



Rushcliffe Local Plan

Rushcliffe Draft Green Belt Review

**PART 2 (b) (Detailed Review of the Nottingham-
Derby Green Belt within Rushcliffe – Rural
Towns and Villages)**

Report of consultation

September 2017

KS/GRE/04

Contents	Page
1. Introduction	1
2. Responses to Green Belt Review Part 2 (b)	4
2.1. Proposed insets for washed over villages	4
2.2. Proposed minor amendments to existing boundaries	5
2.3. Key Settlements Review	6
2.4. Further Comments	9
3. Responses to Green Belt Review Part 2 (b) Assessment of Additional Sites in Key Settlements and Other Villages	11
3.1. Assessment of Additional Sites in Key Settlements and Other Villages	11
Appendix A: Responses to Green Belt Review Part 2 (b)	14
Appendix B: Responses to Green Belt Review Part 2 (b) Assessment of Additional Sites in Key Settlements and Other Villages	133

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Local Plan Part 1: Rushcliffe Core Strategy (Core Strategy) was adopted in December 2014. The Core Strategy was supported by a green belt review. This review comprised a strategic review around the main built up area of Nottingham, a strategic review around rural towns and villages that fall within the green belt within Rushcliffe, and a detailed review around the edge of the main built up area of Nottingham (within Rushcliffe), together with the regeneration sites at Former RAF Newton and Former Cotgrave Colliery.
- 1.2 Rushcliffe's Local Plan is a two Part Process, with Local Plan Part 2 Land and Planning Policies (LAPP) providing full coverage for development within the Borough until 2028. The scope of Local Plan Part 2 is policies for considering the development of land. Secondly, it will contain non-strategic allocations within the Borough around the key settlements and other villages where further residential development is required to meet housing need and is sustainable.
- 1.3 Once finalised, the Green Belt review will provide evidence to support possible revisions to Green Belt boundaries within the rural parts of Rushcliffe.
- 1.4 Two separate consultations on Part 2b of the Green Belt Review have taken place. Both supported Local Plan Part 2 consultations on Green Belt boundaries and possible development site allocations.

Rushcliffe Green Belt Review Part 2 (b)

- 1.5 The first draft Part 2 (b) Green Belt Review was produced for consultation alongside the Issues and Options consultation on Rushcliffe's Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies. Consultation commenced on the 28 February 2016 and finished on the 24 March 2016.
- 1.6 During this consultation the Draft Green Belt Review was exhibited, alongside the Issues and Options documents, at public events in Keyworth, Radcliffe-on-Trent (twice), and Ruddington. It was also made available at public libraries and Council Offices. Paper copies of the draft review and response form were sent to all Parish Councils.
- 1.7 The draft review and response form were published on Rushcliffe Borough Council's website.
- 1.8 All statutory consultees and those on the Local Plan Consultee Database were informed that the Draft Green Belt Review was subject to consultation

alongside the Issues and Options Land and Planning Policies Development Plan.

- 1.9 In total, 76 individuals or organisations submitted comments. This report provides a summary of the comments made. Appendix A sets out, as best as possible, where consultees have made specific suggested modifications to the Green Belt Review. Where relevant, a Council response is provided and, if agreed, changes have then been made to the final version of the Green Belt Review.

Rushcliffe Green Belt Review Part 2 (b) Assessment of Additional Sites in Key Settlements and Other Villages

- 1.10 Due to the Borough's absence of a 5 year supply of deliverable homes, further consultation on Local Plan Issues and Options took place between 17 February 2017 and 31 March 2017.
- 1.11 The consultation identified possible housing sites on the edge of Cropwell Bishop, East Bridgford, Gotham and Tollerton. It also suggested that, in addition to the former colliery, housing sites could be identified on the edge of Cotgrave. As these settlements are currently inset, or will be inset (in accordance with Core Strategy policy 4), the removal of land must be informed by a Green Belt review which determines their importance in Green Belt terms.
- 1.12 This second Green Belt Review consultation also assessed additional housing sites which were submitted by landowners during the previous consultation on the Issues and Options. These included sites on the edge of Cotgrave, Radcliffe and Ruddington. This second part of Part 2b of the Green Belt Review was titled Assessment of Additional Sites in Key Settlements and Other Villages.
- 1.13 During this consultation the Draft Green Belt Review was exhibited, alongside the Further Issues and Options documents, at public events in Cropwell Bishop, Cotgrave, East Bridgford, Gotham and Tollerton. It was also made available at public libraries and Council Offices. Paper copies of the draft review and response form were sent to all Parish Councils.
- 1.14 In total, 53 individuals or organisations submitted comments. In addition to comments on the previous Issues and Options consultation, this report provides a summary of the comments made. Appendix B sets out, as best as possible, where consultees have made specific suggested modifications to the Green Belt Review. Where relevant, a Council response is provided and, if agreed, changes have then been made to the final version of the Green Belt Review.

1.15 During consultation on the Green Belt review of additional sites and other villages it became clear that the referencing of sites (the village name shortened to three letters (e.g. Gotham sites are identified as GOT) and a number) was creating difficulties for consultees as these were similar to those used within the Local Plan Part 2 consultation. However as the individual numbers were in many cases different, some consultees were understandably confused and used the incorrect referencing when commenting on the two documents.

1.16 To ensure this does not occur during further consultation on the Local Plan, the referencing of sites within the Green Belt Review has been amended and sites assigned a letter rather than a number. This should assist consultees when commenting on proposed site allocations within the draft Local Plan.

