, would suffer (15 comments).
d. Should be limited to 300 homes maximum.
e. A mix of housing is needed (17 comments); including bungalows, starter homes and family homes.
f. Traffic impacts would arise if these houses are built (14 comments).
g. Object as development would result in a loss of Green Belt and greenfield land (6 comments).
h. Sites to the east are the best option as they have access to the A606.
i. Site selection for the Neighbourhood Plan sites were changed late in the process and don’t have the support of the general public.
j. Public footpaths need protecting in Keyworth (2 comments).
k. The south of Selby Lane is a more suitable site for housing (6 comments).
l. An old persons home should be included as part of the proposals (3 comments).
m. Greenfield land should not be built on (2 comments).
n. Development in Keyworth is a departure from the Core Strategy’s focus to locate development within or adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham.
o. Sites allocated in the Green Belt will then be further extended in the future, resulting in the loss of Keyworth’s character.
p. Housing densities should be lowered for all sites to reduce impact; therefore additional sites should be allocated to reach the proposed 580 dwellings.

126. Comments from the general public in support of the proposal:
a. All sites should have a good level of affordable housing (17 comments) including Starter Homes (10 comments).
b. Support 580 homes but this should be an absolute limit.
c. Keyworth is a sustainable location for growth; due to good amenities and access (8 comments).
d. 580 houses should be a minimum; development would sustain the existing facilities and services and provide family housing (15 comments).
e. Support, on the basis that infrastructure and roads are provided (4 comments).
f. Keyworth has good bus connections to Nottingham.
g. Good place to build homes as there will be lots of employment opportunities in the future at the developments near M1 J24.
h. Trees and landscape buffers should be used (4 comments).
i. Keyworth needs more users of its facilities (library, leisure centre, shops etc.) so more houses would regenerate these (2 comments).
**Question 9:** Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following sites at Keyworth?

127. When asked whether there is support for each individual site in Keyworth, the following responses were received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KEY4a – Land off Nicker Hill (1)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY8 – Land between Platt Lane and Station Road</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY10 – Land south of Debdale Lane (1)</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY13 – Hillside Farm</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

128. The responses received showed an overall support for development at all sites.

**KEY4a – Land off Nicker Hill (1)**

129. **CEG** (promoting KEY4) support the allocation of KEY4a and state the site is supported by the Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Plan. They state additional technical assessments for the site have been carried out which support the allocation of this site. They also propose that the land south east of the site should be allocated and identified as safeguarded land.

130. **Hogg** (promoting KEY5 + KEY6) states that this site has a greater landscape impact and impact on the settlement character than other proposed sites.

131. **Simpson** (promoting RUD11), **Ruzicka** (promoting COT05) and **Elton** (promoting land at Sutton Bonington) object to KEY4a as it has greater character and landscape impact than other sites.

132. **Pickford** (promoting EBR10) states that this site has a greater impact on landscape and character compared to other sites.

133. **Nicker Hill Residents** raise a number of concerns with their objection. They highlight several issues including access; it is stated that the single access point on the site’s short frontage is not adequate and that there will be increased congestion in addition to that caused by BGS employees. Other comments state that the site is poorly related to the built framework of Keyworth and that it would have an adverse impact on the landscape, Local Wildlife Sites and Green Belt. It is ultimately stated that the site is not a sustainable option as it is a long distance from the village centre and bus stops.
134. **Normanton on the Wolds Parish Council** have concerns with the increased traffic as a result of development at KEY4a. These concerns are due to congestion and safety issues such as speeding, poor visibility at junctions and a lack of footpath under the railway bridge. They also have concerns regarding water management as heavy rainfall results in drainage discharging into streams and land at Normanton; therefore a detailed mechanism of attenuation should be required.

135. The **Environment Agency** state that KEY4a is in Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and the surface water risk should be assessed. They state that the BGS meadow adjacent is a Local Wildlife Site so development must not impact it. A small watercourse in the meadow is also identified and it is stated that this must be protected from negative impacts and enhanced if possible.

136. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** state that this site is adjacent a Local Wildlife Site so would need to be set back to avoid any damaging impacts.

137. **RNCSIG** consider this site as unsuitable as it is adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site. They have a general policy that any good wildlife habitat in the borough is sufficiently rare that is must be buffered from the effects of development.

138. In terms of comments regarding KEY4a from the general public, there is a concern that the landscape impact would be too high (5 comments). The distance from village amenities (3 comments), the traffic impact (2 comments), inadequate roads around the site (3 comments) and poor access to public transport are suggested as to why this site is not suitable.

139. Comments from the general public in support of KEY4a state that more houses can be accommodated on this site (2 comments) and that it is close to facilities and bus services. It is also identified that this site has better road infrastructure than other sites.

**KEY8 – Land between Platt Lane and Station Road**

140. **Miller Homes** (promoting KEY8) support the allocation of KEY8 and state that it is identified for housing in the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan. They suggest the number of dwellings can be increased to 200 and that the site is suitable, available and achievable. It is also stated that the site is located in a sustainable location within walking distance of services and facilities.

141. **Nicker Hill Residents** support the proposal of KEY8 as it does not impact on nature conservation assets or the landscape. It is also stated that the site is a logical extension as it rounds off the village.
142. **Normanton on the Wolds Parish Council** have concerns for the traffic impacts in terms of congestion and safety. They also state that water management should be considered to ensure heavy rainfall does not continue to discharge into streams and land at Normanton.

143. **Plumtree Parish Council** object to the proposal, stating that the site clearly extends beyond a clearly defined urban edge. They state that there will be a traffic impact on surrounding villages and an adverse environmental impact due to pollution in the adjacent watercourse in connection with activities at the BGS. Plumtree PC also have concerns that the site is not sustainable due to the distance from the facilities in the village centre, especially an issue for elderly residents.

144. The **Environment Agency** state that this site is in Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and the surface water flood risk should be assessed. The Plumtree disused railway Local Wildlife Site runs to the north of the site and should be protected from any impacts of development. They also state that there is a watercourse running along Platt Lane which could be indirectly impacted by run-off water. They say this watercourse should be considered and potentially enhanced in any proposals.

145. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** support the allocation of KEY8 as it is considered to have the least damaging impact on biodiversity.

146. **Sport England** object to development at KEY08 as it would impact upon the adjacent sports facilities. They raise questions as to whether there is an impact assessment from cricket and ball strike damage. They also state that housing would prevent the further expansion of the sports facility, in particular an issue as the Playing Pitch Strategy identifies as cricket pitch provision is overplayed.

147. There were a number of issues and comments raised by the general public including the increase in traffic which will adversely impact the existing congested road network (8 comments) and that the site is too far from the village centre (6 comments). There are concerns that KEY8 would represent sprawl into the Green Belt and the risk of coalescence with Plumtree will increase (4 comments). Other comments highlight concerns for the loss of good quality agricultural land (4 comments) and that the exceptional circumstances for releasing Green Belt land have not been justified. It is suggested that access to the site should be off Platt Lane.

148. Other comments given from the general public in support of the proposal state that the site has good access to the road network and bus services (4 comments) and that the site has the least impact on other properties.
KEY10 – Land south of Debdale Lane (1)

149. **Bloor Homes** (promoting KEY9 + KEY10) support this allocation as they believe it is in a suitable and sustainable location for growth. They state the site can accommodate between 200 – 250 dwellings and have submitted development proposals and an existing masterplan of the site.

150. **Nicker Hill Residents** support the development of KEY10 and believe it is more suitable than KEY4a and KEY8. There is less impact on nature conservation sites and the Green Belt and state it is more sustainably located. They state it rounds off the settlement well and suggest it could accommodate a greater number of dwellings.

151. **Aldergate Properties** (promoting KEY11) suggest that KEY10 should be extended west to also allocate land at KEY11. They disagree with the Green Belt Review of KEY11 and have provided a revised assessment alongside a masterplan of how the two sites could be developed as one.

152. The **Environment Agency** state that this site is in Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and that the surface water flood risk should be assessed. They identify a watercourse to the north of the site and suggest proposals protect and enhance it. They also state that development should avoid impacting the Rancliffe Wood Local Wildlife Site to the west of the site in addition to sufficient tree planning to increase connectivity between habitats.

153. **Severn Trent** highlight a medium impact on sewage infrastructure as development will drain to a 300mm diameter foul sewer on Bunny Lane. They state the development may impact the large flooding cluster on the lane. They also state that half of the site may have to drain north to Debdale pumping station and storm water will drain to the watercourse on the site’s northern boundary. It is also highlighted that there is pollution recorded at this location.

154. **Trent Valley IDB** state that the site lies outside of the Board’s district but within the catchment. The Board’s consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge into any water course (other than a designated main river) from the site.

155. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** state that the site contains ridge and furrow which they highlight as being an increasingly scared archaeological and biodiversity feature. They also state that the site is prominent hedgerows which are an important habitat.

156. **RNCSIG** state that KEY10 includes an area of historical ridge and furrow in addition to areas of woodland which should be conserved. Therefore buffering
will be required to ensure there are no adverse impacts from development.

157. The general public stated that more houses would increase traffic in an already congested and dangerous area (due to the blind summit) and the quiet lane people enjoy will become busy and dangerous. Others identify that the site is closer to village facilities and it would round off the settlement nicely.

KEY13 – Hillside Farm

158. Barratt Homes (promoting KEY13) welcome the allocation of this site as it is suitable and readily available for development in the next five years. They have concerns as to why the proposed Green Belt boundary has been drawn around Hillside Farm and its curtilage rather than included it. They also state that the site could accommodate around 90 dwellings (rather than the proposed 50) using the average density, representing an efficient use of greenfield land. It is also stated that a greater number of houses will ‘balance’ the east and west of the settlement numerically in terms of housing allocations.

159. Bloor Homes (promoting KEY9 + KEY10) object to the allocation of KEY13 stating that there are more suitable sites available, such as KEY9. They state the Neighbourhood Plan highlights that development of KEY13 would have additional impact on the local landscape and view into the village. The site would be negatively impacted by odour from the adjacent sewage treatment works, and it is suggested that a 400m cordon sanitaire would be needed, which would encompass the majority of the site.

160. Hogg (promoting KEY5 + KEY6) states that KEY13 is not a preferred site in the Neighbourhood Plan showing the lack of community support. They also state that the site has a greater landscape character impact than other potential sites and that the nearby sewage treatment works are likely to make the site unsuitable.

161. Simpson (promoting RUD11), Ruzicka (promoting COT05) and Elton (promoting land at Sutton Bonington) object to KEY13 as it has greater character and landscape impact than other sites. They also state that it is not allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan showing that it is not supported by the community.

162. Pickford (promoting EBR10) state that this site has a greater impact on landscape and character compared to other sites. It is also identified that this site is not preferred in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.
163. Davill (landowner of part of KEY14, KEY11 + KEY10) do not support the proposed allocation of this site as they believe the landscape and character impact are greater than other potential sites.

164. Trent Valley IDB state that the site lies outside of the Board’s district but within the catchment. The Board’s consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge into any water course (other than a designated main river) from the site.

165. The Environment Agency state that the site is in Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and that the surface flood risk should be assessed.

166. Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust support the allocation of this site as they consider it to have the least damaging impact on biodiversity.

167. Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Committee are disappointed that the sites identified for the Local Plan do not accord with the Neighbourhood Plan, in particular the inclusion of KEY13.

168. The general public have submitted several comments regarding KEY13. The traffic impact on Bunny Lane has been mentioned by many as it is a dangerous junction (14 comments); similarly the junction of Peacock Lane and Keyworth Lane needs upgrading (7 comments). Concerns are also raised in relation to the odour impact from the sewage treatment works (8 comments) and flood impact after heavy rainfall. The loss of agricultural land (3 comments) and wildlife (3 comments) have been highlighted in addition to concerns that the site has been proposed despite it not being allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan (7 comments). Comments have also been made stating that there are legal issues regarding boundaries and ownership making the site unavailable (2 comments) and that the topography of the site will cause several issues. It is also stated that applications for development on this site have been rejected three times in the past.

169. Comments received from those who support development of KEY13 state that the site would be a good location for family housing (5 comments), it is close to village amenities (3 comments) and it would make good use of currently unproductive land. It is also suggested that the site could accommodate more than 50 houses (2 comments).

170. A petition signed by 16 residents of Debdale Lane and surrounding roads was received, in support of the allocation of KEY13. The reasons for support are: direct access to A60, reduced village centre traffic (compared to other sites), reduced parking issues in the village centre and good walking distance to village amenities.
Any other sites in Keyworth (not in the Preferred Options document):

KEY1
171. **Cliffe Investments Ltd** (promoting KEY1) support the allocation of this site and disagree that the Green Belt is a fundamental constraint and that Stanton and Keyworth are already physically connected. They highlight that the site is surrounded by development on three sides.

KEY3
172. **David Wilson Homes** (promoting KEY3) state that this site is more appropriate than those identified as preferred options. They say this is because there are inaccuracies in the Interim Sustainability Appraisal, the Housing Site Selection Interim Report and the Green Belt Review. DWH have submitted a revised Green Belt assessment and a masterplan for KEY3.

KEY5 and KEY6
173. **Hogg** (promoting KEY5 + KEY6) are in support of the development of these sites as a mixed use scheme including retirement housing and employment development, therefore meeting needs of the Neighbourhood Plan. It is accepted that the site is some distance away from the village centre; however, it is close to Wolds Drive local centre and considered to be within walking distance of both. KEY5 and KEY6 have a lower Green Belt and landscape impact than other sites. A masterplan has been submitted in addition to a concept plan of the improvements made to Platt Lane as part of the development.

KEY9
174. **Bloor Homes** (promoting KEY9 + KEY10) support the development of KEY9 as it is preferable to KEY13. It is highlighted as a safeguarded site in the Neighbourhood Plan and is well related to the existing built form. The development of the site can be co-ordinated and integrated with KEY10. Bloor Homes have submitted development proposals and a masterplan for the site.

175. **Nicker Hill Residents** support the development of this site as it is preferable to KEY4a and KEY8. This is because it is more sustainably located, has no impact on nature conservation, has no negative Green Belt impact in terms of coalescence and rounds off the existing built form.
Plumtree Parish Council support development at KEY9 as it is a logical extension to the existing urban area in a non-sensitive landscape area.

Aldergate Properties (promoting KEY11) state that this site is more suitable than those to the north of Keyworth as it is closer to the village centre. They suggest that the landscape evidence commissioned by the Council is unsound, stating that KEY10 and KEY11 should have been assessed as a single site.

Comments from the general public in support of development at KEY11 say that it is in good proximity to the village centre (6 comments) and it has the least impact on the Green Belt. Comments from the general public who oppose development at KEY11 state that it would have an adverse traffic impact on Bunny Lane (3 comments), damage important Green Belt (2 comments) and have an adverse landscape impact due to its topography (3 comments).

Nicker Hill Residents believe development at KEY12 would be a preferable option rather than KEY4a and KEY8. They state it is more sustainably located, there is no adverse impact on nature conservation, it rounds off the existing settlement and has no negative impact on the Green Belt in terms of coalescence.

Davill (landowner of part of KEY14, KEY11 + KEY10) state that parts of KEY14 should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated as part of KEY13 – plans of this have been submitted along with their representation. They raise concern of the negative amenity impact of allocating KEY13 without parts of this site due to continued farming activity on the remaining unallocated area.

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 relation to allocating greenfield land for housing development at Radcliffe on Trent for around 820 houses, more responses objected to the proposals than
supported them. In total, **59 supported** the proposed allocation whereas **84 opposed**.

182. **Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council** state that the Neighbourhood Plan set a minimum of 400 dwellings during the plan period so a proposal of 820 new dwellings is a concern. They also state that the village is in need of an extension to the junior school, a new health centre, improved leisure facilities and improvements to bus and train services.

183. **Mosaic Group** (promoting RAD01) believe there should be no cap on housing numbers in Radcliffe as the Core Strategy does not state there should be. The limit should be subject to the physical and environmental capacity.

184. **William Davis Ltd** (promoting RAD03) suggest Radcliffe has significant capacity for growth but it has experienced little development in the last 20 years. They also state that development would support regeneration objectives in the Neighbourhood Plan and retain services in the settlement such as schools which have a declining role due to aging in the village.

185. **Historic England** state that preferred sites should consider the impact on the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting, also noting the impact on Green Belt sensitivity. They also highlight that the majority of ridge and furrow evident in Radcliffe on Trent has been lost due to intensive farming so sites would need to demonstrate they meet the requirements of NPPF para 135. It is recommended that advice is sought from the local archaeological curator for each proposed site.

186. **Education & Skills Agency** state that the emerging ESFA proposals for forward funding schools as part of the large residential development may be of interest to the council.

187. **Nottinghamshire County Council** state that there are primary school capacity constraints at Radcliffe on Trent, particularly at the infant school, even in terms of accommodating the minimum level of 400 set by the Core Strategy. Further assessment and discussion is on-going within the Local Authority and the County Council wishes to discuss further the education infrastructure to support these allocations prior to the completion of the Local Plan Part 2.

188. **Aslockton Parish Council** agree that Radcliffe should have a substantial proportion of the housing allocations as it is close to the main urban area. They state that improved infrastructure is required to accommodate the increase.

189. **RNCSIG** state that greenfield land site allocation must be kept to an absolute minimum and damage or loss to our local wildlife capital should be avoided.
190. **CPRE** oppose the allocation of land for 820 houses as there is no justification to increase the Core Strategy target. Facilities have deteriorated, for example the health centre is over capacity.

191. **Sport England** are concerned at that the allocation of greenfield sites for development and seek to ensure no playing field sites are developed. They are in support of development which encourages active lifestyles such as walkable communities, connected footpaths and cycle routes. They also state that a population increase of this size will increase demand for sporting facilities so the council should use the PPS and BFS to meet demand.