1.17 The new references are set out below:

Cotgrave		Keyworth		Radcliffe		Ruddington	
Previous Reference	New Reference	Previous Reference	New Reference	Previous Reference	New Reference	Previous Reference	New Reference
COT1	COT/B	KEY1	KEY/A	RAD1	RAD/J	RUD1	RUD/A
COT2	COT/A	KEY2	KEY/B	RAD2	RAD/A	RUD2	RUD/B
COT3	COT/C	KEY3	KEY/C	RAD3	RAD/B	RUD3	RUD/C
COT4	COT/D	KEY4	KEY/D & KEY/E	RAD4	RAD/D	RUD4	RUD/I
COT5	COT/E	KEY5	KEY/F	RAD5	RAD/E	RUD5	RUD/K
COT6	COT/J	KEY6	KEY/G	RAD6	RAD/L	RUD6	RUD/L
COT7	COT/M	KEY7	KEY/H	RAD7	RAD/F	RUD7	RUD/N
COT8	COT/N	KEY8	KEY/J	RAD8	RAD/G	RUD8	RUD/O
COT9	COT/L	KEY9	KEY/K	RAD9	RAD/H	RUD9	RUD/F
COT10	COT/H	KEY10	KEY/L	RAD10	RAD/I	RUD10	RUD/G
COT11	COT/I	KEY11	KEY/M	New Site	RAD/C	RUD11	RUD/E
COT12	COT/K	KEY12	KEY/N	New Site	RAD/K	RUD12	RUD/J
COT13	COT/F	KEY13	KEY/O			RUD13	RUD/M
New Site	COT/G	KEY14	KEY/P			New Site	RUD/D
New Site	COT/O	KEY15	KEY/Q			New Site	RUD/H
		KEY16	Removed				
		KEY17	KEY/I				

Cropwell Bishop		East Bridgford		Gotham		Tollerton	
Previous Reference	New Reference	Previous Reference	New Reference	Previous Reference	New Reference	Previous Reference	New Reference
CRO1	CBI/A	EAS1	EBR/A	GOT1	GOT/A	TOL1	TOL/A
CRO2	CBI/B	EAS2	EBR/B	GOT2	GOT/B	TOL2	TOL/B
CRO3	CBI/C & CBI/D	EAS3	EBR/C	GOT3	GOT/C	TOL3	TOL/D
CRO4	CBI/E	EAS4	EBR/D	GOT4	GOT/D	TOL4	TOL/E
CRO5	CBI/F	EAS5	EBR/E	GOT5	GOT/E	New Site	TOL/C

Cropwell Bishop		East Bridgford		Gotham		Tollerton	
Previous Reference	New Reference	Previous Reference	New Reference	Previous Reference	New Reference	Previous Reference	New Reference
CRO6	CBI/G	EAS6	EBR/G	GOT6	GOT/F		
		EAS7	EBR/H	GOT7	GOT/G		
		New Site	EBR/F				

2. Responses to Green Belt Review Part 2 (b)

2.1 Proposed insets for washed over villages

Below are summaries of comments from the public consultation that relate most specifically to the following questions:

1. Do you consider the methodology for identifying the inset village Green Belt boundaries is appropriate (page 7 of the review)? If you do not, please state how the methodology for new inset boundaries could be improved.

- All consultees who commented on the methodology for identifying the inset village Green Belt boundaries supported or agreed that it was appropriate and complies with paragraph 85 of the NPPF.
- Representatives of the development industry support insetting. There was however encouragement to draw looser Green Belt boundaries around the settlements of Bunny, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Plumtree to enable modest growth.

2. Do you agree or disagree with the suggested inset boundaries for the settlements currently washed over? If you disagree, state why the boundary is incorrect and where the new boundary should be. Your comment should focus on the contribution the land makes to the openness of the Green Belt, long term permanence and the presence of recognisable defensible boundaries.

- The majority of respondents accepted that insetting of these settlements was required and supported the proposed boundaries. Specific comments highlighted the allowance of minor infill development as a positive.
- Representatives of the development industry identified the following sites as possible inset areas:
 - Land south of Moor Lane, Gotham
 - Bunny Brick Works

- Representatives of the development industry encouraged wider Green Belt boundaries around inset settlements/other villages to enable growth and address the housing shortage. Bunny, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Plumtree have been specifically identified.
- Crown Estates support the inset boundary for Shelford.
- East Leake Parish Council and Gotham Parish Council support the tight boundary for Gotham and Bunny as this prevents merging.
- Cropwell Bishop supported the inset boundary for their village.
- Concern regarding the loss of openness as a result of the inseting of Shelford.
- Upper Saxondale boundary supported by a number of residents and the Radcliffe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee.
- The inclusion of the gardens belonging to properties on Home Farm Lane within the settlement boundary was requested by residents.
- Concerns however arose regarding the possible inseting of the Paddock beyond these gardens on Home Farm Lane.

2.2 Proposed minor amendments to existing boundaries

Below are summaries of comments from the public consultation that relate most specifically to the following questions:

3. Do you consider the methodology for identifying minor amendments appropriate (pages 19 to 20 of the review)? If you do not, please state how the methodology for minor amendments could be improved.

- The majority of representations agree/support the methodology for identifying minor amendments.
- Concerns have been raised by representatives of the development industry that the tight boundaries will require a review before or at the end of the plan period in order to deliver an ambitious housing requirement, which is reliant on strategic sites. Additional land at East Bridgford; Cotgrave; Cropwell Bishop; Gotham is suggested.
- Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group support minor amendments.
- Tollerton Parish Council has raised concerns that the Council has not engaged sufficiently on the proposals for Tollerton.
- The consideration of whether land also contributes to the functions of the Green Belt, not just openness and permanence of boundaries was suggested.
- Comments on the external boundary at Sutton Bonnington (Station Hotel) were made. Consultee requested removal of the property and neighbouring buildings from the Green Belt.

- It is suggested that the removal of the British Geological Survey (BGS) is an attempt to justify removal of adjacent sites proposed in the neighbourhood plan.

4. Do you agree or disagree with the suggested minor amendments to existing settlement boundaries? If you disagree, please identify which minor amendment is incorrect and state why and how the minor amendment should be changed. This should be based on the contribution the land makes to the openness of the Green Belt, long term permanence and the presence of recognisable defensible boundaries.

- Consultants have re-iterated that the boundary review must be undertaken to allow for potential development needs in the current and future plan periods. East Bridgford has been identified as a specific settlement requiring a looser boundary.
- Support for including Cropwell Bishop's allotments within the Green Belt.
- Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering support minor amendments for Keyworth.
- Tollerton Parish Council support amendments around Oak Tree Court.
- Inclusion of property south of Flawforth Avenue, Ruddington suggested.
- Support for removal of British Geological Survey by consultants.
- Radcliffe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee supports amendments to Radcliffe's boundary.
- Insetting of East Bridgford Medical Centre has been proposed.
- Boundary behind Woodhouse Gardens, Ruddington should not follow the dyke.
- Cropwell Road, Radcliffe should be removed from the Green Belt.