192. **Langridge Homes Ltd** (promoting COT03), **Simpson, Collington and Robinson** (promoting land at Costock) and **Ruzicka** (promoting COT05) support the total number of homes proposed at Radcliffe on Trent.

193. In terms of responses from the general public, the following matters were raised in relation to 820 new houses allocated at Radcliffe on Trent:

- Traffic is currently an issue so new residential development would worsen the problem (47 comments).
- Agree that Radcliffe should be allocated houses to help reach the borough target (12 comments).
- Radcliffe needs more affordable housing (12 comments).
- Car parking in the village is a problem (15 comments).
- There are access issues onto and off the A52 throughout the village (7 comments).
- Greenfield land in the village should not be developed (18 comments).
- Facilities and services in the village, including schools and the medical centre, are already at capacity (30 comments).
- Too many houses are proposed (12 comments); a total of 400 houses as proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan is a more suitable figure (11 comments).
- Bus services are already at capacity (15 comments).
- Increased traffic from new developments poses a greater risk to pedestrians (9 comments).
- Concerns that the village is growing into the size of a town if there is a 25% increase in population from new residential development (11 comments).
- Concerns that Radcliffe and Holme Pierrepont will merge (2 comments).
- The sewerage and drainage infrastructure will not be able to cope with new housing (6 comments).
• There is a need for smaller housing types (e.g. 2 bed) for first time buyers and for people wanting to downsize (8 comments).
• There is a need for bungalows especially for the elderly (6 comments).
• All new houses must be of high quality and fit into their surrounding character (7 comments).
• Radcliffe has several brownfield sites which should be built on first (5 comments) – suggestions include the land adjoining The Royal Oak and the Trent Hotel.
• Radcliffe on Trent has good transport links to Nottingham and Leicester.
• Several responses were concerned that the consultation document states 1,000 houses are needed for a new school; but only 820 houses are proposed (6 comments).
• Development in Radcliffe would be a departure from the Core Strategy’s focus on development near the main urban area (2 comments).
• A proportion of plots throughout the village should be self-build (2 comments).
• The village needs a leisure centre (3 comments).
• The Council’s analysis of the sites is well-considered and robust.
• Suggested roundabout at the Bingham Road/A52 junction including a road connecting it to RAD03 across the railway line.

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

194. When asked whether there is support for each individual site in Radcliffe on Trent, the following responses were received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAD01 – Land North of Nottingham Road</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD02 – Land Adjacent Grooms Cottage</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD03 – Land off Shelford Road</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD05a – Land North of Grantham Road to South of Railway Line (1a)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD06 – 72 Main Road</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD13 – The Paddock, Nottingham Road</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
195. RAD03 is the only site where opposition for the allocation is greater than the support.

RAD01 – Land North of Nottingham Road

196. **Mosaic Group** (promoting RAD01) state that the site has several positives: it is well related to the existing settlement, has clear defensible boundaries, no ecological objections from Natural England or Wildlife Trust and has no flood risk from the river. Mosaic Group believe the ‘blanket provision’ of employment land on the site is unsubstantiated so 300 dwellings should be developed rather than the proposed 150. There is a risk of surface water flooding on the site; however, this can be mitigated through SUDS also adding to the site’s green infrastructure. The noise impact from the RSPCA kennels adjacent to the site will be fully mitigated with 3m high acoustic fencing. A previous planning application on this site was recommended for approval by planning officers and statutory consultees but it was ultimately refused due to the Green Belt location (application ref: 13/02498/OUT).

197. **Crown Estate** (promoting RAD12) have concerns as RAD01 is in Flood Zone 2. They believe RAD12 would be a better allocation due to the reduced risk as it has no flood history.

198. **National Grid** highlight that RAD01 is crossed by a National Grid high voltage electricity transition overhead line and that it is preferred that buildings are not developed directly beneath them for maintenance and amenity reasons. Any proposed changes in ground level must not infringe on the minimum safety clearance. However, National Grid does encourage high quality, well-planned development in the vicinity of overhead wires, for example open space, nature conservation, landscaping or parking courts.

199. **Nottinghamshire County Council** state that RAD01 is within the sand and gravel Minerals Safeguarding and Consultation Area. However, the edge of settlement location indicates they would be unlikely to be at risk of sterilising the area of the resource that has the potential to be worked.

200. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** state that the development of RAD01 would impact the natural countryside, a network of scarce grasslands, a disused railway nature corridor and Skylarks Nature Reserve.

201. **RNCSIG** are concerned about the impact on the disused Cotgrave Railway Corridor which is part of the Cotgrave Forest Focus Area for targeted nature conservation. They state that there is also a potential impact on Skylarks
Nature Reserve which could restrict future habitat work between the A52 and the river.

202. The **Environment Agency** state that RAD01 is located in Flood Zone 2 (medium risk) with a small area to the south west in Flood Zone 3 (high risk). Therefore this site is subject to a flood risk sequential test and a flood risk assessment (FRA). Modelling from the Greater Nottingham Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2016) shows there would be a large area of flooding in the north of the site in the event of a 1 in 100 year 20% climate change scenario. There would also be flooding across the site in the event of a 1 in 100 year 30% climate change breach of defence scenario.

203. Other comments received in relation to RAD01 showed a general concern of the flood risk on the site (6 comments) and that residents would find accessing the site very difficult (3 comments). However, (4 comments) stated that RAD01 is the most appropriate of all sites In Radcliffe on Trent as it is away from the village centre. Other comments suggest the site is a good location for affordable housing and it is close to transport connections to Nottingham.

RAD02 – Land Adjacent Grooms Cottage

204. **Oglesby** (landowner of RAD02) are in full support of allocating this site. They state that RAD02 has several advantages compared to other sites in the settlement: low Green Belt importance, low landscape value and deliverable within five years. Development would have a design, mix and layout which would be in-keeping with the wider area. They also say that the development of this site is essentially a large infill which rounds off the settlement.

205. The **Environment Agency** state that the site is located within Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and that the surface water risk should be assessed. A watercourse to the south of RAD02 also abuts RAD05a. This should not be culverted, but instead enhanced and incorporated into the development design of both sites.

206. **Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council** suggest the combined number of dwellings proposed for RAD02 + RAD03 should be scaled back from 450 to 150 to alleviate pressure on the already busy Shelford Road. If 450 dwellings are proposed on both sites, the Parish Council suggest a bridge across the railway line connecting to the A52 to avoid the town would be a suitable compromise.

207. Orchard House Care Home opposite the site says they have several residents who are sensitive to certain noises so construction work would cause distress. They suggest that if the development does go ahead, proposals should include a wheelchair accessible open space with a sensory garden.
208. One common response regarding RAD02 states that the roads around the site are already at capacity so access will be an issue (12 comments). Other comments received in relation to the site state that 50 houses are too many (6 comments), consideration of noise and light/shadowing should be made for existing neighbouring properties (5 comments) and that the site should remain for agriculture and wildlife (2 comments).

RAD03 – Land off Shelford Road

209. William Davis Ltd (promoting RAD03) support the delivery of housing on this site. They state there are several advantages of developing RAD03: hedgerows and trees will be retained in addition to substantial tree planting, contributions will be made to improving the local bus service and the site has a low impact on the Green Belt. They say the housing mix is yet to be determined, however, 30% of dwellings will be affordable housing. In addition to 400 dwellings, the site can accommodate 5.12ha of open space, a new primary school and a new medical centre. They also highlight that a new roundabout on Shelton Road will act as a gateway feature which will slow traffic down when entering the village.

210. Oglesby (landowner of adjacent site RAD02) are in full support of developing this site. They state that RAD03 has several advantages compared to other sites in the settlement: low Green Belt importance, low landscape value and it is essentially large scale infill which rounds-off the settlement. They state that any proposals will have a mix, design and layout in-keeping with the wider area.

211. Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council suggest the combined number of dwellings proposed for RAD02 + RAD03 should be scaled back from 450 to 150 to alleviate pressure on the already busy Shelford Road. If 450 dwellings are proposed on both sites, a bridge across the railway line connecting to the A52 to avoid the town would be a suitable compromise.

212. The Environment Agency state that the site is in Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and surface water flood risk should be assessed. A watercourse to the south of RAD03 also abuts RAD05a and should not be culverted, but instead integrated into the development design.

213. Severn Trent highlight that the development of the site would have a medium impact on sewerage infrastructure as foul flows from the development will join a 150mm diameter foul flow sewer on Clumber Drive. There are low return periods predicted downstream and flooding incidents have been reported on Bingham Road. Surface water will be able to discharge to the south of the development to a local watercourse.
214. **CPRE** oppose the allocation of RAD04 as it will have the largest landscape impact on Radcliffe due to its large size. It would encroach into open countryside, adversely affect currently unobstructed views and detract from local amenity with regards to footpaths in the area which are well used.

215. Several additional comments received stated that there are issues regarding highways and access to the site. One main response was that the roads around the site are already at capacity (23 comments). Several responses also suggested the site needs a bridge across the railway line to connect it to the A52 to avoid the village centre (27 comments); this would also benefit site RAD02.

216. Other comments received regarding the allocation of RAD03 suggested that there were too many dwellings proposed (12 comments), that a new health centre and school on site would not work as it only serves part of the village (9 comments) and that the site should remain for agricultural use and wildlife (3 comments). Other responses were in favour of a new heath centre being delivered as part of the development (5 comments), but existing residents should be considered in terms of shadowing and overlooking (4 comments).

**RAD05a – Land North of Grantham Road to South of Railway Line (1a)**

217. **Samworth Farms Ltd** (landowners of RAD05a) state that the advantages of developing the site are: the low Green Belt score, the clear defensible boundaries and no loss of heritage or biodiversity. They state, however, that there will be an increase in biodiversity due to the use of SUDS on site in addition to enhancements to surrounding trees and hedges. It is highlighted that RAD05a is identified for housing in the Neighbourhood Plan and the walking distance to facilities and public transport makes the site a suitable allocation. They also state that there is an opportunity to develop a community facility as part of the proposals.

218. The **Environment Agency** state that RAD05a is in Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and that surface water flood risk should be assessed. They also bring to attention a stream which runs through the site. It should not be culverted but rather enhanced and incorporated into the development proposals. It is also stated that the site abuts Saxondale Railway Local Wildlife Site which will need protecting from any development.

219. **Highways England** raise specific concerns regarding RAD05a as it may require direct access from the A52. They would prefer other options to be
considered ahead of this site and expect the Council to demonstrate that no reasonable alternative options exist before considering access onto the A52.

220. Other comments received in relation to site RAD05a objected to the allocation on the grounds that the A52 already has traffic issues so new housing on this site will add to the problem (12 comments) and that 140 dwellings is too many. Other comments stated, however, that the site is good for development as its good access onto the A52 avoids the village centre. The suggestion for a safe pedestrian crossing across the A52 as part of the proposals was also made (5 comments).

221. One comment suggests access to the site should be via the industrial estate to ease congestion on the A52. Other comments relating to highways issues stated that a traffic light controlled junction is not wanted as it would create another bottleneck in the village road network (2 comments).

222. Alternative suggested uses of the site include a park and ride service to Nottingham and Bingham or retention of the site for use as agricultural land and for wildlife

RAD06 – 72 Main Road

223. The Environment Agency highlight that the site is in Flood Zone 2 (medium risk) and surface water flooding should be addressed. The Greater Nottingham Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2016) shows flooding on the site in the event of a 1 in 100 year 30% climate change breach of defences scenario. It also shows flooding in a 10 in 100 year 50% climate change scenario (due to overtopping of the Trent defences). Therefore the site is subject to a flood risk sequential test and a Flood Risk Analysis (FRA).

224. Nottinghamshire County Council state that RAD06 is within the sand and gravel Minerals Safeguarding and Consultation Area. However, the edge of settlement location indicates they would be unlikely to be at risk of sterilising the area of the resource that has the potential to be worked.

225. RNCSIG object to RAD06 as it is open recreational land with some wildlife value.

226. Other comments received identified the site as a good choice for housing due to its central location (4 comments). Additional comments highlight that the site currently proposes poor access but could accommodate more than 5 houses if this was improved. Alternative uses of the site suggested are for small affordable houses or the new health centre.
RAD13 – The Paddock, Nottingham Road

227. **Mosaic Group** identify this site as a preferable location for employment use rather than at RAD01 (which they are promoting). They base this upon its self-contained layout and proximity to the A52 where noise and air quality are an issue for housing.

228. The **Environment Agency** state that the site is located within Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and that the surface water flood risk should be assessed.

229. **Nottinghamshire County Council** state that RAD13 is within the sand and gravel Minerals Safeguarding and Consultation Area. However, the edge of settlement location indicates they would be unlikely to be at risk of sterilising the area of the resource that has the potential to be worked.

230. Other comments received identified the flood risk on site from poor drainage and water rising from beneath the surface (2 comments). One comment highlighted that a previous application on the site contained a comment advising that the ‘traffic noise levels are dominant’.

231. It is suggested that the mature trees and hedgerows on the site should be retained to ensure the approach into Radcliffe on Trent remains attractive.

Any Other Sites in Radcliffe (not in Preferred Sites document):

232. **Radcliffe on Trent Golf Club** are willing to reduce the size of RAD09 to alleviate concerns. They state that the Green Belt impact is less on RAD09 in comparison to other sites in the village. It is suggested that trees for screening can be used to alleviate concerns regarding the visibility of the site. Other advantages identified by the landowners include: close proximity to the village centre, no loss of quality agricultural land and no heritage impacts.

**Radcliffe on Trent Golf Club** would also be willing to promote site RAD10 alone rather than two sites (RAD09 + RAD10) to alleviate concerns. They state that any new homes would be low density to fit in with the surrounding development and that the Green Belt impact is low compared to other sites in the village. It is also stated that concerns about the loss of sporting facilities are invalid as the land is unused for golf practice, as of two years ago.

233. **Freeston J** (landowners of site RAD11) state that the Green Belt should be extended to the former mineral railway which will act as a strong defensible
boundary. The landowner states that concerns for access to the site can be alleviated through co-operation with adjoining land owners. Other advantages of allocating RAD11 identified by the landowner include the low landscape value and low-medium Green Belt importance.

234. **Crown Estate** (the landowner of **RAD12**) identify their site as a better choice to deliver houses on rather than RAD01 which they believe is unsound. They disagreed with the site’s landscape and Green Belt scoring and suggest they are in fact lower than stated; therefore the site is suitable for development. Crown Estate highlight that RAD12 could deliver up to 600 dwellings and it is available for development in the early part of the local plan period.

**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?*

235. In response to the question whether consultees agreed that Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for housing development at Ruddington for around 410 homes in total, a significantly greater number disagreed. 49 agreed whereas 548 disagreed.

236. 387 of the 548 objections were submitted as a signed pro-forma letter. This is summarised within the resident’s responses below.

237. **Ruddington Parish Council** believes that no more than 250 new homes should be allocated within the greenbelt at Ruddington. Ruddington is not the solution to the major strategic sites failing to deliver housing.

238. **Aslockton Parish Council** highlights that Ruddington has a large range of potential sites and as a key settlement, has a somewhat lower percentage increase than not only most of the key settlements but that of some of the other villages.

239. **Historic England** state that preferred sites should consider the impact on the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting and noting impact on Green Belt sensitivity.

240. **Sport England** is concerned over the allocation of greenfield sites. Care should be taken not to include any playing field sites within these allocations. Developments of this size should be designed to promote active lifestyles.
through sport and physical activity. This level of population increase would create further demand for sporting facilities. Therefore the council should use the PPS and BFS to understand and meet current and new demand.

241. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** considers the allocated sites more preferable than those originally considered.

242. **RNCSIG** state that greenfield site allocations must be kept to an absolute minimum and damage or loss to our local wildlife capital should be avoided. All sites represent a major intrusion into the wider countryside should be avoided.

243. **Simpson** (promoting RUD11), **Mordecai** (promoting RUD06), **Space Foods Ltd** (promoting RUD07), **Langridge Homes Ltd** (promoting COT03), **Loughborough Road Consortium** (promoting RUD03), **Nottingham City Transport**, and **Collington and Robinson** (promoting land at Costock) support the allocation of land for 410 homes.

244. **William Davis Ltd** (promoting RUD13) and **Taylor Wimpey** (promoting RUD08) disagree. The former believes the 410 should be set as a minimum (‘at least’), whilst the latter considers Ruddington a suitable location for a higher proportion of homes than other key settlements. **Peveril Homes** (promoting land to the north of Tollerton) suggest that these sites should be re-allocated at Tollerton.

245. **Ruddington Action Group** states that 410 does not reflect the spirit of Core Strategy Policy 3 and that existing permissions will increase the number of new homes in Ruddington overall by 24%. Furthermore the SA does not address the distances from the village centre which will increase car use and congestion; the SA incorrectly refers to a leisure centre; and increases in housing will not necessarily support services. SWOT analysis of the Conservation Area identified inadequate road infrastructure, lack of parking and development in the Green Belt without improvements as threats.

246. Residents highlighted the following objections to the allocation of land at Ruddington for 410 homes:

- 410 are too many. 250 should be the limit. Ruddington has provided sufficient housing and should not compensate for failure of other sites to deliver. The Council should focus on bringing these sites forward rather than allow further land banking and increased developer profits.
- Inadequate services and facilities – school, medical centre, dentist and sewage treatment are at capacity. Bus services have reduced.
- Poor road infrastructure, especially within the village centre and on the A60. Exacerbated by lack of parking and development at Sharphill Hill. Relief roads to the north and south, a one way system in the centre, and improvements to road junctions on the A60 were suggested.
- Loss of green field and Green Belt should be prevented. Contrary to Green Belt policy which protects openness, the merging of settlements, and should be permanent. Higher density development should be focused on brownfield sites. Vacant properties should be brought back into use.
- Sites outside the Green Belt that are sustainable should be prioritised.
- Loss of village identity and impacts on quality of life as village becomes a part of the Nottingham conurbation.
- Impacts on wildlife and heritage assets (including conservation area).
- Other villages are more suitable and sustainable.
- Homes already delivered should count towards the total.