2.3 Key Settlements Review

Below are summaries of comments from the public consultation that relate most specifically to the following questions:

5. Do you consider the methodology for assessing land around Rushcliffe's Key Settlements against the purposes for including land within the Green Belt is appropriate (pages 39 to 44 of the review)? If you do not, please state how the methodology could be improved.

- Broad support for methodology and two stage approach (strategic areas and individual sites)
- Support for assessing 5 purposes

- The assessment of Green Belt importance should be expanded to other villages to enable release for development.
- Clarification regarding assessment of urban fringe and open countryside character is suggested.
- The existence of inappropriate development adjacent to the site should reduce the site's performance against preserving the countryside from encroachment.
- Assessment of merging should consider perception rather than physical reduction in distance. This would include the impact of physical barriers/features which separate areas physically and mentally.
- Review concentrates on areas where development has either been applied for or is anticipated to be likely. Not a proper review of the GB as a whole. Results appears to favour already selected sites (presume Neighbourhood Plan suggested sites in Keyworth). It is not a rational application of the criteria.
- Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group supports the methodology.
- Methodology should focus on Strategic/Town or Settlement Assessment to avoid more subjective assessment of individual sites. This would provide a broader strategic direction for development, rather than picking the lowest scoring sites.
- Preserving the setting of historic towns is incorrectly named historic settlements. This purpose is intended to protect cities/towns such as York, Durham or Bath. Inclusion within the settlements of smaller settlements overstates the importance of the Nottingham/Derby Green Belt.
- Important that an overly mechanistic approach is avoided.
- A scoring system that combines various Green Belt issues can blunt and ignore specific circumstances. This should be recognised so that the results can be considered within this context and given appropriate weight.
- Not all purposes carry the same weight (e.g. importance of preserving historic towns v preventing merging).
- Methodology should recognise that some boundaries are weaker (e.g. hedgerows) than others.
- Scoring system is too subjective.
- KEY11-15 should be assessed together.
- The scoring system and use of only 4 categories means the assessment is vulnerable to minor differences in the scoring.
- Consideration should be given to the benefits of development.

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

- Review should assess land at Cropwell Bishop, East Bridgford, and Gotham.
- Radcliffe on Trent Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee agrees that to accommodate the new housing, the existing green belt boundary (which is drawn tightly around Radcliffe), will need to be significantly changed.
- RAD3 score should be lower reflecting a reduced score against restricting sprawl.
- RAD 9 and 10 are incorrectly scored and should be lower due to absence of merging, limited sprawl and encroachment into the countryside.
- Score for Radcliffe North East should be higher (15) and the assessment of Radcliffe West should be lower, this includes RAD1.
- Cropwell Road, Radcliffe should be inset.
- Additional site submitted off Island Lane in Radcliffe on Trent.
- KEY1 should be scored higher due to significant sprawl, merging with Plumtree and Normanton, screening of neighbouring British Geological Survey (which is given too much weight) and open countryside character.
- Conversely the landowner of KEY1 suggests the site should score lower due to lesser impact on countryside encroachment and preserving historic character.
- Objection to the removal of KEY1 was expressed by other residents.
- KEY2 and 3 should reflect conclusions of Neighbourhood Plan evidence base. Both should be lower.
- Site Key B (KEY4 in the Green Belt Review), forms an important break between Keyworth and the village of Stanton-on-the-Wolds.
- Key 4 comprises open arable fields, with some blocks of conifer planting; however, the boundaries of the Neighbourhood Plan's proposed allocation has been drawn indiscriminately and without reference to any strong, recognizable or permanent features, which would provide any long term physical or visual barrier or enclosure.
- The development of Site Key B (KEY4) would encroach into the open countryside and would not form a logical 'rounding off' of the existing built form to Keyworth.
- The scoring is poorly justified and the explanations appear engineered to try and fit with the proposed allocation and safeguarded sites in the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan.
- KEY9 and 10 should be assessed together. KEY10 should score higher as they are separated by a weak boundary and the farm unit should not be split up.
- KEY10 and 11 should not be scored the same. KEY11 is in a more prominent location where development would be seen over a wide area.

The Green Belt designation therefore prevents noticeable sprawl. KEY10 is screened by topography.

- In addition to KEY11, KEY12 and 13 are also prominent.
- KEY13 should be lower as sprawl is not as significant.
- KEY11, 12 and 13 should be assessed together.
- KEY14 score for safeguarding countryside should be reduced to reflect presence of urban edge.
- Barratt Homes support conclusions regarding KEY10.
- Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group supports the scores and conclusions. However, site boundaries do not mirror those suggested in the Neighbourhood Plan and therefore comparison is difficult and scores less relevant.
- The score for Strategic Green Belt Area Cotgrave is over exaggerated. The impact on the setting of Cotgrave's historic core is a subjective matter. With regards to the narrowing of the distance with the strategic allocation at Tollerton, a small scale development will not give rise to any perceptible reduction of this gap.
- COT5 should score lower as the Grantham Canal is not a designated heritage asset.
- COT7 score is too high, should apply local test not NPPF. The only purpose that applies is protecting countryside from encroachment.
- COT9 should score lower in relation to countryside encroachment and sprawl as the site is surrounded on three sides.
- COT10 is incorrectly scored and should be lower due to screening by topography and woodland and relationship with settlement edge. Assessment should consider encroachment by local people.
- RUD1 should not be removed from the Green Belt.
- RUD4 score for preserving historic setting should be reduced. 5 is too high. RUD4 would have a low impact on the Green Belt.
- Score for RUD5 supported by landowner.
- RUD6 score should be reduced due to overstated impact on conservation area and existence of buildings north and south of the site.
- Additional site off Old Loughborough Road, Ruddington has been submitted.