247. Residents made the following positive comments:

- Development could provide affordable housing and properties for elderly residents who wish to downsize.
- Should be more than 410 as infrastructure is in place (in Ruddington and nearby West Bridgford (accessible by bus)) and new homes would help sustain services and the vitality of the village. Any infrastructure concerns can be addressed through S106.
- Development should include gardens and green corridors for wildlife.
- New homes should not be pastiche mock homes. They should provide an attractive entrance to the village.

248. 387 individually signed pro-forma letters were received. The letter objected to the allocation of land for 410 new homes on the basis that a combined increase in housing of 25% since 2011 (resulting from existing permissions, the potential development of remaining brownfield sites and the allocation of land for 410 new homes) would impact on services and facilities, the vitality of the village centre (as congestion increases), and quality of life of residents. A significant reduction in the number of new homes is proposed.

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

249. The following representations were received:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUD01</td>
<td>Land to the west of Wilford Road</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD05</td>
<td>Land south of Flawforth Lane</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD11</td>
<td>Old Loughborough Road</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUD13</td>
<td>Land Opposite Mere Way</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

250. 208 of the 299 objections to RUD11 were submitted as a signed pro-forma letter. This is summarised within the residents’ comments on RUD11 below.

251. **Nottinghamshire County Council** state that any development in this Planning Area would rely on the growth of St Peter’s C of E Junior School, and this is the subject of on-going discussion currently. The County Council wishes to discuss further the education infrastructure to support these allocations prior to the completion of the Local Plan.

252. **Aslockton Parish Council** supports the allocation of all four sites.

253. **The Environment Agency** state that a surface water risk assessment should be undertaken on all 4 sites.

254. **Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board** state that all four sites lie outside the Board’s district but within the catchment. The Board’s consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.

255. **Bloor Homes** (promoting RUD01), **Linden Strategic Land Ltd** (promoting RUD05), **Simpson** (promoting RUD11), and **William Davis Ltd** (promoting RUD13) support the allocation of their respective sites for housing. They have all provided further evidence that address constraints (e.g. flood risk, Green Belt importance, protection of open space, and boundary treatments).

256. **Mordecai** (promoting RUD06) also supports the allocation of RUD05 and RUD13. **Nottingham City Transport** and **Ruzicka** (promoting COT05) support the allocation of all four sites.

257. **Space Foods Ltd** (promoting RUD07) and **Taylor Wimpey** (promoting RUD08) state that their sites should be allocated. RUD07 is of low green belt importance and impacts on highway network and noise from kennels can be mitigated (evidence will be provided at the forthcoming appeal). RUD08 is well connected to the village and local facilities, close to public transport, and green belt and landscape impacts can be mitigated.
258. **Burt** (promoting RUD04) considers RUD04 well located and impacts on heritage assets can be mitigated.

259. **Loughborough Road Consortium** (promoting RUD03) considers RUD03 deliverable. It could contribute to meeting self-build requirements and provide an area of expansion for the school and alternative access. They also consider that the criteria for selecting additional proposed housing sites at Ruddington have not been applied consistently. They state that there is particular respect to this for sites RUD11, RUD13 and RUD05 which all have higher Strategic Green Belt Scores than RUD03. It is also stated that RUD11 also has a higher site specific Green Belt score compared to RUD03.

**RUD01 – Land to the west of Wilford Road (south)**

260. **Ruddington Parish Council** object to the allocation of RUD01

261. **Environment Agency** state that RUD01 is within flood zone 2 with the north east corner in flood zone 3. A sequential test and flood risk assessment is therefore required. Surface water flood risks should be assessed. Packman Dyke should not be culverted, but instead enhanced.

262. **Sport England** objects to RUD01 as it involves the loss of a playing field site. Sport England find it encouraging that it is noted that equivalent or better provision is required as part of the application. However, to make the replacement site viable it should also be allocated as part of the local plan. The site is listed as an asset of community value and covered within the Playing Pitch Strategy as a disused site. However, the strategy also highlights deficiencies for playing fields provision within the area which suggests that the facility needs to be retained unless justification can be provided. In addition the growth in population may create demand for additional pitches and other sports facilities which should also be given consideration.

263. **RNCSIG** consider RUD01 an intrusion into wider countryside.

264. **Gladman Development Ltd** (promoting land at East Leake), **Loughborough Road Consortium** (promoting RUD03) and **Space Foods Ltd** (promoting RUD07) object to the allocation of RUD01. They highlight non-compliance with Green Belt policy (notably merging) and flood risks (and the application of the sequential test) as issues that constrain the site and prevent its allocation and delivery.

265. Residents submitted the following objections to RUD01:
• Loss of Sellors Field which is accessible to a large number of residents and given to the residents. It is protected by a covenant and identified as an asset of community value. Should not be moved to a less accessible location.
• Would merge Ruddington with Nottingham – contrary to Green Belt policy.
• Flood risks for residents and increased risk for neighbouring properties. There are opportunities to avoid flood zones 2 and 3.
• Loss of Green Belt countryside.
• Increased traffic congestion on Wilford Road and within the village centre. Exacerbated by inadequate parking spaces and its isolated location which will encourage driving.
• Dangerous access off Wilford Road. However there should be no access of Camelot Street.
• Inadequate services and facilities – schools and medical centre.
• Impact on wildlife, including effects on Packman Dyke and Willwell Farm Cutting. Loss of hedgerows and trees, including the poplar trees. Should remain a green corridor.
• Loss of rural views and rural setting/gateway of Ruddington. A high quality design is therefore required.
• The site should be a school.

266. Residents submitted the following positive/guiding comments:

• Should contain a mix of properties to meet needs of first time buyers and downsizers.
• Should provide affordable housing.
• Provides access to Clifton, Wilford and West Bridgford without going through the centre of the village. Avoids busy A60.
• Has pedestrian and cycle access to the village centre and St Peters School.
• Could provide a village hall.
• A link road to Nottingham Knight Roundabout should be built.

RUD05 – Land south of Flawforth Lane

267. Ruddington Parish Council supports the allocation of RUD05.

268. Historic England recommend that provisions be made within specific site criteria and supporting text justification to ensure that development considers the Conservation Area to the west and listed structures at Easthorpe House,
including any enhancement opportunities for views and/or mitigation measures that may be required.

269. **RNCSIG** consider RUD05 an intrusion into wider countryside.

270. **Loughborough Road Consortium** (promoting RUD03) support RUD05

271. Residents submitted the following objections to RUD05:

- Flawforth Lane is congested at peak times as the road is too narrow. This is exacerbated by development at Edwalton.
- Dangerous A60/Flawforth Lane junction. A60 disconnects the isolated site from the village.
- The A60 forms the eastern boundary of the village. Allocating RUD05 breaks this robust boundary. This weakening would result in further development.
- Adverse impacts on wildlife and green corridor south of the village.
- Detrimental to street scene, setting of village and Conservation Area. Therefore requires a high quality design.
- Surface water run-off causes ditch on Flawforth Lane overflows.
- Adverse impacts on neighbouring properties. One is completely surrounded.

272. Residents submitted the following positive/guiding comments:

- Trees should be preserved on site as these provide screening and a backdrop for neighbouring residents.
- Could, in addition to RUD13, provide alternative route between Flawforth Lane and A60.
- Should deliver affordable housing, open spaces and adequate parking.
- Access to Wheatcroft Roundabout and A609 – avoiding the village centre.
- Could deliver more homes, including bungalows and affordable housing.

**RUD11 – Old Loughborough Road**

273. **Ruddington Parish Council** objects to the allocation of RUD11.

274. **Burt** (promoting RUD04), the **Loughborough Road Consortium** (promoting RUD03) and **Space Food Ltd** (promoting RUD07) object to the allocation of RUD11 as the allocation of land for 10 units in the Green Belt is flawed and conflicts with NPPF para 17. Site is fundamentally constrained by the Green Belt designation. Conflict with Green Belt policy cannot be reconciled as
openness would be affected and distance between Ruddington and existing
development to the north will be reduced. Self/custom build is not ‘appropriate
development’ in the Green Belt and would not constitute ‘very special
circumstances’. Furthermore, Taylor Wimpey (promoting RU08) and Burt
state that the site is beyond a 20 minute walk to the village centre and therefore
unsustainable.

275. Residents submitted the following objections to RUD11:

- Site is in an unsustainable location. Distance from the village centre will
  encourage car usage and increase congestion. Convenience store on
  Ashworth Avenue has closed.
- Land provides visual separation for Ruddington and it is visible within the
  wider landscape.
- An outlying area which prevents the merging/coalescence of Ruddington
  with Nottingham. Contrary to Council’s position regarding the importance
  of this area of Green Belt.
- Development would affect the historic bridleway and former tollhouse,
  local amenity/tranquility enjoyed by residents, walkers and cyclists and
  the setting of Ruddington Hall.
- Adverse impacts on wildlife – including a green corridor north of the
  village.
- Increased congestion on the A60/A52 and Old Loughborough Road.
- Junction on A60 is dangerous.
- Out of character with neighbouring frontage development. Self-build will
  encourage a range of styles and use of materials.
- Sloping site.
- Would make an insignificant contribution to meeting housing targets
- Loss of agricultural land.
- Expensive location where only top end self-build will occur. Need more
  affordable locations for self-build.

276. Residents submitted the following positive/guiding comments:

- Should deliver a mix of housing, including affordable homes. Not just large
  properties.
- Small development – least impact.
- A high quality design which includes open space and adequate parking is
  required.
- Frontage development only.
- Close to bus routes and bus stops on the A60.
277. A standard pro-forma letter of objection against the allocation of RUD11 was received from 208 residents. This letter identifies: the site’s scenic, hillside location and the visual separation this site provides between Ruddington and West Bridgford; even a limited number of homes is contrary to Green Belt policy; development would spoil the amenity of the neighbouring historic bridleway and setting of Ruddington Hall; it would also remove agricultural land from production; and destroy a wildlife corridor.

RUD13 – Land opposite Mere Way

278. Ruddington Parish Council supports the allocation of RUD13.

279. Bradmore Parish Council believes RUD13 would have serious impacts on peak traffic flow around the business park. If allocated it should include affordable housing.

280. Historic England recommends that provisions be made that any development proposal for RUD13 considers the Conservation Area to the west including any enhancement opportunities for views and/or mitigation measures that may be required.

281. Severn Trent highlight that a medium impact on sewage infrastructure. Analysis predicts flooding in low return periods downstream from the development. Due to topography flows may have to be pumped. Surface water can be drained to a watercourse to the east of the development.

282. RNCSIG consider RUD13 an intrusion into wider countryside.

283. Loughborough Road Consortium (promoting RUD03) and Gladman Development Ltd (promoting land at East Leake) object to the allocation of RUD13 as it does not comply with Green Belt assessment. A60 is a robust boundary and development would constitute intrusion into the Green Belt. Loughborough Road Consortium additionally add that the development of RUD13 would put extreme pressure on other sites in the conservation area that are not currently allocated for housing.

284. Residents submitted the following objections to RUD13:

- Site is too large and projects into open countryside, beyond the A60 which is a robust and defensible boundary. It is therefore contrary to Green Belt policy.
- Increased congestion on the A60 and at the junction with Flawforth Lane. Site should be reduced in scale to limit highways impact.
• The A60 separates the site from the village – it will be a satellite with no amenities. Will require a crossing point.
• Adverse impacts on wildlife and a corridor south of the village.
• Would adversely affect Conservation Area and Croft House.

285. Residents submitted the following comments on the development of the site:

• Site could be expanded to accommodate more homes.
• Easy access onto the A60 (and bus routes), avoiding the village centre.
• If allocated with RUD05, a link road between the A60 and Flawforth Lane could be provided.
• Should provide a mix of homes, including affordable homes.
• A high quality of design is required in order to provide an attractive approach/gateway into Ruddington.

286. Residents also submitted comments on sites which have not been selected as preferred allocations. This includes RUD07 and concerns regarding access, safety of pedestrians and impact on the setting of the Country Park. Positive comments on RUD08 highlighted its proximity to the village, location west of the village (which avoids traffic through the village) and Fairham Brook being a natural barrier. RUD06 is suggested as it is not located in a sensitive area of the Conservation Area.

Any Other Sites in Ruddington (not in Preferred Sites document):

RUD03 – Land Adjacent to St Peters Junior School

287. Loughborough Road Consortium (landowners of RUD03) state that housing development on RUD03 has several positive attributes. It is identified as being immediately deliverable, has good access to the A60 and would contribute toward other services in Ruddington. They say the site would provide affordable housing in line with policy requirements in addition to an element of self/custom-build. It is stated that the site has a capacity of approximately 70 dwellings.

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?
288. In relation to allocating greenfield land for housing development at Cropwell Bishop for around 160 houses, more respondents support the proposal compared to those who object to it. Of the 113 responses to this question, **59 support** the allocation of 160 homes whereas **54 object** to the proposal.

289. **Terra Strategic** (promoting CBI05) support housing growth on Cropwell Bishop’s greenfield sites as there is a good range of village facilities to support it. They state that the village has not experienced growth for 20-30 years but it is much needed to support existing local services.

290. **Davidsons** (promoting CBI02) highlight that greenfield land is generally quicker to deliver housing on and has less complicated infrastructure issues, therefore good for boosting the housing supply. Davidsons believe that Cropwell Bishop has the ability to support more than 160 new houses whilst still balancing landscape and Green Belt constraints.

291. **Peveril Homes** (promoting land to the north of Tollerton) object to the proposed allocation of housing at Cropwell Bishop. They believe consideration should be given to re-allocate some or all of these dwellings to sites at Tollerton.

292. **Nottingham County Council** state that there is a capacity for the local primary school to accommodate housing growth of this level.

They also state that both allocated sites are within the gypsum Minerals Safeguarding and Consultation Area. British Gypsum should be contacted regarding the history and future of gypsum works in the vicinity of the proposed sites.

293. **Langar cum Barnston Parish Council** state that additional housing in Cropwell Bishop will impact on the surrounding villages’ interconnections and infrastructure. They have concerns that more houses will result in more traffic, therefore resulting in drivers to seek alternate ‘rat run’ routes through smaller outlying villages. The Parish Council also suggest improvements to infrastructure and facilities are delivered before any development begins.

294. **Aslockton Parish Council** do not support development in villages other than for local need. However, Cropwell Bishop is a village but it does have several facilities including a health centre so must be considered for allocations as a preferred ‘other village’ location.

295. **Historic England** state that the preferred sites should consider the impact on the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting, also noting the impact on Green Belt sensitivity.
296. **CPRE** oppose the allocation of 160 houses as the village has few facilities and only a skeletal bus service.

297. **RNCSIG** state that greenfield site allocation must be kept to an absolute minimum and damage or loss to local wildlife capital should be avoided. Major intrusions into the wider countryside should be avoided.

298. **Simpson** (promoting RUD11), **Ruzicka** (promoting COT05) and **Collington and Robinson** (promoting land at Costock) support the housing numbers proposed.

299. In terms of responses from the general public, the following comments and issues were raised in relation to 160 new houses on greenfield land in Cropwell Bishop:

- Traffic and congestion is an existing issue (25 comments).
- The existing road surface quality is very poor (4 comments).
- Village facilities are under capacity pressure, especially the school (25 comments).
- Too many houses, it is unsustainable (15 comments).
- Greenfield land should not be built on (11 comments).
- An improved bus services is needed (10 comments).
- Cropwell Bishop needs more affordable homes (10 comments).
- Open space provision and tree planting should be a priority (8 comments).
- There has been too much development recently; notably the chicken farm, other housing developments, landfill site, rebuild of the Co-op and Severn Trent sewerage works upgrade (8 comments).
- On-street parking is a problem (7 comments).
- Sewerage and drainage does not have the capacity to support new houses (7 comments).
- Cropwell Butler has 0 allocations but should take a share of those allocated at Cropwell Bishop (3 comments).
- Rich local wildlife should be considered (5 comments).
- There are several brownfield site which should be developed before any greenfield sites (3 comments). Suggested: site between 9 and 19 Church Street for 20 dwellings.
- Allocations in Cropwell Bishop represent a departure from the Core Strategy’s focus on development adjacent or within the main urban area.

324
**Question 15:** Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following sites at Cropwell Bishop?

300. When asked whether there is support for each individual site in Cropwell Bishop, the following responses were received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBI02 – Land North of Memorial Hall (1)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBI05 – Land East of Church Street</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

301. CBI02 has a majority objection to the proposals for housing development, whereas CBI05 has a majority in support of development.

**CBI02 – Land North of Memorial Hall (1)**

302. **Cropwell Bishop Parish Council** does not agree with the proposals for housing development on CBI02 and suggest it would be better suited for recreation. A suggested preferred solution would be to develop only the north east corner of the site along with the east side of CBI03 (which is no longer being allocated).

303. **Hurst and Richards** (promoting site CBI01 which is not being allocated at this point of the plan process) state that the development of this site would clearly be sprawl into the countryside.

304. **Davidsons** (promoting CBI02) support the development of CBI02 and are committed to early delivery of the site. It is also stated that following a transport appraisal, it is demonstrated that new traffic generated from the site can be safely accommodated by the highway infrastructure. Davidsons also state that the site will have suitable access from Mercia Avenue, not from Nottingham Road. Proposed design principles include: retention and planting of vegetation, low density development toward the edge, retention of public rights of way, a ’village feel’ character, a green buffer along the bridleway corridor and a housing mix to include affordable homes.

305. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** highlight the potential adverse impacts on the adjacent Local Wildlife Site and Green Infrastructure Corridor of the Grantham Canal. Protected species are resident adjacent to the site and they currently use CBI02 for foraging. Increased footfall, changes in management and increased dog walking will affect the sensitive Hoehill Pasture Local Wildlife Site.
306. **Historic England** state that the site could offer an opportunity to better reveal and enhance the former Grantham Canal heritage asset by incorporating it into open space as part of green infrastructure as well as cultural heritage.

307. **RNCSIG** also state their concerns regarding the adjacent Grantham Canal Local Wildlife Site and nature corridor. They suggest it must be adequately buffered from development.

308. The **Environment Agency** identify the site as being within Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and the surface water risk should be assessed. They also state that the site lies adjacent to several Local Wildlife Sites (Hoehill Pasture and Grantham Canal) which must not be impacted by development, but instead enhanced.

309. **Trent Valley IDB** state that the site lies outside the Board’s district but within the catchment. The Board’s consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made into any watercourse, other than a designated main river.

310. **RNCSIG** state that Grantham Canal is a Local Wildlife Site and important green corridor so must be buffered.

311. **Simpson** (promoting RUD11) and **Ruzicka** (promoting COT05) both object to the allocation of CBI02.

312. In terms of additional comments from members of the public there is a shared view that the access to the site via Mercia Avenue is not suitable (17 comments). This concern is due to the disruption and issues it would cause to the elderly residents who reside there. Other responses show concern of development impacting the Grantham Canal and bridleway green infrastructure (11 comments), concerns regarding frequent surface water flooding (6 comments) and comments stating that the site would protrude into the countryside too much (5 comments). Additional responses stated there are reports of a badger set close to the site, that raw sewage has recently backed up onto the road surface and a new chicken farm will have dust and odour impacts.

313. Other comments on CBI02 state that the flat topography is ideal for housing, the canal acts as a strong defensible boundary and that the site is a good distance away from the village centre (2 comments).

314. One suggestion of an alternate access solution was to have it from the main road alongside the Memorial Hall car park (5 comments).
CBI05 – Land East of Church Street

315. **Terra Strategic** (promoting CBI05) say that the site will deliver several community facilities in addition to houses; these include a car park and a drop-off/pick-up facility for the school. They state that the 70 dwellings will be a mix of housing types with 30% being affordable housing. Proposed characteristics include woodland planting, two-storey maximum building height and building materials and appearance to reflect the existing styling of Cropwell Bishop. The promoters of the site state that a public exhibition of the proposals in September 2017 resulted in general support from the residents who attended.

316. **Gladman Development Ltd** (promoting land at East Leake) refer to a statement by Rushcliffe Borough Council, identifying significant Green Belt land to the east of the settlement whose development would adversely affect the rural setting of the village.

317. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** are pleased to see the site area has been reduced, but are concerned that it will still be an intrusion into the landscape. They state that the development would need a strong boundary on the eastern edge to define the right of way and create a wildlife corridor.

318. The **Environment Agency** have identified the site as being within Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and the surface water risk should be assessed. They also state that there is a watercourse running to the north west of the site which needs protecting and maintaining.

319. **Trent Valley IDB** say the majority of CBI05 lies outside the Board’s district but within the catchment, apart from a small section in the north eastern part of the site. The site is served by a riparian watercourse along the northern boundary which enters the Board’s district directly. The Board’s consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.

320. **Historic England** state that the plan needs to demonstrate it meets the requirements of Para 135 of the NPPF and it is recommended that advice is sought from the local archaeological curator. There would be an opportunity to better reveal and enhance understanding of this site through further investigations at any development stage.

321. **RNCSIG** state that CBI05 would be a significant intrusion into the wider countryside if developed.

322. A common response from the general public is that access via the bend on Church Street is unsafe (12 comments). The occurrence of flooding along
Church Street is also mentioned by multiple respondents (5 comments). There are also concerns regarding the number of vehicles accessing the site if houses and a car park are developed on the same site (5 comments) and concerns that the village will be prone to future expansion if the site is developed (2 comments). Other comments mentioned the need for preservation of mature trees on the site and the potentially negative impacts of building houses next to a sewerage works.

Any other sites in Cropwell Bishop (not in the Preferred Options document):

323. **Hurst and Richards** (promoting CBI01) believe the Housing Site Selection Interim Report is unsound and that CBI01 should be allocated for development as part of the Local Plan. They state that the site has existing development on three sides so can be considered infill to an extent. They have carried out further assessments which indicate there are no environmental or physical constraints to developing the site.

324. **Talbot, D** (land owner of an additional site submitted during consultation) supports the development of CBI05 and would like to submit their own site for consideration to be included in the local plan. The site lies to the west of CBI05 and would provide it with access to Cropwell Butler Road, therefore avoiding the need for the current proposed access on the unsafe s-bend.

325. **Southwell and Nottingham Diocese** (promoting CBI04) support the allocation of new homes in Cropwell Bishop. However, it fails to take into account the potential of CBI04. They state any ecological issues can be mitigated and that their land is a small and readily developable site, which can come on stream early in the process.

**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?*

326. In relation to allocating greenfield land for housing development at East Bridgford for around 100 homes, there is a clear majority in responses which object to the proposal. **45 support** the proposed allocation whereas **70 oppose**.
327. **East Bridgford Parish Council** state that 90% of participants who responded to the Community Plan Questionnaire would prefer the settlement to remain as it is with no additional development. However, the Parish Council believe that some future growth could be beneficial with regards to the increased support for local shops, clubs and healthcare. Therefore, they are prepared to accept housing subject to additional open space, play areas, improved services and traffic controls.

328. **East Bridgford Community Planning Group** accept that development in the village over the last 50 years has been beneficial, and that Green Belt development is now required as infill development is not possible. They also state that Rushcliffe Borough Council’s proposals focus on housing numbers but not on the traffic impact, village character impacts, housing mix or future impact. The group have consulted with landowners and submitted a new single site which they believe is more suitable than those proposed.

329. **Stagfield Ltd** (promoting EBR08) suggest that East Bridgford has existing facilities which have the capacity to support ‘medium level growth’. They believe an allocation of 100 dwellings is rational and effective.

330. **Southwell and Nottingham Diocese** (promoting EBR01 + EBR02) support the allocation of new homes in East Bridgford and consider the settlement has scope to sustain more than 100 new homes.

331. **Aldergate Properties Ltd** (promoting EBR07 + EBR07) are in support of housing development in East Bridgford as they believe it is a sustainable location. The village has a high demand for housing, good facilities including a medical centre and shops, good connections to public transport and benefits from recent improvements to the A46.

332. **Taylor Wimpey** (promoting EBR03 + EBR04) state that more than 100 homes should be allocated in East Bridgford as it is a more sustainable settlement than Cropwell Bishop, according to the Sustainable Locations for Growth Study. They say this study was given weight within the Aslockton appeal decision. It also has more land available. Reserve sites should be allocated as further contingency against further delays of the SUE’s.

333. **Gladman Development Ltd** (promoting land at East Leake) state that several sites in East Bridgford are identified as having weak defensible boundaries and impact upon the adjacent Conservation Area. They suggest development in East Leake is more suitable as there is no Green Belt impact.
334. **Peveril Homes** (promoting land to the north of Tollerton) object to the proposed allocation of houses in East Bridgford. They believe consideration should be given to re-allocate some or all of these dwellings for sites at Tollerton.

335. **Langridge Homes Ltd** (promoting COT03), **Simpson** (promoting RUD11) and **Ruzicka** (promoting COT05) support the total number of housing proposed.

336. **Nottinghamshire County Council** state that the school is over capacity and over-subscribed. There are limited options to expand the existing schools as the site is constrained. Whilst the housing development at the former RAF newton site will have its own school provision, early arrivals from this development will create difficulties in ensuring a sufficiency of provision.

337. **Historic England** state that the preferred sites should consider the impact on the historic environment, heritage assets, their setting and Green Belt sensitivity.

338. **CPRE** oppose the allocation of 100 homes as the village has few facilities and only a skeletal bus service.

339. **RNCSIG** oppose the allocation of land for 100 houses. Greenfield site allocation must be kept to an absolute minimum and damage or loss to local wildlife capital should be avoided. Major intrusions into the countryside should be avoided. Such sites should not be developed.

340. In terms of additional responses from the general public, the following issues were raised in relation to the proposed allocation of 100 new houses at East Bridgford:

- The roads are already too congested (41 comments).
- Existing services and facilities are already at capacity; notably schools and the doctors’ surgery (38 comments).
- 100 houses is too many, will result in the loss of the ‘village character’ (19 comments).
- The roads are unsafe so a larger population will increase risks (18 comments).
- On-street parking is an issue (13 comments).
- Greenfield land should not be developed (19 comments).
- The existing sewerage and drainage infrastructure has problems, especially on Main Street (9 comments).
- All brownfield sites in Nottingham and Nottinghamshire should be developed before any greenfield land in the village is released (7 comments).
- All hedges and trees should be retained (7 comments).
• The bus service connecting East Bridgford to Nottingham is insufficient (7 comments).
• The proposed 100 houses for East Bridgford should be re-allocated to Newton and Bingham (7 comments).
• The individual sites should be released from the Green Belt gradually.
• No more large houses should be built (4 comments).
• Good to see the previously allocated intrusive sites on the south, west and north east of the village are no longer proposed (3 comments).
• East Bridgford can support a small number of additional houses (2 comments).
• All development should be screened from trees to retain the rural setting.
• Houses are needed to support the declining village community e.g. struggling clubs, shops and pubs.
• None of the sites are close to village facilities so they will generate more traffic (3 comments).

341. One comment suggests a potential infill location to develop: the Holloway Close garage site.

342. With regards to housing type, comments were received suggesting smaller homes are needed for the elderly to downsize to (12 comments) in addition to the provision of affordable homes (16 comments). It is also stated by several respondents that the development proposals should be high quality with a fitting design to minimise impacts on the Conservation Area (9 comments).

*Question 17: Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following sites at East Bridgford?*

343. When asked whether there is support for each individual site in East Bridgford, the following responses were received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EBR06 – Closes Side Lane (West)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR07 – Closes Side Lane (East)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR08 – Land to the North of Butt Lane</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR10 – Land South of Butt Lane</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

344. The responses show that there is an overall objection to all proposed sites other than EBR08 which has a higher number of respondents in support.
EBR06 – Closes Side Lane (West)

345. **Aldergate Properties Ltd** (promoting EBR06 + EBR07) support development on EBR06 as it is a deliverable site in a sustainable location. They have undertaken several assessments which confirm that there are no highways, drainage or legal issues which would hinder delivery. They also have concerns that the plan used in the Council’s consultation document is misrepresentational as the adjacent existing Fosters Close does not appear, potentially influencing the Council’s comment regarding impact upon the setting. They confirm the proposals will include a policy compliant number of affordable housing, retain existing hedgerows where appropriate and strengthen the site’s boundary.

346. **Bailey** (landowners of EBR08) believes that EBR06 should not be developed as the impact on the Green Belt is inappropriate in addition to the impact it would have upon the Conservation Area. They reinstate that the site is also identified as a ‘view of positive landscape’ in the village’s Townscape Appraisal.

347. **East Bridgford Community Plan Group** are concerned that housing development on EBR06 would increase road traffic through the village centre.

348. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** state that development would result in a loss of grassland. This is already scarce across Rushcliffe.

349. The **Environment Agency** say the site is in Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and the surface water risk should be assessed.

350. **Trent Valley IDB** state that the site lies outside the Board’s district but within the catchment. The Board’s consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.

351. Comments received from the general public include concerns that the surrounding roads around the site are too narrow (11 comments), that the development would negatively impact upon the Conservation Area (2 comments) and development would impact upon surrounding residents’ property value. Other comments suggest EBR06 is one of the best options for development as it doesn’t protrude into the Green Belt as much as others.

EBR07 – Closes Side Lane (East)
352. **Aldergate Properties Ltd** (promoting EBR07 + EBR06) support development on EBR06 as it is a deliverable site in a sustainable location. They have undertaken several assessments which confirm that there are no highways, drainage or legal issues which would hinder delivery. They have concerns that the plan used in the Council’s consultation document is misrepresentational as the adjacent existing Fosters Close does not appear, potentially influencing the Council’s comment regarding impact on the setting. They confirm the proposals will include a policy compliant number of affordable housing, retain existing hedgerows where appropriate and strengthen the site’s boundary.

353. **Taylor Wimpey** (promoting EBR03 + EBR04) state that EBR07 is wholly dependent on the delivery of EBR06. Sites should be deliverable in their own right. EBR07 is a peninsular development contrary to the existing framework.

354. **Bailey** suggests the dwellings on EBR07 will be higher density than the neighbouring housing. They also state that the Green Belt should be retained as it serves several important functions.

355. **East Bridgford Community Plan Group** state that development at EBR07 would increase road traffic through the village centre.

356. The **Environment Agency** say the site is in Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and the surface water flood risk should be assessed.

357. **Trent Valley IDB** state that the site lies outside the Board’s district but within the catchment. The Board’s consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.

358. The site received similar comments to EBR06 from the general public. Main issues are that the roads around the site are too narrow (7 comments), that the site is adjacent to the Conservation Area and a listed building (2 comments) and development would impact surrounding neighbours’ property values. Other comments mentioned the site should remain greenfield (2 comments) and suggested that the proposals should only allow for bungalows on edges which border existing dwellings.

**EBR08 – Land to the North of Butt Lane**

359. **Stagfield Ltd** (promoting EBR08) say the site has a number of advantages which make it good for housebuilding: well related to the existing settlement, no constraints and no access issues. They say the logical extension to the village currently has 15 proposed dwellings; however, this could be increased to 20 as
identified in the ‘Identification of Additional Settlements Background Paper’. It is also stated that whilst independent from EBR10 across the road, there are some synergies between the two which could increase the efficiency of the housebuilding process; such as a footpath extension, relocation of speed limit signage and extension of utility connections.

360. **Aldergate Properties Ltd** (promoting EBR06 + EBR07) disagree with the Council’s comment stating that EBR08 has ‘less impact on the setting of the village’ as there is no evidence to support this. They believe the site is highly visible and development would significantly alter the setting of the village.

361. **Taylor Wimpey** (promoting EBR03 and EBR04) raise concerns regarding the visibility of the site and impact on the landscape and Green Belt.

362. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** are concerned at the loss of grasslands if this site is developed. They also state that this habitat is rare in Rushcliffe.

363. **Historic England** note that the ridge and furrow previously evident has been lost to intensive arable farming. It is recommended that any site specific criteria encourages the design, layout and landscaping of any scheme to take into account views in and out of the Conservation Area to preserve its character and appearance.

364. The **Environment Agency** state that the site is located within Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and that the surface water flood risk should be assessed.

365. **Trent Valley IDB** state that the site lies outside the Board’s district but within the catchment. The Board’s consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made into any watercourse, other than a designated main river.

366. Responses received from the general public identified the site as being well located with good access onto Butt Lane avoiding the village centre (5 comments). Several comments were also made suggesting the site should be extended into the land to the north (3 comments). Other comments suggested EBR08 would constitute ribbon development out of the settlement (5 comments) and it would spoil the attractive approach into East Bridgford (2 comments). There are concerns that the site is located close to the medical centre so vehicle movements all through the day will create access issues.

**EBR10 – Land South of Butt Lane**
367. **Pickford** (landowner of EBR10) highlights that the site is well related to the village in terms of form, character and proximity to the village centre. They say the site has good access from Butt Lane meaning the contribution to village centre traffic is reduced. It is stated that the site is well contained and will create a strong new Green Belt boundary. The health centre has been identified adjacent to EBR10 which the landowner could provide additional land for car parking to alleviate pressures it currently experiences at peak times.

368. **Taylor Wimpey** (promoting EBR03 + EBR04) raise concerns regarding the visibility of the site and impact on the landscape and Green Belt.

369. **Aldergate Properties Ltd** (promoting EBR06 + EBR07) reinstate that the Council say EBR10 has ‘less impact on the setting of the village’, however, there is no evidence to support this. They believe the site is highly visible and would significantly alter the setting of the village if developed.

370. **Historic England** note that the ridge and furrow previously evident has been lost to intensive arable farming. It is recommended that any site specific criteria encourages the design, layout and landscaping of any scheme to take into account views in and out of the Conservation Area to preserve its character and appearance.

371. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** identify the site as being adjacent to Springdale Wood Nature Reserve which must be adequately buffered from any development. Part of EBR10 is adjacent a rich wildflower meadow which also needs adequate buffering from development. A significant greenspace buffer is recommended to the south and east to form a strong defensible boundary.

372. **RNCSIG** also state that EBR10 is adjacent Springdale Wood Nature Reserve and a lovely rich wildflower meadow which both need adequate buffering from development.

373. The **Environment Agency** state that the site is in Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and the surface water flood risk should be assessed.

374. **Trent Valley IDB** state that the site lies outside the Board’s district but within the catchment. The Board’s consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made into any watercourse, other than a designated main river.

375. **Elton, Simpson** (promoting RUD11) and **Ruzicka** (promoting COT05) support EBR10.
376. Other comments received from the general public regarding EBR10 have concerns for the bottleneck that will be created as a result of vehicles accessing the medical centre and the housing site (6 comments). It is also believed that the development of this site will encourage further ribbon development along Butt Lane (4 comments) and that it would spoil the attractive approach to the village (3 comments). Several comments relating to the woodland south of the site recommend that the public right of way to access it remains (4 comments) and that there are concerns the woodland would suffer as a result of development (6 comments). Other comments states that EBR10 is a good location for new housing for several reasons including good access and a positive addition to the village size (2 comments).