2.4 Further comments

Below are summaries of comments from the public consultation that relate most specifically to the following question:

3. Please provide any others comments you wish to make.

- Review should also examine land in other smaller villages (Shelford, Bunny, West Leake etc...) to reduce development pressure on the Key Settlements.
- Release of sites around Gotham encouraged by Saint Gobain as they do not contribute to Green Belt purposes.
- Land north of Nottingham Knights Roundabout and A52 should be released.
- Green Belt north of A52 (around Sharphill Wood) should be protected as a community park.
- St James Business Park should be inset.
- In terms of Cropwell Bishop/East Bridgford/Gotham/, the review should be wider and amendments to existing insets or new insets should allow for development and for safeguarded land, particularly at Fern Road/Kirk Hill/Leake Road.
- Strategic assessment is consistent with Tribal Study and allows larger release of land that will ensure Green Belt boundaries have long term permanence. Individual site assessments are contrived.
- Further land should be released south of the Tollerton/Gamston Strategic Allocation.
- Tollerton Parish Council requests that areas north of Tollerton remain protected by the Green Belt designation.
- COT4 should be safeguarded if not allocated within the LAPP.
- KEY7 should be allocated or, if not, safeguarded.
- Radcliffe Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee supports the Strategic Area Scores, but does not agree that land within the South East Area and sites within are disconnected from the urban edge.
- RAD1 landowner provided further evidence supporting its allocation, including Local Plan Inspectors report.
- Land at Closes Side Lane, East Bridgford was proposed.
- Land between the new A46 and old A46 (the external boundary) should be removed.
- East Leake supported safeguarding to ensure long term permanence of the Green Belt boundary.
- Conversely, concerns regarding safeguarding highlighted that this pre-judged decisions regarding allocations beyond the plan period.
- Loss of Green Belt should be off-set through the extension to the Green Belt.
- Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council has not endorsed individual sites. They encourage new housing development are spread around the village, including land to the south east.
- Land at the junction between Loughborough Road (A60) and the minor road that leads in an easterly direction towards Wysall should be inset.

The very tightly drawn Inset boundary for Bunny will facilitate the development of only very small areas of land.

- Natural England did not comment on performance of individual areas of Green Belt. It highlighted the potential benefits that the Green Belt can bring and encouraged the LAPP to plan positively within the Green Belt.
- The Tollerton/Gamston strategic allocation's boundary are not robust and do not comply with the NPPF. Green Belt has been weakened and development pressure is likely to result in further releases.
- Objection to RUD8 received. Non Green Belt issues highlighted however (traffic etc...).
- Reduction in distance of the external boundary from the main urban area suggested. 6 miles is suggested.

3. Responses to Green Belt Review Part 2 (b) Assessment of Additional Sites in Key Settlements and Other Villages

3.1 Assessment of Additional Sites in Key Settlements and Other Villages

Below are summaries of comments from the public consultation that relate most specifically to the following questions:

1. Do you agree or disagree with the review of the additional Green Belt sites around Rushcliffe's Key Settlements and other villages against the purposes for including land within the Green Belt? If you disagree, state why the assessment is incorrect and provide your Green Belt score and conclusions on Green Belt importance. Your comment should focus on the land's performance against Green Belt purposes.

- Landowners and residents commented on the methodology and submitted revised site scoring against the five Green Belt purposes (see Appendix B for detailed comments and responses)
- Numerous representations objected to the loss of Green Belt in principle. Development should be located on brownfield sites within the city.
- Many comments re-iterated objections within responses to the Local Plan consultation. Notably the lack of services, facilities and infrastructure.
- Green Belt review did not consider impacts on wildlife or landscape (non-green belt issues).
- The review is too subjective
- The review is too quantitative and not subjective
- The Green Belt review did not consider local opposition to development which is expressed through consultation on community plans and village design statements.

- Neighbourhood Plans should inform which sites are removed from the Green Belt.
- Numerous comments, including from Historic England, stated that the assessment of the Green Belt's importance to the historic setting of villages should consider / score more highly the presence of non-designated assets, including ridge and furrow, the Decoy and Old Mill which are in Tollerton, and old railway in Gotham. It should also look at historic landscapes, including old field (pre-enclosure) patterns.
- As no settlements are 'historic' the review should not consider the Green Belt's importance against the fourth purpose.
- Purposes should be weighted depending on the settlement.
- Coalescence of East Bridgford and Newton, Tollerton and Nottingham/Gamston, and Ruddington and Nottingham identified.
- Core Strategy Inspector determined that further land north of Tollerton should not be released for development.
- Tollerton's Green Belt should not be continually reviewed.
- Mickleborough Hill (Ruddington) should be protected as it provides an important area of countryside/open space between Nottingham and Ruddington.
- Green Belt review should consider mitigation measures (e.g. design, layout and landscape buffers)

2. Please provide any other comments you wish to make

- Inadequate infrastructure to accommodate further development.
- Review should consider ecological issues and loss of ridge and furrow.
- Impacts on neighbouring properties.
- Loss of agricultural land and areas of amenity should be included in the review.
- Assessors do not have any knowledge of the area.
- Development should be focused on brownfield sites close to services and facilities.
- Existing allocations must be developed first before further land is removed from the Green Belt.
- Tollerton should not be reviewed twice – contradicts permanence.
- Inspector recommended no further removal of land north of Tollerton.
- Concerns that neighbouring residents have not been consulted about possible allocations.
- Historic England re-iterates that non-designated assets and historic landscape features should be assessed.

- Nottinghamshire County Council advises that the review consider brownfield sites adjacent to boundaries. Also that Cropwell Bishop Medical Centre should be inset.
- Photographs used do not reflect reality. They reinforce the review's bias.