Any other sites in East Bridgford (not in the Preferred Options document):

Alternative suggested site: **Land North of and including EBR08**

377. **East Bridgford Parish Council** believe this stretch of land between Closes Side Lane and Butt Lane (including EBR08) should be allocated as a new, single site. They believe the development of this site should omit the need to build on EBR06 and EBR07. It is stated that the landowners intend to offer this land for development. Advantages of developing this site include the good highway access and existing access to the sewer system. It is stated, however, that the different plots of land will not become available at the same time so there is importance in creating a coherent masterplan.

378. **East Bridgford Community Plan Group** state several advantages of developing this site: land owners have confirmed their interest and it will continue the traditional village grid road layout. The group has identified that such a large development would require significant pre-assessment of sewerage, school places and provision of community facilities.

379. **Crossland** (owners of part of the land north of EBR08) wish to offer their land to be included as part of one larger allocation (proposed by East Bridgford Parish Council) to help satisfy the need for housing. They wish for their land to be used to provide a mix of housing including starter homes and homes for the elderly as well as 3, 4 and 5 bedroom houses. It is also stated that all buildings are to be no more than two storeys high, built to high design standards, high energy efficiency standards and to have suitably landscaped recreation and open space.

380. **Cockayne** (owners of part of the land north of EBR08) wish to offer their land to be included as part of one larger allocation (proposed by East Bridgford Parish Council) to help satisfy the need for housing. They wish for their land to be used to provide a mix of housing including starter homes and homes for the
elderly as well as 3, 4 and 5 bedroom houses. It is also stated that all buildings are to be no more than two storeys high, built to high design standards, high energy efficiency standards and to have suitably landscaped recreation and open space.

381. Several comments from the general public regarding this site have been received including a general support for the development of it (7 comments). A range of advantages of developing this site over the currently proposed sites have been highlighted: no border with the Conservation Area, no heritage impact, direct access to the A46 and a continuation of the village’s historic grid pattern. However, concerns have been raised that the Parish Council did not make the proposal for this site available to the public for discussion (2 comments).

**EBR01 + EBR02**

382. **Southwell and Nottingham Diocese** (promoting EBR01+EBR02) state that the plan currently fails to take account of these two sites which should be considered for development.

**EBR03 + EBR04**

383. **Taylor Wimpey** (promoting EBR03 + EBR04) maintain that the two sites should be allocated as they are well connected to the village services and facilities, close to a business park and accessible by public transportation. They state that appropriate mitigation can address impacts on heritage assets, notably the Manor House and landscape. Consequently, impacts on the Green Belt would also be reduced. They say the site could deliver 125-200 homes and these would contribute to solving a worsening housing supply situation.

**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?**

384. In response to the question whether Local Plan Part 2 should allocate greenfield land for around 100 homes at Gotham, there was no significant majority in views of the proposal. **47 agreed** whereas **48 objected**.

385. **Gotham Parish Council** object to the proposals for several reasons, and state that the question wording is contradictory because of the use of ‘around’ and ‘in total’. They suggest the prioritisation of Brownfield sites and state that the draft
Neighbourhood Plan should be used to identify sites for development. They state the Borough Council’s analysis of village infrastructure capacity is incorrect:

a. Education - Gotham Primary School is at capacity. East Leake Academy is stretched due to new housing in East Leake.
b. Health - the medical surgery has recently expanded.
c. Community facilities - the butcher closed in 2014.
d. Sewerage - Moor Lane treatment plant is at capacity.
e. Flooding - flooding issues were experienced in 2016.
f. Access - inaccurate assessments from when sites were assessed as different land parcels.

386. **Aslockton Parish Council** agree that Gotham has the facilities to accommodate 100 new houses.

387. **Nottinghamshire County Council** state that there should be scope to increase local primary school capacity to support the proposed level of growth. This would be subject to developer contributions being received.

388. **Nottingham City Transport** state that greenfield land should only be allocated where there is no current use, it would result in a loss of local employment and income for Gotham village.

389. **Historic England** state that any allocated sites should consider the impact on the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting noting the impact on Green Belt sensitivity.

390. **RNCSIG** oppose the allocation of land for 100 homes. They state that greenfield site allocation must be kept to a minimum and damage to local wildlife capital should be avoided. It is also stated that major intrusions into the countryside should be avoided.

391. **Wooley** supports 100 new dwellings as a minimum as it is considered to be a sustainable location for growth.

392. **ST Properties Limited and Charnwood Development Services** (promoting GOT08) object to the proposal and state that Gotham can accommodate a greater number of new dwellings as it is a sustainable and accessible location. They state that the Neighbourhood Plan allocates sites for 115 dwellings and also suggest that smaller sites should be allocated in addition.

393. **Peverill Homes** (promoting land to the north of Tollerton) object to the proposal on the basis that some or all of the dwellings should be re-allocated to sites at Tollerton.
394. **British Gypsum** (promoting other sites in Gotham) object to the proposal, stating that the village is sustainable and accessible so it would be able to accommodate a greater level of development.

395. **Langridge Homes Ltd** (promoting COT3) support the allocation of land for 100 homes.

396. **Simpson** (promoting RUD11) supports the total number of new homes proposed in Gotham.

397. **Ruzicka** (promoting COT05) support the total number of homes proposed.

398. **Southwell and Nottingham Diocese** (promoting GOT06) state that Gotham can accommodate development in excess of 100 dwellings.

399. In response to the question asking if greenfield land should be allocated for 100 homes in Gotham, the general public raised these comments:
   a. Development in Gotham should only be for local needs, not Borough-wide needs (7 comments).
   b. Brownfield sites should be prioritised before greenfield (8 comments); a suggestion is the British Legion site.
   c. Smaller sized sites would be preferred (2 comments).
   d. Should be limited to 50 houses (5 comments).
   e. Should be limited to 80 houses (2 comments).
   f. Policy wording should ensure 100 is a maximum.
   g. Services and facilities are not able to support new housing (6 comments).
   h. Concerns that removal of the bus depot will reduce the bus service serving the village (2 comments).
   i. Adequate infrastructure should be provided alongside any development (2 comments).
   j. Suggested that Gypsum Way is extended northerly to reconnect with the road to Nottingham.
   k. 100 houses will result in 200 additional cars on the already congested roads.
   l. Gotham shouldn’t suffer due to the previous inability to deliver at the strategic sites.
   m. GOT05a should be the only site – no more further allocations.
   n. Gotham has good transport links.
   o. The village is in good proximity to employment Nottingham and the currently developing employment opportunities around M1 J24.
   p. More than 100 new houses could be supported in Gotham.
**Question 19:** Do you support the proposed allocation for housing development of the following site at Gotham?

400. When asked whether there is support for the proposed site in Gotham, these are the responses received:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOT5a – Land East of Gypsum Way/The Orchards (1)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOT5a – Land East of Gypsum Way/The Orchards (1)**

401. **Wooley** (landowners of part of GOT5a) support the proposal for GOT5a saying that it forms a natural extension to the settlement, has a low Green Belt impact and is in close proximity to the village centre. They state the area of land in their ownership can accommodate around 45 dwellings with several potential access points. They are having ongoing negotiations with adjacent landowners and it is stated that the site is available, suitable and deliverable.

402. **Laking** (trustee of part of GOT05) state that both trustees support the allocation of GOT5a.

403. **ST Properties Limited and Charnwood Development Services** (promoting GOT08) object to the proposal at GOT5a as it would have a detrimental impact on the character of the village. They state the single large site of GOT5a would take longer to develop than a selection of smaller sites which could be delivered much quicker. It would be incongruous development as GOT4 will remain undeveloped. It is also stated that development of the site will impact upon a listed building, the landscape and the bordering LWS.

404. **British Gypsum** (promoting other sites in Gotham) object to the proposal, stating that the site is unsuitable for several reasons. They say it has a high risk of surface water flooding, it bounds a LWS, has a heritage impact on a Grade II listed barn and is an incongruous extension to the village. They highlight that they own other more appropriate sites in Gotham which should be considered. These are identified in their representation as SG1 (for employment), SG2 (for mixed use), SG3 (for mixed use) and SG4 (for affordable housing).

405. **Southwell and Nottingham Diocese** (promoting GOT06) do not support the allocation of GOT5a and suggest GOT06 is a preferable and more logical option in relation to planning terms and the shape of the settlement.
406. **Gladman Development Ltd** (promoting land at East Leake) state that this site does not appear to be well-related to the existing settlement. They also state that the Green Belt review is inadequate and inconsistent as it states there are no heritage assets on site or nearby; however, the bus depot building is Grade II listed.

407. **Gotham Parish Council** object to the proposal of GOT5a. They are concerned that more than 100 houses will be developed in the future following the development of this site. They suggest the bus depot should be considered as a separate single site and that the Local Plan and Gotham Neighbourhood Plan should be co-ordinated in terms of identified sites. It is also noted that the deliverability of the site is questionable due to the number of landowners involved.

408. **Kingston on Soar Parish Council** object to the allocation of GOT5a as it would add to the traffic issues between Gotham and the M1 through Kingston on Soar. They state the development would reduce road safety, require expansion of the school, improve the parking situation and require sufficient flood prevention measures.

409. **Nottinghamshire County Council** state that this site is located within the gypsum Minerals Safeguarding and Consultation Area. They say that British Gypsum should be consulted regarding the history and future of gypsum working in the vicinity of the site.

410. The **Environment Agency** state that the site is located in Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and that the surface water risk should be assessed. They also identify that the site is adjacent to Gotham Disused Railway Local Wildlife Site which should be protected from harm and enhanced by the development where possible.

411. **Historic England** support the allocation of GOT5a subject to consideration of the retention of the listed building on site, suggesting it should be incorporated into the wider scheme. Site specific policy or clear wording in justification text should be used to address this.

412. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** state that the allocation of this site is unacceptable due to its proximity to a LWS, it represents a major intrusion into the landscape and there would be a loss of valuable habitats including grasslands, scrub, trees and a network of dense hedges. They also have concerns that once development has commenced, the fields directly adjacent to the site will be prone to future development.

413. **RNCSIG** state that GOT5a represents a significant intrusion into the wider countryside and that they would wish to see buffering between the development
and the nearby Local Wildlife Site.

414. **Severn Trent** highlight that there is a medium risk to sewage infrastructure as foul flows from the development will drain into a 150mm diameter pipe on Monks Lane. It is predicted to flood in low return periods. Downstream of the development there is a large cluster of internal flooding on Curzon Street. There is a brook on the opposite side of Leake Road that the development could discharge; however, a pipe underneath the road would have to be constructed.

415. **Trent Valley IDB** state that the site lies outside the Board’s district but within the catchment. The Board’s consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made into any watercourse, other than a designated main river.

416. **Nottingham City Transport** object to the development of GOT5a as it would result in the loss of the Nottingham City Transport Gotham Depot. They state it is an award winning bus depot which generates employment opportunities and secondary income for the village of Gotham as the 118 staff based at the depot use local shops and facilities. One issue they raise is that the NCT number 1 bus service (linking East Leake and Loughborough with Clifton and Nottingham) is operated from the Gotham Depot, so a new freehold site between Gotham and Clifton would need to be made available to relocate to.

417. In terms of the response from the general public regarding the allocation of GOT5a, these issues and comments were raised:
   a. There is no defensible boundary.
   b. The access from Hall Drive would be unsuitable.
   c. Access should be from Gypsum Way only to limit traffic passing through the village (3 comments).
   d. The site has recently flooded (2 comments).
   e. Development would result in a loss of the bus depot, an important local employer (2 comments).
   f. Too large, there would be greater support if the site was smaller (4 comments).
   g. New open spaces and trees are needed.
   h. 100 houses should be the absolute limit.
   i. No three-storey houses (2 comments).
   j. Gotham Neighbourhood Plan should be adhered to (3 comments).
   k. Affordable housing is needed in Gotham (6 comments).
   l. Bungalows for the elderly (4 comments).
   m. Small houses, no more large executive houses (6 comments).
   n. New shop and industrial units would be welcome (3 comments).
418. Members of the general public in support of the proposal state:
   a. The site is well contained (3 comments).
   b. Good access to and from the site (2 comments).
   c. It would improve the off-street parking problems on Leake Road (3 comments).

Any other sites in Gotham (not in the Preferred Options document):

GOT08
419. **ST Properties Limited and Charnwood Development Services** (promoting GOT08) are in support for the allocation of this site, stating that it is a preferred site in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. It has a lower impact on the Green Belt and landscape and is well related to the existing pattern of development.

420. The general public state that the allocation of GOT08 would adversely extend the village and has dangerous surrounding footpaths and roads. It is also suggested that this site is at risk of flooding and drainage issues.

GOT04
421. **Taylor** (landowner of GOT04) is in support of the allocation of this site. They say it is suitable, available and deliverable so should be released from the Green Belt and developed to contribute to the borough’s delivery of housing. The identified ridge and furrow has been ploughed so there is no further justification for not removing the site from the Green Belt.

422. The general public responded with concerns that the medieval ridge and furrow will be lost if the site is removed from the Green Belt and developed for housing.

GOT01
423. Comments received from the general public state that this site should be allocated as village surveys show it is the preferred site. It is stated that wildlife value is no greater than other sites.

424. It is also suggested that the land behind (and possibly including) the run down industrial estate to the north of the village is developed for affordable housing.

**Land at 63 Moor Lane**
425. **Horner** (landowners of the site) submit their site for consideration to be allocated in the emerging Local Plan. They state that the site provides land for one new dwelling in an infill location. It is also stated that the site does not contribute to the openness of the Green Belt and development would not result in coalescence of settlements, making it appropriate for development.
Bunny Brickworks

Question 20: Do you support the proposed allocation of the former Bunny Brickworks (site BUN01) for a mixed use development of around 100 new homes and employment development?

426. In relation to allocating the former Bunny Brickworks (site BUN01) for a mixed use development of around 100 new homes and employment development, the received responses showed more support than objection. 43 support the proposed allocation with 29 objecting.

427. Bunny Parish Council do not support development in Bunny as it would be a departure from the Core Strategy which stated development would be concentrated on urban areas and large villages. They also state that development of 100 new houses in addition to the existing 268 in the settlement is not appropriate. It is also highlighted that the site has previously been refused permission for 200 dwellings for several reasons: the Green Belt location, it is outside of the existing settlement’s built up area, there are limited local facilities and public transport and conflicts would arise between the residential development and the adjacent recycling site and trading estate.

428. Pickford (landowner of EBR10) raise concerns of how sustainable the site would be with regard to its remoteness from the village services and facilities. They suggest there are more suitable and sustainable sites located on the immediate edge of other villages.

429. Gladman Development Ltd (promoting sites in East Leake) suggest that developing the site would likely lead to isolated homes in the countryside.

430. Bloor Homes (promoting RUD01, KEY9 + KEY10) and Hogg (promoting KEY5 + KEY6) state that Bunny is an unsustainable location for new housing due to the lack of services and facilities. They suggest that allocating houses here would be a departure from Core Strategy principles.

431. Nottinghamshire County Council state that Bunny Primary School is at capacity and over-crowded currently and for the foreseeable future. 100 additional dwellings within the catchment would generate demand for an additional 21 places, which would require the addition of another classroom, support space and toilet facilities. The proposed allocation should therefore require the provision of additional capacity at Bunny CoE Primary School to be funded by the proposed development.
They also highlight that the site is directly adjacent to a waste recycling facility which has planning permission for open air storage and processing of aggregated and incinerator bottom ash. As such they state there is the potential for disturbance to any sensitive neighbouring uses from dust, odour and noise. NCC have serious reservations regarding compatibility of these possibly neighbouring land uses and environmental controls that may prevent the future operation of the existing facility.

Aslockton Parish Council fully support the allocation of brownfield sites.

Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust would like to see the retention of some of the valuable naturally regenerated habitats within the provided open space.

RNCSIG expect the adjacent woodland area to be buffered from development. They also identify the need to protect the road verge area beyond the brickworks as this supports species such as Cowslip.

CPRE support the development of BUN01 in principle. They state that the village has very few facilities although it does have a reasonable bus service. They suggest the bus service is maintained and enhanced.

Historic England state that the preferred sites should consider the impact on the historic environment, impact on Green Belt sensitivity and heritage assets and their setting.

The Environment Agency state that BUN01 is within Flood Zone 1 (low risk) and the surface water flood risk should be assessed.

Trent Valley IDB state that the Board’s consent will be required prior to any increase in surface water discharged from the site being made to any watercourse other than a main river.

Bunny Appliance (owners of Bunny Trading Estate) support the proposals for a mixed use development at BUN01 but object to the proposed site boundary. They believe it should be extended to include the Bunny Trading Estate which is adjacent to Bunny Brickworks. They state the trading estate does not serve any of the five purposes of the Green Belt so it should be released as part of BUN01; this would then make it easier for the landowner to invest in the site and increase employment floor space.

Elton, Simpson (promoting RUD11), Ruzicka (promoting COT05) and Collington and Robinson (promoting land at Costock) all oppose the allocation of BUN01 as the remoteness of the site from the village services and facilities is unsustainable. They suggest that more suitable sites exist on the
edge of other villages. The brownfield status of BUN01 does not provide sufficient justification to depart from sustainability principles.

442. In terms of other comments received from the general public, several issues and comments were raised:

- 100 dwellings is too many (2 comments).
- The local school is at capacity (4 comments).
- The proposal is too far from the facilities in Bunny (5 comments) and the footpaths connecting it are of poor quality (3 comments).
- The site is downwind from Johnsons recycling plant (former landfill) which will cause odour and noise issues (3 comments).
- Traffic issues and poor access on the A60 (4 comments).
- The co-creation of employment sites and housing development can often be clumsy and sub-optimal for the residents, especially in a small area.
- Poorly protected mine entrances and ventilation shafts in the area are dangerous to new residents.
- Development in Bunny would depart from the Core Strategy’s focus on allocating development within and adjacent the main urban area.
- It would be good to see improvements to this site (3 comments).
- This brownfield site should be a model sustainable development for Rushcliffe to showcase: local clay materials, reed bed sewer treatment, grey water recycling, communal solar power, electric cars only.
- Affordable and social housing should be provided as part of the proposal.
- Suggested alternative uses: solar farm as it is out of sight and produces no noise.