Appendix A: Responses to Green Belt Review Local Plan Part 2 Issues and Options

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Mike Downes Antony Aspbury Associates obo Larkfleet Homes	1	Support the principle of inseting of settlements, however in the case of Bunny, Cropwell Butler, Gotham and Plumtree, these settlements offer a good range of local facilities and the proposed tight boundaries restrict modest and logical growth.	Decisions regarding allocating sites on the edge of other settlements will be made through the preferred options consultation. In order to inform these decisions the Green Belt Review has assessed additional sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton. These settlements have been included in the review as they could support further development. The same methodology used for the assessment of sites on the edge the Key Settlements has been applied and this is compliant with NPPF Paragraphs 84 and 85.	Assessment of SHLAA sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton have been included within the final Green Belt Review
Guy Wakefield Hunter Page Planning obo Miller Homes	1	Support	Support noted and welcomed	Not amended
Ian D Clarke	1	Methodology appropriate	Noted	Not amended
Cllr Nigel Lawrence	1	Agree	Noted	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Gaynor Cottee	1	Agree that it is appropriate	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended
Dr C Davenport chair of Cropwell Bishop Parish Council	1	Agree	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended
Mr and Mrs C Patrick	1	Agree	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended
Mrs A Toombs	1	Yes	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended
Timothy Parker	1	It is essential any Green Belt review now should be on the basis that it has influence, and may change what is in the local plan.	The Green Belt review is an important part of the evidence base that will inform site selection. Sites can only be removed in exceptional circumstances. The importance of land to the performance of the Green Belt will form a critical element in establishing whether such circumstances exist. Whilst the Core Strategy doesn't anticipate any extra housing at Cotgrave it is a key settlement therefore the Council has undertaken a Green Belt assessment if circumstances change through the production of Local Plan Part 2.	Assessments of SHLAA sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton have been included within the Green Belt Review.
Matt Hubbard	1	Methodology for identifying inset	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
obo Mr T Dickens		boundaries complies with NPPF paragraph 85. It is accepted that the smaller villages identified in paragraph 2.1 of the Green Belt Review Part 2 (B) are suitable to be 'inset' villages.		
Chris Smith	2	Agree with minor amendments	Noted and Welcomed	Not amended
James Stannard. DPDS	2	Site south of Moor Lane, Gotham should be included within the settlement boundary as it does not lead to sprawl, will not merge towns, would not encroach on countryside or does not protect the setting of historic towns.	Decisions regarding allocating sites on the edge of other settlements will be made through the preferred options consultation. In order to inform these decisions the Green Belt Review has assessed sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton. These settlements have been included in the review as they could support further development. The same methodology used for the assessment of sites on the edge the Key Settlements has been applied and this is compliant with NPPF Paragraphs 84 and 85.	Assessment of SHLAA sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton have been included within the Green Belt Review
Mr and Mrs Patrick	2	Bunny could be joined with Green Belt land to create one larger village	Decisions regarding allocating sites on the edge of other settlements will be	Assessment of SHLAA sites on the edge of East

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>made through the preferred options consultation. In order to inform these decisions the Green Belt Review has assessed sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton. These settlements have been included in the review as they could support further development. The same methodology used for the assessment of sites on the edge the Key Settlements has been applied and this is compliant with NPPF Paragraphs 84 and 85.</p>	<p>Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton have been included within the Green Belt Review</p>
Ian D Clarke	2	<p>Consider that given the site is previously developed and of low quality, the area at Bunny Brickworks should be removed from the Green Belt and promoted for mixed use development.</p>	<p>LAPP Issues and Options consultation has asked whether Bunny Brick Works should remain an employment allocation within the Green Belt or whether other uses would be appropriate. This is a major developed site in the green belt and therefore some development may be appropriate on the site. This will be considered on its merits.</p>	<p>Not amended</p>
Mike Downes	2	<p>In all settlements bar Shelford,</p>	<p>Decisions regarding allocating sites on</p>	<p>Assessments of SHLAA</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Antony Aspbury Associates obo Larkfleet Homes		Newton, Bradmore and Upper Saxondale there is scope for sustainable growth within a widened inset.	the edge of other settlements will be made through the preferred options consultation. In order to inform these decisions the Green Belt Review has assessed sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton. These settlements have been included in the review as they could support further development. The same methodology used for the assessment of sites on the edge the Key Settlements has been applied and this is compliant with NPPF Paragraphs 84 and 85.	sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton have been included within the Green Belt Review.
Stuart Williamson AMEC obo Crown Estate	2	Crown Estate support the proposed inset for Shelford village	Support noted and welcomed	Not amended
Guy Wakefield Hunter Page Planning obo Miller Homes	2	Agree	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended
Ian D Clarke	2	This proposal is not about which sites should be released from the green	Decisions regarding allocating sites on the edge of other settlements will be	Assessments of SHLAA sites on the edge of East

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		belt and which should be protected no matter what, but to explore possibilities to build on a tiny proportion of the most environmentally degraded parts of the green belt to address what is a national housing crisis, without having any significant adverse effect on the five purposes of the green belt around our villages.	made through the preferred options consultation. In order to inform these decisions the Green Belt Review has assessed sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton. These settlements have been included in the review as they could support further development. The same methodology used for the assessment of sites on the edge the Key Settlements has been applied and this is compliant with NPPF Paragraphs 84 and 85.	Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton have been included within the Green Belt Review.
East Leake Parish Council	2	Agree with the proposed boundary for Gotham and Bunny as they are tightly drawn and this will help preserve separation if these settlements.	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended
Ken Mafham associates obo Gotham Parish Council	2	We agree with the policy in the Core Strategy that housing in other settlements should be for local needs only and in Gotham for example there is capacity for that scale of housing within the proposed village envelope and through rural exception sites	Support for existing Core Strategy housing policy for Gotham noted.	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Cllr Nigel Lawrence	2	Shelford village is characterised by its openness, and as a result it contributes greatly to the openness of that part of the Green Belt on the bottom of the Trent valley. It is a community with few community facilities, making it unsuitable for significant development. I question the wisdom of removing it from the Green Belt and losing the protection it provides. I see no benefit to the existing community. I also see significant risks that the openness would be rapidly lost, and with it its contribution to the Green Belt.	Core Strategy Policy 4 (part 4) identifies Shelford as a settlement which should be inset (removed) from the Green Belt. Policy 4 (part 5) requires these inset boundaries will be created through Local Plan Part 2 (LAPP). The Green Belt review informs this process. The Inspector considered Shelford's built form did not contribute to the openness of the Green Belt and in accordance with paragraph 86 of the NPPF recommended its removal from the Green Belt. Whilst Shelford will no longer be washed over by the Green Belt this does not change the policy of only permitting infill (currently allowed under Green Belt policy) or an exception site for affordable housing within the Green Belt. This approach is set out in policy 3 and 8 of the Core Strategy.	Not amended
Gaynor Cottee	2	Agree with the inset for Gotham	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended
Dr C Davenport	2	Agree. The outcome largely follows	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
chair of Cropwell Bishop Parish Council		the recommendations of the Parish Council.		
Mr and Mrs C Patrick	2	Agree	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended
Mrs A Toombs	2	Agree	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended
Mr Hubbard obo Mr T Dickens	2	Agree as boundaries are logical and allow for minor infill and redevelopment of brownfield land	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended
Tom Collins Fisher German OBO various landowners	3	The suggested inset boundaries are drawn tightly around the settlements and will, inevitably, require a review of the Green Belt boundaries at some point, either before or at the end of the plan period. The Council has an ambitious housing requirement to deliver over the plan period, relying on the delivery of three large urban extensions. Should the Council fail to deliver the number of homes needed during the plan period, additional land will be required to facilitate the housing delivery. It is considered that additional land at East	Decisions regarding allocating sites on the edge of other settlements will be made through the preferred options consultation. In order to inform these decisions the Green Belt Review has assessed sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton. These settlements have been included in the review as they could support further development. The same methodology used for the assessment of sites on the edge the Key Settlements has been applied and this is compliant with NPPF Paragraphs 84 and 85.	Assessment of SHLAA sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton have been included within the Green Belt Review