Any other sites in Bunny (not in the Preferred Options document):

443. **Mourtzis, S** do not support the development of Bunny Brickworks (BUN01) but wish to submit an alternative site which they believe is more appropriate for Bunny. The site they propose is land to the east of Loughborough Road directly south of the existing built up area of the settlement and they believe this is a better site to develop rather than BUN01. They state it will support fewer dwellings so impact on local facilities will be reduced and it is closer to the village centre. As there is a substantial sports pavilion on the site, it is believed that the land must be regarded as 'previously developed land' in accordance to the definition in NPPF Annex 2.

**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?

444. In response to this question, **39 agreed** that the former Islamic Institute should be allocated whereas **16 disagreed**.

445. **Nottinghamshire County Council** state that NCC is working with the Academy Trust to address possible expansion to provide places, subject to S106 contributions being agreed.

446. **Historic England** state that preferred sites should consider the impact on the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting and noting impact on Green Belt sensitivity.

447. **Environment Agency** state that the surface water flood risk should be assessed.

448. **Aslockton Parish Council** fully supports allocation of this brownfield site.

449. **Sport England** state that there would be impact on, and possible prejudice, to adjacent sports facilities by the introduction of residential properties and greater considerations of amenity. Does the proposal require an impact assessment to ensure that there is no impacts from adjacent cricket, ball strike etc. The allocation also causes the loss of potential areas for expansion of sports facilities.

450. **Trent Valley IDB** state that the site lies outside the Board’s district but within the catchment. The Board’s consent will be required prior to any increases in surface water discharge from the site being made to any watercourse, other than a designated main river.

451. **CPRE** support in principle the re-development of this brownfield site. The village has very few facilities however although a reasonable bus service.

452. **Langridge Homes Ltd**, promoting COT03, supports the allocation of this site.

453. **Bloor** (promoting RUD01), **Elton** (promoting land at Sutton Bonington), **Hogg** (promoting KEY05 and KEY06), **Pickford** (promoting EBR10), **Simpson** (promoting RUD11), **Collington and Robinson** (promoting land at Costock) and **Ruzicka** (promoting COT05) all state that the site has planning permission and should not be allocated. Inconsistent with approaches to other villages, not identified for growth, that are equally or more sustainable locations.

454. Residents provided the following objections:
• Allocating this site would conflict with the Core Strategy – which directs development towards the main urban area.
• Local services and facilities need improvement.

455. Residents provided the following positive comments:

• Supports the re-use of brownfield sites
• Should provide affordable housing – not large houses

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.

456. Nottinghamshire County Council's advice regarding strategic highways issues states that it is not necessary to rework the strategic transport traffic modelling undertaken to inform the Core Strategy. However, the Memorandum of Understanding regarding delivery of supporting strategic transport infrastructure on the A52 /A606 such that newly allocated sites are also required to contribute financially to the package of strategic highway improvements should be revised.

457. Melton Borough Council state that none of the proposed housing allocations raise concerns. They suggest that the two authorities work together on strategic matters, including implications of the Strategic Growth Plan for Leicestershire.

458. Highways England state that Phase 1 of the A52 junction improvements scheme will provide short term mitigation for the preferred allocations. However, Transport Statements / Transport Assessments will still be required to support individual planning applications and they will be subject to the MoU process until such a time that funding for the improvement works has been completed.

459. Natural England - Whilst it would appear that the proposed allocations would not lead to the loss of over 20 ha BMV land (COT09, COT10, COT11a, EL02, ELO5, ELO6, KEY08 and KEY04a) we advise that paragraph 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework should be considered and we suggest that guidance on soil handling is followed. Any allocations should include specifications which enhance green infrastructure, biodiversity and deliver net gains where possible, as set out in the Core Strategy policies 16 and 17.
460. **Historic England** state that the heritage assessment information is welcomed. It is evident that the Council is taking a positive approach to the historic environment as part of the plan process.

461. **Education & Skills Agency** state that the Local Plan should identify the size of school required at Clifton South. In addition, the Plan could provide greater clarity by indicating an area of land that will be safeguarded for the new school, to help provide more certainty around delivery.

They also state it would be useful if a Planning for Schools topic/background paper could be produced, expanding on the evidence in the Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Nottinghamshire’s School Place Planning Strategy.

462. **Severn Trent Water** state that they will complete any necessary improvements to provide additional sewage, surface water, and water supply and quality capacity once there is sufficient confidence that a development will go ahead. Severn Trent also highlight the requirement within building regulations for new homes to consume no more than 125 litres of water per person per day.

463. **The Coal Authority** state that whilst former mining activities and related hazards are not (according to their records) a strict constraint on any proposed allocation, due diligence should ensure that sites do not contain any mine entries or other coal related hazards which would require remediation or stabilisation prior to development.

464. **Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust** state that designated nature conservation sites, informal green space and Green Corridors must be avoided. Habitat features with in the ‘wider’ countryside, such as mature trees, orchards, hedgerows, copses, woodland, ponds and lakes, grasslands, rivers and ditches etc. are also important and are largely irreplaceable. In some circumstances, integrating them sensitively into new development Green Infrastructure network may be appropriate. If such sites or habitats are affected (either directly or indirectly), any buffering or mitigation will need to be adequate.

465. **Nottingham Campaign for Better Transport** state that the transport system is unable to cope with the increased demand for travel. Modal shift from car to rail is vital on the A52 corridor, but this will not happen if a poor level of service continues. However there are concerns that work on the new rail franchise and the Local Plan are progressing in parallel, but not working with each other. On-street parking is an issue across the borough, most notably in West Bridgford.
They state that sustainable transport options should be planned in at the Local Plan stage rather than through negotiations at the planning application stage. With the Local Plan Part 2 clearly setting out what is expected of developers.

466. **Pedals** states that access by bike, existing and potential, should be a very important consideration in the final selection of housing allocations as this will assist measures to reduce car use.

Pedals is completing a feasibility study for a new foot-cycle bridge over the Trent with connections to a variety of existing and proposed upgraded and new routes on both banks of the river. These will link to open space, leisure, recreation areas in the Trent Corridor and the strategic allocation at Gamston/Tollerton.

Pedals also promotes improvements to: the pedestrian/cycleway along the A52 between Bingham and Gamston; the toucan crossing of the A52 east of Gamston and links to the Canal (on both sides of the A52); crossings across the A52 linking Edwalton and Tollerton; cycle routes between Keyworth and West Bridgford; the A606/A52 Lings Bar Junction; the subway under the A52 at Sharp Hill; and the cycle path under the A52 at Ruddington/Wilford Lane (linking with RUD01).

467. **Aslockton Parish Council** feel there should be further clarification on housing at other small villages - what is small scale and what is the exact definition of infill? We would also like to reiterate our agreement with Local Plan Part 2 Further Options consultation document that the 75 houses on Abbey Lane, Aslockton will be included in Local Plan Part 2 as housing allocation and it would not be sustainable for any further greenfield sites to be identified.

468. **East Leake Parish Council** has provided comment on sites within Sutton Bonington and Tollerton. SUT01 is not in the Green Belt so can deliver homes quickly. The site was not included due to concerns with primary school capacity; however Normanton School appears to have capacity. In Tollerton the main constraint for allocating housing here was also primary school places, however, the school does not appear to be at capacity and there is no detail about any option of expansion. Ratcliffe-on-Soar Power Station is set to close during the plan period. This is a brownfield site with excellent road and rail links – this should be considered in the Local Plan Part 2.

469. **Sutton Bonington Parish Council** has raised concerns about the possible allocation of land off Landcroft Lane, Sutton Bonington. Concerns regarding the site off Park Lane and the inadequate services and facilities within Sutton Bonington apply equally to this site. As do concerns on public transport,
accessibility to village facilities and the impact on the single track lane.

470. **West Bridgford Hockey Club** wish to explore any opportunities the Local Plan Part 2 can present in assisting the Club in ensuring future longevity. They state that it is likely they will have to relocate during the Plan period so have appointed Litchfields to undertake a site-finding exercise, resulting in only one suitable future site. They submit a parcel of land located to the south of West Bridgford, immediately north of Ruddington to be allocated as a sports facility in Local Plan Part 2. They would also welcome the opportunity to work with the Council to consider any other sites which could provide facilities for the club.

**Promoters of sites not in preferred allocation settlements:**

471. **Newton Nottingham LLP** (promoting the strategic allocation at the former RAF Newton) propose that an additional 150 units could be delivered within the allocation, however this would require required parts of green infrastructure (planned allotments and public open space) to be accommodated beyond the allocation within the Green Belt. As directed by the Core Strategy, the extension of this strategic allocation should be considered before other villages.

472. **Barratt Homes** (promoting COT01 + KEY13) encourage the designation of 'safeguarded' land to meet development needs beyond the Local Plan Part 2. Such an approach is encouraged by the NPPF in reviewing existing Green Belt Boundaries through Local Plans. The Borough Council has already adopted such an approach through the Core Strategy on the edge of the Edwalton Urban Area and should adopt a similar approach through the Local Plan Part 2. They state that 'Safeguarded Land' should be assessed and designated in those 'Key Settlements' which are most likely to accommodate future housing growth.

473. **Bridge** (promoting Willowbrook Farm, Bassingfield) highlights their site’s derelict condition and the requirement for a positive planning approach. Landowner is willing to restrict development to 7-8 dwellings.

474. **Breedon** (promoting land off Cliff Hill Lane, Aslockton), **Davidson** (promoting land north of Abbey Lane) and **Fox** (promoting SHLAA site 694 at Aslockton) believe there is no case to limit growth in Aslockton to 75 dwellings. **Davidson** highlights the need for an increase in land required (for 3,600 to 5,000 homes) and the subsequent need to look at sites in other villages, notably Aslockton. The decision to consider ‘other villages’ within the plan shows the position regarding these villages and has changed since the appeal decisions within Aslockton. The village has a wide range of services and facilities which meet day to day needs. The primary school has spare capacity and is well served by
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public transport (along the A52 corridor). Restraining development in smaller villages and promoting sites in Flintham and Bunny is inconsistent. Breedon consider land at Cliff Hill Lane is well related to the services and facilities in the village and would form an appropriate extension to the village. Fox suggest their land could deliver 15 homes.

475. Hallam Land Management (promoting WHA01) state that Whatton and Aslockton are sustainable settlements (and should be considered one settlement in planning terms) and that WHA01 is an infill site and is not constrained and has the potential to deliver 90 homes. Whipling Farm Partnership (promoting land off Orston Lane, Whatton) also believes land should be identified in Whatton and pre-application advice stated that development would be well-related to the build form of the village.

476. Richborough Estate (promoting TOL1) have supplied evidence that the local school could accommodate the 32 pupils generated by the development of TOL01 (150 homes), as pupils numbers are predicted to decline. The absence of education constraints should result in the re-instatement of Tollerton as a location for growth. TOL01 represents the most sustainable location as it is enclosed on three sides (reducing landscape and Green Belt constraints) and located close to services and facilities.

477. Holbrook et al (promoting part of TOL2) believe that TOL2 should be allocated as it is a well-connected site, related to the built form and would assist in addressing the failure in housing delivery.

478. Elton (promoting land off Landcroft Lane, Sutton Bonington) considers the arguments put forward for limiting growth in some settlements due to school capacity is flawed. There is insufficient evidence to limit growth in Sutton Bonington. It is comparable with the ‘other villages’ identified for growth and inconsistent with approaches to development at Bunny and Flintham. Development of land of Landcroft Lane can be assimilated into the village.

479. Raiment (promoting land at Sutton Bonington) request their site, behind Landcroft Lane is allocated.

480. Collington and Robinson (promoting land at Costock) state that Costock is a suitable settlement capable of accommodating some growth and that land north of Main Street/Leake Road is a sustainable location. The allocation of land at Flintham and Bunny, but not Costock is inconsistent. Especially given that Costock is a more sustainable settlement.

481. Trustees of Butler Reynolds (promoting land at Costock) consider the presence of both primary school and a local convenience store/post office as
requirements for new housing is overly restrictive. Costock has a range of services in nearby East Leake there is also a bus service. Land at Parklands should be allocated for 24 units.

482. **Wilson** (promoting land at Stanton on the Wolds) request their site, off Melton Road, is allocated.

483. Residents providing the following comments on 'other issues':

- Additional policies should cover listed buildings, waste and sustainability.
- Local Plan should focus on establishing ‘new towns.’
- All allocations should provide a mix of sites, including smaller homes for downsizers, small bungalows and one and two bedroom houses.
- The Council should look at opportunities to develop housing and associated services and facilities along the Nottingham to Grantham railway line – Orton, Elton, Aslockton and other villages.
- Decision to allocate sites in rural settlements based on educational capacity rather than the merits of sites is flawed. The assessment of surplus educational spaces is notoriously volatile and CIL/S106 can enable funding.
- Planning permissions should not be altered.
- Housebuilders land bank – these should be built on first
- New homes bonus forces the release of Green Belt. Why is Rushcliffe building on more land than its neighbours?
- Revised plan needed to reflect significant new employment developments to the west of Nottingham. New housing should be focussed on areas to the west of Nottingham.
- Wildlife impacts must be properly assessed and mitigation identified before sites are allocated.
- Village identity and character will be lost.
- Edwalton Golf Club should be built on.
- Land at RAF Newton:
  - This development has not yet delivered anything it promised – namely a district centre or primary school, so impacts upon East Bridgford.
  - Needs pubs, shops etc. to make it more of a community.
- Tollerton:
  - Should not have any further development.
  - Tollerton Primary School has no capacity or potential for expansion.
- Ratcliffe-on-Soar Power Station / South Clifton
o The power station should be considered for future development. It has potential for a large number of new dwellings.
o Also a lot of greenfield land alongside the A453, a ‘new town’ could be built here.
o Possibility of extending tram to new developments here, and up to EMA airport.
Appendix H: Local Plan Part 2 – Preferred Options, summary of exhibition responses

Introduction

Planning officers from Rushcliffe Borough Council organised ‘drop in’ exhibitions within the ‘key settlements’ of Cotgrave, Keyworth, Radcliffe on Trent and Ruddington, and the rural villages of Cropwell Bishop, East Bridgford and Gotham.

One exhibition was held in each settlement and these occurred early within the consultation period. These exhibitions were promoted through various mediums as explained within each event summary.

Purpose of Events

In accordance with the Borough Council’s adopted Statement of Community Involvement, the exhibitions provided opportunities for local residents and others with an interest in development in the Borough to discuss the preferred site options for housing development within the seven villages and town with the Borough Council’s planning officers and those elected members who also attended.

Exhibition Material

The inclusion of a tailored exercise for each settlement where the exhibition was held ensured residents were able to express their views and comment on the design, layout, type of houses and other types of development (open space etc.)

Exercise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exercise</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment on preferred sites</td>
<td>Using post-it notes attendees were able to provide comments on the type of housing that should be developed on the preferred housing sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These comments could focus 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To assist members of the public, response forms were created for each event, these included the specific questions on each settlement within the Preferred Options consultation. These could be completed at the exhibition, or at home and posted back to the Borough Council in pre-paid envelopes that were provided at each event.

Events Schedule

The following exhibition schedule was organised:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 October 2017</td>
<td>4pm until 8pm</td>
<td>Ruddington</td>
<td>St Peter’s Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 October 2017</td>
<td>4pm until 8pm</td>
<td>East Bridgford</td>
<td>Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 October 2017</td>
<td>4pm until 8pm</td>
<td>Gotham</td>
<td>Memorial Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 October 2017</td>
<td>4pm until 8pm</td>
<td>Cropwell Bishop</td>
<td>Old School House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 October 2017</td>
<td>4pm until 8pm</td>
<td>Radcliffe on Trent</td>
<td>Grange Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 November 2017</td>
<td>4pm until 8pm</td>
<td>Cotgrave</td>
<td>Welfare Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 November 2017</td>
<td>4pm until 8pm</td>
<td>Keyworth</td>
<td>Village Hall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ruddington

Location: St Peter’s Rooms

Date and Time: 17 October 2017, 3pm until 8pm

Exhibition Exercise

The preferred option consultation identifies 4 housing sites which would contribute around 410 new homes to the borough’s housing supply. These sites were identified following responses from residents, developers, landowners, local interest groups and statutory consultees to the Local Plan Part 2: Issues and Options, and Local Plan Part 2: Preferred Options Consultations.

Exercise: Type of Housing Development

Task: Using post it notes please provide any comments you wish to make regarding the preferred housing sites.

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.

Post-it note responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUD01: Land to the west of Wilford Road (south) (estimated capacity around 180 homes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sellors Playing Field must not be built on as it is important to the village (x31 similar comments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not suitable as it is in a flood area (x12 similar comments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Village already too congested with traffic on Wilford Road (x14 similar comments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased population means local schools should have additional capacity (x3 similar comments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All houses should have at least two car park spaces to prevent parking on the road (x2 similar comments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Better pedestrian and cycle routes should be create (x2 similar comments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Affordable houses should be built here (x2 similar comments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Speed cameras installed as there is a correlation with new developments and increased speeding vehicles (x2 comments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Packman Dyke must be protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved transport links into city centre from Ruddington.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bloors representative has said there will be 230/240 houses built here, is this true?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site should be reduced in size to prevent coalescence of settlement to Nottingham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The site should have some self-build houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provision of more council housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No housing for private rental.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SUDS are needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Renewable energy incorporated into the development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Useable green space to be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accessing main road from nearby streets is difficult – will be the same for these new houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rushcliffe only think about money, not the consequences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**similar comments).**
- New houses will impact upon village amenities (**x2 similar comments**).
- Green Belt should never be built on (**x2 similar comments**).
- Eco houses should be built.
- Village Hall should be left alone.
- Retirements houses/flats should be built so existing family homes can be made available.