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		Bridgford/Cotgrave/Cropwell Bishop/Gotham should be identified for inclusion within the inset boundaries as well as further safeguarded land to be identified for development in the longer term when required. The methodology should be explicit in seeking to achieve these long term objectives.		
Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	3	Agree	Noted	Not amended
Mike Downes Antony Aspbury Associates obo Larkfleet Homes	3	Support	Noted and Welcomed	Not amended
Tollerton Parish Council (Bill Banner)	3	The parish council welcomes the opportunity to comment on these plans. The parish council does not consider there to have been sufficient engagement from the borough council on the methodology or appropriateness of the proposals for	Further engagement with Parish Councils can occur informally, on request, at any time or through the formal consultation on the Local Plan Part 2 and supporting Green Belt Review.	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		Tollerton and would welcome further discussion on future land use within the village before the plans are adopted - to ensure that opportunities for neighbourhood led planning remain available to Tollerton residents.		
Guy Longley Pegasus Planning Group OBO Mrs B Mordecai	3	The methodology is generally appropriate; however the judgment of minor amendments should also consider whether the land to be amended makes a contribution to the role and function of the Green Belt, not just whether it can be considered to be countryside.	Minor amendments seek to address incremental changes to the edges of settlements as development (both permitted and those requiring planning permission) has occurred. The proposed boundaries have been amended according to the land's contribution to openness (and necessity to keep it open), its long term permanence and definable boundaries. This approach complies with the NPPF. Paragraph 3.4 should be amended to clarify that openness, not whether site is within the countryside, is the determining factor.	Agree - Amend paragraph 3.4 to read: <i>"As with the identification of boundaries for the new inset villages, the review only requires the assessment of the land's openness and where permanent defensible boundaries exist to preserve it"</i>
Guy Wakefield Hunter Page	3	Agree	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Planning obo Miller Homes				
Featherstones Planning obo Various	3	Do not agree. Station Hotel, Sutton Bonnington and surrounding properties should not be in the Green Belt as the area does not contribute to its openness.	The first part of the Green Belt review determined that there was no need to review the outer green belt boundary. The outer boundary of the Green Belt does not form part of the Green Belt Review. In any case, Station Road is a strong definable and defensible boundary in this area.	Not amended
Ian D Clarke	3	Yes providing it is in keeping with NPPF Paragraph 85 - when defining boundaries, local planning authorities should use physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.	Noted	Not amended
Liam Toland Heaton Planning Obo David Wilson Homes	3	We are not against the alteration to the Green Belt inset boundary at Keyworth with regards a) British Geological Survey (BGS) campus. However, the removal of the BGS campus from the Green Belt appears to be an attempt to provide stronger justification for the removal of	Disagree - The BGS Campus does not contribute to the openness of the Green Belt. Its removal creates a more logical Green Belt boundary. The assessment of adjacent sites has considered the physical and visual implications of the BGS upon neighbouring sites as well as Green	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		adjacent sites proposed as either allocations or safeguarded sites in the Neighbourhood Plan.	Belt boundary issues (e.g. rounding off).	
Cllr Nigel Lawrence	3	Agree	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended
Mr and Mrs C Patrick	3	Agree	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended
Mrs A Toombs	3	Yes	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended
Timothy Parker	3	I am upset that a Green belt review has never yet been undertaken in this area - & then you state with this review- you do not intend to change the boundaries whatever the score! The public has never had their say & there should be opportunity in this assessment for change now! Any assessments to this Green Belt review SHOULD be incorporated in the Local Plan.	Decisions regarding allocating sites and amendments to the Green Belt, where it is considered necessary will be made during the progression of Local Plan Part 2. The methodology is compliant with NPPF Paragraphs 84 and 85.	Not amended
Mr Hubbard obo Mr T Dickens	3	After 19 years the GB boundaries are out of date and need of revising accordingly in order to meet requirements of the NPPF. Support approach to the review of existing	Welcome support for the approach. The methodology used is the same for all sites submitted to the Authority within the SHLAA and which are determined to be suitable if Green Belt	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		boundaries provided methodology used is the same for all sites that the Council are taking into consideration in this process.	policy restrictions were removed.	
Chris Smith	4	Agree with proposed insets	Noted and Welcomed	Not amended
Tom Collins Fisher German OBO various landowners	4	No comments on the proposed minor amendments for East Bridgford's/Cotgrave's/Cropwell Bishop's/Gotham's/Ruddington's existing boundary, but reiterate the above point that the boundary review must be undertaken to allow for potential development needs in the current and future plan periods.	Decisions regarding allocating sites on the edge of other settlements will be made through the preferred options consultation. In order to inform these decisions the Green Belt Review has assessed sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton. These settlements have been included in the review as they could support further development. The same methodology used for the assessment of sites on the edge the Key Settlements has been applied and this is compliant with NPPF paragraphs 84 and 85.	Assessment of SHLAA sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton have been included within the Green Belt Review
Ben Driver	4	Our only comments relates to Cropwell Bishop (map c and paragraph 3.10) – we support amendments to include allotments	Noted and welcomed	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		within the Green Belt		
Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	4	Minor amendments for Keyworth seem reasonable	Noted	Not amended
Tollerton Parish Council (Bill Banner)	4	The parish council agrees with the minor amendments around Oak Tree Court, Tollerton.	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended
Guy Longley Pegasus Planning Group OBO Mrs B Mordecai	4	Support amendment to Flawforth Avenue, however it is considered that the property to the south should also be inset from the Green Belt as our assessment does not consider that the function of this area does not form a critical part of the Green Belt.	Representation provides suggested amendments to the assessment of RUD6. As the property south of Flawforth Avenue and north of RUD6 has not been submitted for development within the SHLAA this review has not assessed the impact of this neighbouring property upon the Green Belt and whether a permanent and defensible boundary can be established. The proposed removal of Flawforth Avenue from the Green Belt (proposed as an amendment to the boundary) and removal of RUD6 would necessitate the removal of this property, as this would establish a	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			stronger permanent boundary. Notwithstanding future changes to the Green Belt boundary, at present this property does not detract from the openness of the Green Belt. It is set back from the road and within extensive grounds.	
Guy Wakefield Hunter Page Planning obo Miller Homes	4	Agree with BGS proposal for reasons stated	Noted	Not amended
Ian D Clarke	4	Agree	Noted	Not amended
Paul Stone, Signet Planning obo Aldergate Properties	4	The current Green Belt boundary for East Bridgford is not consistent with national policy, a permanent boundary has not been established to meet local or longer term development needs.	Decisions regarding allocating sites on the edge of other settlements will be made through the preferred options consultation. In order to inform these decisions the Green Belt Review has assessed sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton. These settlements have been included in the review as they could support further development. The same methodology used for the assessment of sites on the edge the	Assessment of SHLAA sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton have been included within the Green Belt Review