- RUD01 is not suitable for any development, other sites are more suitable.
- Impact of new homes should be softened by landscaping, trees and sensitive design.
- Any lost hedgerows should be compensated for.
- Why should there be additional homes built to the original allocation in Ruddington?

**Summary**

A vast majority of comments stated that Sellors Playing Field is very important to the village, so it should not be developed.

The location of the site within an area at risk of flooding was also highlighted as an issue which should prevent the development of this site.

All houses should have a minimum of two car parking spaces, to reduce issues caused by on-street parking.

A mix of housing types and tenure should be provided, including affordable homes.

The increased population will have an impact upon services including local schools and doctors.

The site is in the Green Belt and therefore should not be developed.

**RUD05: Land south of Flawforth Lane**

(estimated capacity around 50 homes)

- Affordable houses should be built (**x6 similar comments**).
- Concerns for the increased levels of traffic (**x5 similar comments**).
- Eco housing should be built (**x4 similar comments**).
- More pedestrian crossings needed as roads are already difficult to cross (**x4 similar comments**).
- A good site to build houses on (**x3 similar comments**).
- School places in the village are already full (**x3 similar comments**).
- Green Belt should not be built on (**x2 similar comments**)
- Serious flooding issues at the western end of Flawforth Lane (**x2 similar comments**).

- Bungalows would be suitable here.
- The affordable houses should be built near to the shops and buses.
- Special help for local residents wanting to buy homes.
- Extension of 30mph speed limit should be carried out.
- Design should be in keeping with existing properties. Very bad access to the proposed site.
- Health facilities will need improving to allow for increased population.
- Why does the village have to suffer because of developers failing to deliver on the previous larger sites.
- Speed cameras needed.
- Site is a haven for wildlife so should not be built on.
• Alteration of traffic light patterns out of Kirk Lane toward town centre to improve flow (x2 similar comments).
• Road surface improvements are much needed on Flawforth Lane.

• Self-build should be allocated for some plots here.
• Executive houses should be built on this site.

Summary

The site is in the Green Belt and should not be developed.

More pedestrian crossings are needed, as it is already difficult to cross the main road in the village.

Affordable homes should be built.

Eco-homes should be built.

Increased traffic congestion as a result of the growing population will cause issues.

The increased population will also add stress to local services such as local schools.

There are issues of flooding toward the western end of the site.

RUD11: Old Loughborough Road
(estimated capacity around 10 self and custom-build homes)

• It is Green Belt land, so should not be developed (x4 similar comments).
• Smaller, affordable housing should be built (x4 similar comments).
• New homes should be eco houses (x3 similar comments).
• Is it really worth building just ten houses? (x3 similar comments)
• This development would physically connect Ruddington with the city.
• The houses built should be award winning designs, not plain ‘box-houses’.
• Safe pedestrian and cycle routes into the village are needed.
• Transport links into city centre should be improved.
• Any hedgerows lost must be compensated for.

• Kirk Lane and Flawforth Lane traffic lights need improving.
• Close to the school so more traffic safety measures are needed.
• Heavy traffic already flows through Ruddington. New houses would make it worse.
• RUD11 is an important site for wildlife and it needs protecting.
• The high density will look monstrous.
• SUDS need to be incorporated.
• Renewable energy sources for homes.
• Useable green space in the developments should be included.
• Concerns for schools in the area to cope with the increase.

Summary
Any new houses should be eco-homes.

The site is in Green Belt land and therefore should not be developed.

A number of comments question whether building just 10 houses will be worth it.

Smaller, affordable homes should be built on this site.

Pedestrian/cycle links need to be improved.

### RUD13: Land opposite Mere Way
(estimated capacity around 170 homes)

- One of the best sites for development (x12 similar comments).
- A mix of affordable houses should be built (x5 similar comments).
- Roads are already too congested, so more houses would make this worse (x5 similar comments).
- Green Belt should be protected (x4 similar comments).
- Public transport needs improving (x3 similar comments).
- Better pedestrian and cycle access into the village is needed (x2 similar comments).
- Schools are already at capacity (x2 similar comments).
- Homes for elderly and down-sizers to free up existing larger homes for families (x2 similar comments).
- A substantial perimeter of trees should be created on the boundary with the countryside.
- Can’t all 410 houses be built on this single site?
- Can a new Tesco be built here?
- A new school should be created here.
- Doctors are already too busy.
- New houses should be in keeping with the design of the Conservation Area.
- Each house should have two parking spaces to ensure there is no/little on street parking.
- This is the furthest site out of Ruddington we can hope for.
- Safe pedestrian and cycle routes should be made from the site into the village.
- Ensure any hedgerows lost are compensated for. This site would have the least impact upon the village’s traffic problem.
- Centre of Ruddington should be one-way traffic to ease congestion.
- Two-bed houses and flats should be built.
- Flood and surface water issues.
- Houses should be eco-houses.
- RUD13 should be reduced whilst using RUD06 – this will reduce the amount of countryside developed.
- Build thatched cottages.
- Some of this site should be allocated for self-build.
- Access should be from the traffic island to Flawforth Lane.
- Renewable energy for homes.
- Allocation of land for green space within the development is important.
- SUDS will need to be incorporated.
- Do not link the site to Flawforth Lane.

### Summary

Many of the comments identify this site as one of the best for development.
Better pedestrian and cycle access is needed.

The Green Belt should not be developed.

Roads in the village are already too congested. Any additional houses would make this matter worse.

Affordable houses should be put into the housing mix.

Homes for the elderly and disabled should be built, therefore freeing up larger homes for families.

Public transport links need improving alongside any development.
East Bridgford

Location: Village Hall

Date and Time: 25 October 2017, 4pm until 8pm

Exhibition Exercise

The preferred option consultation identifies 4 housing sites in East Bridgford which would contribute around 100 new homes to the borough’s housing supply. These sites were identified following responses from residents, developers, landowners, local interest groups and statutory consultees to the Local Plan Part 2: Issues and Options, and Local Plan Part 2: Further Options Consultations.

Exercise: Type of Housing Development

Task: Using post it notes please provide any comments you wish to make regarding the preferred housing sites.

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.

Post-it note responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EBR06: Closes Side Lane (west) (estimated capacity around 20 homes)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Increased traffic. Cross lane, Cherryholt Lane and Fosters Close cannot take another 100 cars (x8 similar comments). These do not have footpaths.</td>
<td>• Should have off road parking (x2 similar comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poor access. Cross Lane and Butt Lane junction would become too dangerous (x3 similar comments).</td>
<td>• EBR06 or EBR07 – not both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bungalows and small houses at low densities (x3 similar comments)</td>
<td>• Minimal issues – overlooking and access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No places at the school - Newton School dependent (x3 similar comments).</td>
<td>• As good a site as any.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No (x2 similar comments)</td>
<td>• Should be a mix including affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need better bus services (x2 similar comments) and a pub</td>
<td>• Green areas – lawns, hedges etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not needed if EBR08 is extended which is a more favourable traffic option (x2 similar comments).</td>
<td>• Impact on conservation area EBR03 and EBR04 seem better options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Must be energy/water efficient (x2 comments)</td>
<td>• Impact on listed buildings 40 yards away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other sites have better/safer access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recent traffic accident outside school means no more cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Too much infill – poor amenities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Must maintain privacy of neighbouring properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Drains need upgrading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sheltered accommodation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary

Local residents highlighted access and traffic congestion as the main concern, followed by the need to provide a mix of house types, including smaller properties, bungalows and affordable housing.

The lack of school capacity was mentioned.

The promotion of alternative sites, notably EBR08, also occurred.

#### EBR07: Closes Side Lane (east) (estimated capacity around 20 homes)

- Poor access and increased traffic (x6 similar comments)
- Mix of houses – large, small and affordable/starter homes (x5 similar comments)
- Sites EBR08 and EBR09 have better access (x4 similar comments)
- More off-street parking required (x3 similar comments)
- Build bungalows (x3 similar comments)
- Need better public transport (x2 similar comments)
- No
- Dangerous junction at Cross Lane and Main Street.
- Not low value green Space
- 100 homes are too many – East Bridgford has only built 5 in the last 14 years.
- Too much infill – poor amenities.
- If needed looks suitable – minimal interference.
- High quality, low density – not social housing.
- Homes for rent
- Environmentally sustainable housing and cheap to maintain.
- Build please
- Don’t build
- Either EBR06 and EBR07 – not both
- Do not need extra houses in East Bridgford
- Other sites have better access
- Loss of countryside views
- Loss of green fields.

#### Summary

Local residents highlighted access and traffic congestion as the main concern, followed by the need to provide a mix of house types, including smaller properties, bungalows and affordable housing.

The promotion of alternative sites, notably EBR08, also occurred.

On-street parking has been raised as an issue which should be addressed in the area. The loss of valued countryside/open space was also a concern.

#### EBR08: Land to the north of Butt Lane (estimated capacity around 15 homes)

- Smaller affordable properties for all ages (x6 similar comments)
- Parking at Doctors is a problem and is dangerous (x5 similar comments)
- Bungalows (x5 similar comments)
- Best option for growth
- Low density
- Not social housing
- Safe cycling route along Butt Lane.
- Protect Springdale Wood
- Character of the village will be spoilt by development fronting Butt Lane *(x3 similar comments)*
- Include affordable housing *(x2 similar comments)*. More than 30%.
- Extend to Closes side lane *(x3 similar comments)*
- Provide a mix of housing – large and small *(x2 similar comments)*
- Well-designed/high quality *(x2 similar comments)*. Not all the same.
- No school capacity *(x2 similar comments)*
- Increased school capacity must be guaranteed *(x2 similar comments)*.
- Ruin countryside views – single storey only.
- EBR08 interferes minimally with other residents.

- Better transport facilities
- Main Street congested due to traffic and parked cars.
- Off-street parking Need to address the use of East Bridgford as a short cut to Gunthorpe Bridge.
- Pedestrian crossing required across Butt Lane at the doctors.
- When will Newton be developed?
- Development must not overlook bridleways.
- Neighbouring properties should not be overlooked.
- Ecohomes should be built
- Street lighting required on Butt Lane
- Reduction in speed along Butt Lane
- Poor drainage

**Summary**

There was clear public support for smaller more affordable homes rather than only larger homes. This includes bungalows which would allow residents to downsize and have less visual impact.

Parking issues at the doctors were highlighted as a problem, as was congestion through the village on Main Street.

The extension of EBR08 to Closes Side Lane was also promoted as an alternative to the other sites.

School capacity was re-iterated as an issue which must be addressed before development occurs.

**EBR10: Land to the south of Butt Lane** *(estimated capacity around 45 homes)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable and starter homes for first time buyers and families</td>
<td><em>(x11 similar comments)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco-homes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single storey for houses on bridleways.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road should not run next to Bridleways.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Centre is at capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most landscape sensitive site – should be omitted. Drains are at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least impact on traffic through the village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the village (x4 similar comments) 
especially Main Street.
- Mix of attractive small and larger 
  properties (x3 similar comments)
- No (x2 similar comments)
- Off-street parking
- Houses for rent
- No social housing
- No

- More public transport required
- Views from medical centre should be 
  preserved through sight lines
- Loss of green field
- Better public transport required
- Located close to services and 
  facilities.

Summary

The need to provide affordable housing, starter homes, smaller properties and 
bungalows for young families and elderly residents was clearly expressed.

The capacity of the school was re-iterated.

The existing footpath should be retained and additional parking for the doctors 
should be provided.

Congestion, particularly on Main Street, was highlighted as a problem that would be 
made worse.
**Gotham**

**Location:** Memorial Hall

**Date and Time:** 26 October 2017, 3pm until 8pm

**Exhibition Exercise**

The preferred option consultation identifies 1 housing site which would contribute around 100 new homes to the borough’s housing supply. This site was identified following responses from residents, developers, landowners, local interest groups and statutory consultees to the Local Plan Part 2: Issues and Options, and Local Plan Part 2: Preferred Options Consultations.

**Exercise: Type of Housing Development**

Task: Using post it notes please provide any comments you wish to make regarding the preferred housing sites.

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.

**Post-it note responses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOT05a: Land east of Gypsum Way/The Orchards (1) (estimated capacity around 100 homes)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The main road (Leake Road) is too busy already and the infrastructure cannot support any additional homes and people (x8 similar comments).</td>
<td>• Why are you building on this site and not the RBL site (GOT01)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Off-street parking should be provided by means of a new road to the rear of Leake Road (x4 similar comments).</td>
<td>• Areas of land adjacent to the site should remain in the Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need for bungalows for the elderly (x3 similar comments).</td>
<td>• The site needs a southern boundary to prevent further development of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need for more affordable homes (x2 similar comments).</td>
<td>• Would prefer lots of smaller sites to be developed rather than one giant one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of houses should strictly be no more than 100 (x2 similar comments).</td>
<td>• Need for more family houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New houses should not be built any higher than two storeys (x3 similar comments).</td>
<td>• Houses designed for elderly/disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 100 new houses goes beyond local need (x2 similar comments).</td>
<td>• Why can’t GOT1 be developed, as it was the village’s choice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• people should be two-bedroom for visitors or carers.</td>
<td>• The old barn would be ideal for a village museum, something which the village lacks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to Leake Road will be a huge challenge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Density of houses is too high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It would be sensible to add additional access onto Gypsum Way, despite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Attractive materials should be used, unlike the red bricks of recent nearby developments.
- No problem with 100 houses on this site.
- Loss of biodiversity.
- Would be good if all required houses could be built on this single site as it is already within the village boundary.
- Provision of some houses for those in Gotham who want to downsize to a two-bed house.

Summary

The main concerns highlighted traffic concerns, especially the main road through the village (Leake Road) which, according to responses, is already too congested. More houses would add to this issue.

Affordable homes, family homes and bungalows are desired.

The building heights should not exceed two storeys, with one comment suggesting a ban on any upward extensions in the next 20 years.

Strict limit of 100 homes to be built here, with some stating that this is too many.

Off-street parking should be provided to ensure congestion issues are not worsened.

Comments for Gotham sites NOT identified

- GOT04 should remain in the Green Belt.
- GOT04 has impacts upon Pygall Avenue and Hall Drive.
- GOT01 would be a better site (x3 similar comments).
Cropwell Bishop

Location: Old School House

Date and Time: 30 October 2017, 4pm until 8pm

Exhibition Exercise

The preferred option consultation identifies 2 housing sites in Cropwell Bishop which would contribute around 160 new homes to the borough’s housing supply. These sites were identified following responses from residents, developers, landowners, local interest groups and statutory consultees to the Local Plan Part 2: Issues and Options, and Local Plan Part 2: Further Options Consultations.

Exercise: Type of Housing Development

Task: Using post it notes please provide any comments you wish to make regarding the preferred housing sites.

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.

Post-it note responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBI02: Land north of Memorial Hall (1) (estimated capacity around 90 homes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Access onto Hoe View from Mercia Avenue and then onto Nottingham Road is inadequate and dangerous. Speeding cars. (x11 similar comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Loss of and visual intrusion into Green Belt and Countryside (x6 similar comments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flooding/Drainage issues on site (x6 similar comments) and on Church Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nottingham Road already congested and too narrow due to parking. (x4 similar comments) Pavements are too narrow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cumulative traffic impacts due to relocation of the Co-op and current development behind Church Road (x3 similar comments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access should be along Bridleway to Nottingham Road with traffic lights (x3 similar comments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Decision made on maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Land should be saved for leisure and recreation purposes (x2 similar comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bridleways should be protected and maintained (x2 similar comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extends towards the chicken farm. Less than 1km (x2 similar comments) Safety concerns on Medina Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Playing fields have a covenant that prevents development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inadequate sewage capacity at this end of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maximise green/garden space for wildlife and reduce flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impact on local wildlife site. Intrusion into habitats, loss of fauna and disturbance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need extra doctors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inadequate infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No capacity at the doctor’s surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimise the eyesore on the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Well placed to the west of the village</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

The greatest concerns regarding CBI02 focused on the possible access to the site via Hoe View Road and Mercia Avenue and the congestion on Nottingham Road. Residents highlighted risks of increased accidents at the junction of Hoe View Road and Nottingham Road and parking on Nottingham Road as specific issues. Some residents suggested access should be via the existing bridleway. This was not universally supported however.

Loss of Green Belt and intrusion into open countryside were highlighted as the site is not infill.

Increased flood risks and inadequate drainage were noted.

CBI05: Land east of Church Street (estimated capacity around 70 homes)

- Increased congestion/traffic through the village *(x8 similar comments)*
- Negative impact on the green and open environment of the school *(x4 similar comments)*
- Poor access on bend and increased risk of accidents *(x4 similar comments)*
- Inadequate bus service *(x4 similar bus services)*
- Surgery is at capacity and will need expanding *(x2 similar comments)*
- Roundabout would alter the look of the village *(x2 similar comments)*
- Retain footpath on western boundary
- Too close to the school – increased congestion.
- Loss of sledging hill.
- Flooding issues on site
- Flooding issues on Church Street (including foul water sewage).
- Inadequate sewage capacity
- Infrastructure needs careful planning
  Access of Fern Road, via Main Street.
- Village character needs to be maintained.
- Access to the school and parking must be conditioned
- Affordable housing with off-street parking.

Summary

Impacts on traffic on Church Street and Nottingham Road were a significant concern as was the safety of providing access (via a roundabout) on the bend on Church Street.

The loss of open countryside adjacent to the school, flood risk, lack of community services and facilities and inadequate bus services within the village were highlighted.
Radcliffe on Trent

Location: Grange Hall

Date and Time: 31 October 2017, 4pm until 8pm

Exhibition Exercise

The preferred option consultation identifies 6 housing sites in Radcliffe on Trent which would contribute around 820 new homes to the borough’s housing supply. These sites were identified following responses from residents, developers, landowners, local interest groups and statutory consultees to the Local Plan Part 2: Issues and Options, and Local Plan Part 2: Further Options Consultations.

Exercise: Type of Housing Development

Task: Using post it notes please provide any comments you wish to make regarding the preferred housing sites.

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.

Post-it note responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RAD01: Land north of Nottingham Road (estimated capacity around 150 homes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Avoid development within the floodplain. How confident is the council that homes will not be flooded? <em>(x4 similar comments)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sewage issues within the area must be addressed. Current system (including pumps) cannot cope <em>(x2 similar comments)</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Traffic on Shelford Road <em>(x2 similar comments)</em> and parking in the centre are the main problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site should include good green space with connections through the site that maintain the green edge and provide play areas <em>(x2 similar comments)</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additional traffic is a significant issue. Will further highways works be required on the A52? Have recent improvements been a waste of money?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Only allocate land outside the area at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Open spaces should be located within the area at risk of flooding and ‘greener’ areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site should connect to the old mineral railway line recreational route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus development towards Newton – more space there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Health centre needs rebuilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure developers start building once planning permission is granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus development towards the east of the village adjacent to the A52.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need more small houses and starter homes for the elderly (for downsizing) and families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Larger buildings/homes should be nearer residential area and road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stop extensions to small houses ensure they remain affordable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sensible school site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Significant noise impact on residents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
risk of flooding.  
- S106 money must secure upgraded infrastructure and services.  
- Infrastructure must be provided upfront.  
- Highways access onto Holme Lane should be prevented.

Summary
The main issues raised by residents were flooding, sewage system capacity and need to deliver green infrastructure on site.

Green Infrastructure should include play areas which integrate with other green infrastructure assets in Radcliffe (including former minerals line) and along the River Trent green corridor.

Areas at risk of flooding should be avoided and instead provide open space.

The sewage system (including pumps) will require upgrading to accommodate additional development. Raw sewage has threatened to enter homes in the vicinity of RAD01 during periods of heavy rain (this was fed back verbally to officers at the event).

Homes should not be 4 and 5 bed exclusively. Need smaller family homes.

RAD02: Land adjacent Grooms Cottage (estimated capacity around 50 homes)

- Impacts on traffic  
- A52 is at capacity  
- Cumulative impact with RAD03, particularly increased traffic on Shelford Road. Needs access onto A52.  
- Traffic calming measures required on Shelford Road to slow speeding traffic.

Summary
The main concerns regarding RAD02 highlighted traffic issues on Shelford Road and the cumulative effects of both RAD02 and RAD03.

RAD03: Land off Shelford Road (estimated capacity around 400 homes)

- Shelford Road cannot cope/is at capacity/dangerous (17 similar comments). Cumulative traffic impacts with Newton development.  
- Pedestrian and road access to A52 across railway line should be provided, linking RAD03 with RAD05a (16 similar comments). Shelford road should be a secondary access.  
- Wrong place for a school due to traffic, parking, distance from the rest  
- Green buffer (trees) should be created between existing homes and new development (2 similar comments).  
- Medical centre is already at capacity (2 similar comments)  
- Mini roundabout is not ‘mini’ within submitted planning application. It will not solve traffic issues on Shelford Road (2 similar comments)  
- More bungalows (2 similar comments)
of the village *(x5 similar comments).* Conflicts with Neighbourhood Plan.
- Medical centre should be located in the centre not on RAD03 *(x4 similar comments).* It should be redeveloped in its current location. Conflicts with Neighbourhood Plan.
- Must provide affordable housing *(x4 similar comments)* and starter homes for local families.
- Improved bus service along Shelford Road required. 15 minute walk is too far for some people *(x4 similar comments)*.
- Traffic calming measures on Shelford Road are required to slow traffic *(x3 similar comments)*.
- Requires open spaces, not all houses together.
- Should be connected to Clumber Drive
- Development at Shelford Road will turn Radcliffe into a town.
- A52 is at capacity
- Sewage issues need addressing – blocked drains.
- Increased flood risk – surface water run-off.
- 400 homes are too many.
- Insufficient amenities for this many people.
- Secure robust S106 to deliver infrastructure.

### Summary

The main concern expressed by residents regarding RAD03 was congestion and safety on Shelford Road and the increased traffic that this development would generate. Due these issues a significant number of residents proposed linking RAD03 and RAD05a and providing an alternative access onto the A52.

The relocation of the school and medical centre from the centre of the village, where it is accessible to most residents, to RAD03 was also a concern. Bus services should be improved.

Residents highlighted the need to provide affordable, starter homes and smaller properties for local families. Not large expensive detached homes.

Green buffer along the western boundary required to reduce impact on neighbouring residential area.

RAD05a: Land north of Grantham Road to south of railway line (1a) *(estimated capacity around 140 homes)*

- Poor access onto A52. Access from Hudson Way and Harlequin is already dangerous *(x11 similar comments).* This will be made worse following works to improve traffic flow. Would require traffic lights and pedestrian crossing.
- A52 is not coping with current traffic levels. Ques go back to Saxondale *(x6 similar comments).*
- Radcliffe needs a bypass *(x6 similar comments).*
- Negative comments ignore necessities for housing. Problem with A52 is limited capacity at Gamston.
- Loss of countryside views from A52 and Harlequin.

### Summary
Existing congestion on the A52 and safe access onto this highway was the primary concern of residents.

A by-pass was supported.

### RAD06: 72 Main Road (estimated capacity around 5 homes)

- Site is too small.
- Stop traffic coming through Radcliffe from Newton. Direct onto A46/A52.

**Summary**

There were limited comments on RAD06. Site size was the only concern.

### RAD13: The Paddock, Nottingham Road (estimated capacity around 75 homes)

- Risk of flooding and impact of climate change (**x2 similar comments**).
- Health centre should be expanded/rebuilt in its current location (**x2 similar comments**).
- Houses should be sound proofed.
- Prefer RAD09 and RAD10.
- Health centre should be located on this site.
- Better than Shelford Road site.
- Sensible school site.
- Traffic can be managed onto A52.

**Summary**

Flood risk and noise were highlighted as the main issues that would require addressing.

### Alternative Sites

(although not prompted to do so, attendees expressed the following comments on sites not selected as preferred options)

- RAD09, 08 and 10 should be allocated (**x6 similar comments**). These sites are close to the schools and centre of the village.
- All houses should be at Newton Airfield.
- RAD07 is blighted by oil drilling.
- Sites should be identified near Saxondale.
**Cotgrave**

**Location:** Welfare Social Club

**Date and Time:** 9 November 2017, 4pm until 8pm

**Exhibition Exercise**

The preferred option consultation identifies 4 housing sites in Cotgrave which would contribute around 350 new homes to the borough’s housing supply. These sites were identified following responses from residents, developers, landowners, local interest groups and statutory consultees to the Local Plan Part 2: Issues and Options, and Local Plan Part 2: Further Options Consultations.

**Exercise: Type of Housing Development**

**Task:** Using post it notes please provide any comments you wish to make regarding the preferred housing sites.

*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.*

**Post-it note responses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COT01: Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park</th>
<th>COT02: Location</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Do not build on green field sites <em>(x9 similar comments)</em> – Rushcliffe has loads of brownfield sites which should be built on first. Newton and derelict houses</td>
<td>• Object to all the sites – Cotgrave is large enough already</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality bungalows <em>(x7 similar comments)</em> and/or communal elderly homes</td>
<td>• Colston Gate and Hollygate Lane junction is congested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Road system cannot cope and is already congested <em>(x4 similar comments)</em> especially Hollygate Lane during rush hour</td>
<td>• Not enough amenities Single user units - 3/4 bed family homes already built in Cotgrave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No backing/overlooking onto existing housing, no 3 storey housing – consider bungalows closer <em>(x3 similar comments)</em></td>
<td>• Low level lighting near the woods as valuable habitat area for nocturnal animals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low cost <em>(x2 similar comments)</em> and social housing</td>
<td>• Off road parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Include a playground / Multi–use open space <em>(x2 similar comments)</em></td>
<td>• Low density</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inadequate infrastructure and services <em>(x2 similar comments)</em></td>
<td>• Drainage and flooding issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact on Country Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pedestrian route into Cotgrave Country Park must be retained. Should be a bridleway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve facilities at the country park – warden and toilets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Who wants this?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The main concerns and suggestions focused on the loss of greenfield sites and need to develop brownfield first, the need to deliver bungalows, prevent overlooking of neighbouring properties, deliver low cost/affordable housing, include open space and address infrastructure issues in the village.

Impacts on the country park and need to maintain access to it was also highlighted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COT09: Land south of Hollygate Lane (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Infrastructure and services need improving (x5 similar comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bungalows (x3 similar comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Low cost for young people (x3 similar comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Single user units (x2 similar comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inadequate medical facilities (x2 similar comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Social housing needed (x2 similar comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Traffic measures for all sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Public bridleway needs to be retained and should be surfaced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COT10: Land south of Hollygate Lane (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Bungalows for the elderly (x7 similar comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Affordable low cost starter homes (x5 similar comments) for young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Single user units (x2 similar comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consider MOD sites across the country – Newton (x2 similar comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Must consider parking as each house has 2/3 cars now – must have offf-street parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop sites on the edge pf Bunny, Bradmore, Langar, Cropwell Bishop and Sutton Bonnington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The main concerns and suggestions focused on inadequate infrastructure and services and the need to deliver bungalows and low cost housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increased congestion and parking issues were also highlighted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous improvements to the village have not been delivered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better access to Hollygate Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Open Space within the development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must assess cumulative impacts of all development upon the highway network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The main concerns and suggestions highlighted the need to deliver bungalows and affordable/low cost housing.

Traffic, parking and increased congestion were also referred to as important issues that need addressing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COT11a: Land south of Hollygate Lane (3a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Affordable/Low cost housing <em>(x5 similar comments)</em> for young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bungalows <em>(x3 similar comments)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Single User Units <em>(x2 similar comments)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not enough infrastructure <em>(x2 similar comments)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No houses next to bungalows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

Affordable, low cost housing for young people and bungalows or single user units were highlighted by residents as being needed within any development of the site.

As with the other sites, traffic congestion and parking issues were also referred to as issues that should be addressed.

Infrastructure issues were also highlighted.
Keyworth

Location: Centenary Lounge, Keyworth Villager Hall

Date and Time: 13 November 2017, 4pm until 8pm

Exhibition Exercise

The preferred option consultation identifies 4 housing sites in Keyworth which would contribute around 580 new homes to the borough’s housing supply. These sites were identified following responses from residents, developers, landowners, local interest groups and statutory consultees to the Local Plan Part 2: Issues and Options, and Local Plan Part 2: Further Options Consultations.

Exercise: Type of Housing Development

Task: Using post it notes please provide any comments you wish to make regarding the preferred housing sites.

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.

Post-it note responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY04a: Land off Nicker Hill (estimated capacity around 150 homes)</th>
<th>KEY04b: Land off Nicker Hill (estimated capacity around 150 homes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Retirement/downsizing homes (x8 similar comments). Debdale House not replaced.</td>
<td>• Need extra parking in the village centre (x2 similar comments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incorporate open space (including children’s play space and dog walking areas) to link with footpaths and bridleway (x5 similar comments).</td>
<td>• 3 bed detached houses with garages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mix of housing including for first time buyers (x4 similar comments). Not just executive homes.</td>
<td>• Affordable housing (x2 similar comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved public transport links into the village. Busses should go both ways around the village (x3 similar comments)</td>
<td>• Unsafe junctions at: Platt Lane/A606; Main Road/Melton Road (A606); Pendock Lane/Loughborough Road and Nicker Hill/Station Road (x2 similar comments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poor road infrastructure and traffic congestion (whichever site) (x3 similar comments)Need starter homes</td>
<td>• Not enough school places (x2 similar comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Should be larger (x3 similar comments)</td>
<td>• KEY1 seems an appropriate site (x2 similar comments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• On a bus route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Doesn’t increase traffic through the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not as obtrusive as other sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No thanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Capacity of health centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary
The need to provide a mix of housing was highlighted by residents as a major issue; especially homes for retired people who would like to downsize and/or require assisted living accommodation. Homes for first time buyers were also suggested.

It was also suggested by a number of residents that the site should contain open spaces for children and informal areas.

Improvements to the bus services that connect the site to the village centre were highlighted alongside concerns regarding, parking in the village centre, road infrastructure, traffic congestion and the safety of junctions on Station Road, the A606 and A60.

Some residents the site should be larger as it is less obtrusive.

**KEY08: Land between Platt Lane and Station Road (estimated capacity around 190)**

- Too many houses (**x4 similar comments**)
- Widen Platt Lane as it's too narrow (**x5 similar comments**)
- Unsafe junction at bottom of Nicker Hill (with Station Road/Platt Lane) (**x5 similar comments**)
- Improve junctions with A606 (**x4 similar comments**)
- Good agricultural land (Grade 2) (**x4 similar comments**)
- Affordable and low cost housing for families (**x3 similar comments**)
- Should have front and rear gardens and not be densely packed together (**x2 similar comments**).
- Site floods (**x2 similar comments**)
- Sewage
- No (**x2 similar comments**)
- Infrastructure will not sustain it (**x2 similar comments**)
- Too far from shops and amenities.
- Mature trees on Station Road should stay.
- 3 bed detached houses with garages.
- First time buyers – lower cost housing.
- Why was 06 and 07 rejected?
- Green Space
- Close railway and create cycle way to Edwalton.
- KEY05 is no further from the village than KEY08
- Flat site
- On a bus route.
- Traffic does not go through the village
- Traffic calming required on Nicker Hill.
- Redesign BGS entrance- take it back to prevent back-up of traffic on Nicker Hill.
- Too close to railway line.

**Summary**

The width of Platt Lane (and railway bridge) and junction safety (Nicker Hill/Station Road/Platt Lane) were highlighted as significant highways concerns.

The need to provide affordable/low cost/family homes was raised as requirement.

Flooding and inadequate infrastructure were also highlighted.

**KEY10: Land south of Debdale Lane (1) (estimated capacity around 190 homes)**
- Affordable housing and starter homes required *(x5 similar comments)*
- Enable downsizing by building smaller properties. Include apartments (extra care/sheltered housing) for the elderly *(x3 similar comments)*
- Debdale Lane and Bunny Lane will not be able to cope with construction traffic or with traffic generated by new residents *(x2 similar comments)*
- 3 bed detached houses *(x2 similar comments)*
- Junction with A60 congested. Requires traffic light *(x2 similar comments)*
- Increased traffic through the village *(x2 similar comments)*
- Parking provision in the village is inadequate *(x2 similar comments)*
- Should build in the City where the need is.
- Developing the site will destroy the countryside and village life

- Need better access out of the village either towards Loughborough or Nottingham.
- Mix of housing required
- Open space linear buffer on west boundary with natural open ground to the north. Impacts on High Court Drive – not considered in visual impact assessment.
- Loss of wildlife
- Impact on ancient hedgerow.
- Loss of Green Belt
- Difficult policing such a large area.
- Medical centre is at capacity.
- Should be a country park.
- Bus service can’t cope Do not extend to Debdale Lane
- No 4/5 bed houses
- Low density
- Dangerous access onto bunny Lane
- Bungalows to preserve long distance views for residents.
- Develop KEY01, 02 and 03 – flat, on bus route, less traffic through the village.
- Ridge and furrow on lower fields – archaeology should be examined

**Summary**

A wide range of concerns were raised regarding KEY10. As with other sites, the need to provide a mix of housing for residents was highlighted, especially starter/lower cost/affordable homes for younger people and families and properties for the elderly.

Access onto Bunny Lane and congestion through the village and at the Junction with the A60 were also highlighted.

Environmental (loss of wildlife) and historic issues (ridge and furrow) were also raised.

**KEY13: Hillside Farm (estimated capacity around 50 homes)**

| Excellent plot/best site – near village square *(x11 similar comments)* | No more executive homes. |
| Congestion on Bunny Lane *(x5 similar comments)*. | Site is productive farmland. |
| Poor/dangerous access onto A60 *(x5 similar comments)* | Need homes for young people to stay in the village. |
| Not part of neighbourhood plan *(x5 similar comments)* | Sloping site – not suitable. |
| | Sewerage issues in the village. |
| | Flooding on Bunny Lane |
**similar comments)**
- Protect the Green Belt *(x4 similar comments)*.
- No need to build given existing allocations *(x2 similar comments)*.
- Additional site not required.
- Destroys views into and out of the village *(x2 similar comments)*.
- Site is not being farmed – destroyed *(x2 similar comments)*.
- Boundary is in dispute with neighbouring residents *(x2 similar comments)*.
- Too near to sewage treatment work *(x2 similar comments)*.
- Low cost affordable housing needed *(x2 similar comments)*.
- Precursor to more development south of bunny Lane.
- Loss of agricultural land.
- Breaks robust ditch boundary.
- What about Wysall side along Lings Lane?

**similar comments)**
- Does not flood.
- School and medical centre need more capacity.

**Summary**

Due to the site’s proximity to the village centre there was support for this site from some residents.

However concerns were raised regarding congestion on Bunny Lane and at the junction with the A60. Access onto Bunny Lane was also a concern due to the undulating road.

The site is not identified within the emerging neighbourhood plan and this was highlighted as a reason not to allocate the site.

As with other sites the need to provide a mix of housing, including low cost or affordable housing, was also highlighted.