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			Key Settlements has been applied and this is compliant with NPPF Paragraphs 84 and 85.	
Radcliffe on Trent Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee	4	The NPSC supports the alterations recommended to the green belt inset boundaries for Radcliffe on Trent, namely (a) Garden at 12 Nottingham Road, Fig A11; (b) 72 Nottingham Road & 12-22 The Chestnuts, Fig A12 (c)(LAPP: pages 33, 85 & 86. GBR pages 31–34 inclusive, CS Policy 4). Gardens at rear of 9-17 Lamcote Gardens & 3 Greenway Close, Fig A13; and (d) The Green & 1 Holme Lane, Fig A14.	Support noted and welcomed	Not amended
Cllr Nigel Lawrence	4	East Bridgford. Agree with the amendments proposed behind the (ex) Reindeer Inn, and at Fosters Close. Suggest that East Bridgford Medical Centre is similarly removed from the Green Belt. It too was built in the Green Belt using the Rural Exception legislation so I consider that the same logic as Foster's Close	Welcome support for alterations to East Bridgford. Medical centre was not a rural exception site; these sites are permitted for affordable housing. The medical centre was approved on the basis that the benefits of the centre outweighed the harm to the GB. Removal from the Green Belt, following revisiting the site, is agreed as the	Map and supporting paragraph 3.16 included: <i>"The Medical Centre is a substantial building on the edge of East Bridgford. Located beyond the inset boundary it does not contribute to the</i>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		should apply.	land does not contribute to the openness of the Green Belt and permanent and defensible boundaries exist around the centre.	<i>openness of the Green Belt and should be inset. Its impact on openness has been further increased by the granting of planning permission for an extension (constructed in 2016). The boundaries of the Medical Centre comprise robust and permanent hedgerows and a footpath."</i>
Mr and Mrs C Patrick	4	Agree	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended
Mrs A Toombs	4	Agree	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended
B Venes	4	Woodhouse Gardens is not developed to the dyke. There should be a green area near the dyke. The area was a bird sanctuary that was used as a sump by the builders.	The proposed boundary follows the dyke as this is a more robust, permanent and logical boundary.	Not amended
Timothy Parker	4	I am upset that a Green Belt review has never yet been undertaken in this area - & then you state with this review- you do not intend to change	Policy 3 part 2.b of the adopted Core Strategy restricts development in Cotgrave to infill and the former colliery. This is the current policy	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		the boundaries whatever the score! The public has never had their say & there should be opportunity in this assessment for change now.	position and was established following comprehensive consultation with the public and an independent examination. Decisions regarding future growth at Cotgrave will however be made through the progression of Local Plan Part 2. This will entail further consultation and examination. If it is determined that sites are needed, the Green Belt review will inform site selection,	
Mr Hubbard obo Mr T Dickens	4	No comments to make regarding the suggested minor amendments to the existing settlement boundaries	Noted	Not amended
Darren Venables JLL obo Radcliffe on Trent Golf Club	5	Critique of the methodology: Broadly agree with the two stages identified i.e. the Strategic Review (stage 1) and the Detailed Review (stage 2), however no site visits have been made in order to directly compare the land parcels on each of the criteria in the methodology. Consider that a landscape study	All SHLAA sites on the edge of the Key Settlements within the Green Belt, and the villages of Cropwell Bishop, East Bridgford, Gotham and Tollerton that are potentially suitable for development were visited to determine their performance against the five Green Belt purposes. However it is agreed that the assessment should clarify that all sites were assessed.	Paragraph 4.9 amended to clarify that all the parcels of land were visited: " <i>All the parcels of land were visited and assessed against the criteria and matrix to determine their Green Belt importance.</i> "

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>should be provided as part of the evidence base to support the Green Belt Review and Local Plan Part 2.</p> <p>Agree with the approach of applying the five purposes identified. However, there are some assessment criteria which the LPA have adopted to add further detail to the five purposes and how they are applied which we disagree with. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proximity and visual connectivity to the settlements clearly defined urban edge and to the perception that the distance between settlements would be reduced, as no site visits have appear to been undertaken. • Unclear whether adjacent inappropriate development is being accounted for when assessing the existence and scale of inappropriate development within the site/area. 	<p>A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of these sites has also been commissioned and will support site selection within the Draft Preferred Options. When determining the urban edge of a settlement, this may include land within the Green Belt. Consequently a site may be connected to the physical settlement boundary but still constitute an outlying development within the Green Belt (e.g. Cropwell Road in Radcliffe on Trent).</p> <p>The inclusion of Green Belt land inside settlement boundaries means the distance between settlements is determined according to their physical limits not the width of the Green Belt designation. This ensures the assessment of merging considers the physical merging of settlements (or the perception merging).</p> <p>Assessment Matrix outlines the criteria</p>	<p>Footnote has been added to the Assessment Matrix. This states that <i>"The reduction in distance will be measured between physical settlement boundaries, not distances between Green Belt boundaries..."</i></p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further clarification of urban fringe criteria is recommended. In addition the criterion for assessing the likelihood of ‘unrestricted sprawl’ appears confused. Having a single boundary with the settlement does not necessarily provide a precursor to sprawl. A site needs to be considered in the round. The criterion ‘assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment’ although generally acceptable, does not make adequate provision for land which is read against existing development, or contained within other existing uses, which do not constitute countryside. 	<p>for determining whether the land is urban fringe or open countryside. In accordance with the matrix, the existence of inappropriate development adjacent to the site is only considered if it impacts on the character of the site.</p> <p>As a rule sites that share one boundary with a settlement are likely to protrude into the open countryside and constitute greater sprawl than those that share more than one boundary and round of a settlement.</p>	
Tom Collins Fisher German OBO various landowners	5	The Assessment Criteria and the assessment matrix scoring system is broadly supported, and should be applied to all settlements which are to be inset from the Green Belt. Assessments provided for the sites being promoted at East Bridgford,	Decisions regarding allocating sites on the edge of other settlements will be made through the production of Local Plan Part 2. In order to inform these decisions the Green Belt Review has assessed sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham	Assessments of SHLAA sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton have been included within the Green Belt Review.

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		Cotgrave, Cropwell Bishop Gotham and Ruddington.	and Tollerton. These settlements have been included in the review as they could support further development. The same methodology used for the assessment of sites on the edge the Key Settlements has been applied and this is compliant with NPPF Paragraphs 84 and 85.	
Mr Michael Styles	5	The review concentrates on areas where development in the Green Belt has either already been applied for or is anticipated to be likely. It is not an objective review of the Green Belt as a whole. The way the methodology has been applied and the scores given to certain areas seem to be working towards low scores for areas that have 'already' been selected as sites for future development. They are not a rational application of the criteria.	The Green Belt review informs the selection of sites that will be removed to deliver the housing targets in the Core Strategy. It must therefore focus on those sites that have been submitted by landowners for development. Not all these sites will be required and development is not anticipated on all the sites. The assessment methodology is as objective as it can be. No sites have yet been selected and any low scores for sites being 'promoted' is coincidental.	Not amended
Andrew Hiorns Planning obo	5	Support methodology but disagree with conclusions for sites COT10 and	Criticism of wider strategic area is based on the importance of their site,	Site tables have been amended. Strategic

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Parkers of Leicester Ltd		COT11. Critiqued strategic score and inclusion in tables.	rather than the importance of the wider area which includes land between Hollygate Lane to Owthorpe. Table structure and inclusion of both sites score and wider strategic area score has caused some confusion. The strategic area score provides context for individual sites. It is agreed that the relationship between the strategic score and site score could be clearer.	Green Belt score is shown adjacent to name of Strategic Green Belt Area.
Liberty Stones Fisher German obo Samworth Farms	5	The assessment criteria and the assessment matrix scoring system is broadly supported, however it is not considered to have been applied equally across Radcliffe on Trent. Detailed critique of each site in Radcliffe.	<p>RAD 1 - Disagree with merging conclusion as RAD1 will not result in the complete or virtual merging (see matrix on page 42).</p> <p>RAD 2 - Agree that the weak hedgerow is not substantial; therefore the score for restricting sprawl should be 2. But does not merit 3.</p> <p>RAD 3 - Agree encroachment score should be 3 due to urban edge being visible but not an overriding feature.</p>	<p>RAD2 score for restricting sprawl increased from 1 to 2 and recognition of weak hedgerow included in justification. Green Belt score increased from 9 to 10.</p> <p>RAD3 score for safeguarding from encroachment increased from 2 to 3 and total score increased from 9 to 10. Justification</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>RAD 4 - disagree with proposed merging score as RAD4 would reduce the distance to Saxondale by half and a third to Newton and Bingham. Disagree with a lower score of 3 for safeguarding against encroachment. Score of 4 reflects the existence of some inappropriate development however it is not significant and urban edge is not prominent within the site. The land is open countryside in character.</p> <p>RAD5 - Whilst there are strong defensible boundaries, the nature of the northern and eastern boundary means the site is open and gives a strong impression of open countryside when viewed from Bingham Road. Consequently development would appear a prominent intrusion into the open countryside. Score of 3 is appropriate. Agree reduction in score for merging of settlements to 2.</p>	<p>amended.</p> <p>RAD5 score for merging reduced from 4 to 2. This is justified in the assessment.</p> <p>RAD7 score for safeguarding from encroachment has been reduced from 5 to 4.</p> <p>RAD 9 and 10 have both had merging of settlement scores reduced to 1 with justification in respective tables.</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>RAD7 - Disagree with proposed score of 4 for preventing sprawl. Site meets criteria score as set out in matrix. Disagree with proposed score of 3 for merging of settlements due to significant reduction in distance between Radcliffe and Upper Saxondale. Agree that the permission for a well-head reduces the land's safeguarding performance.</p> <p>RAD9 - Disagree with reduction in score for safeguarding as settlement edge is not visible. See photograph in assessment.</p> <p>RAD 10 - Amend score and justification for merging of 10 and 9. Both sites should score 1 to reflect housing development on the west side of Cropwell Road. Whilst in the Green Belt these properties are within settlement of Radcliffe on Trent. Neither site is closer to Cropwell Bishop than the last property on</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			Cropwell Well Road.	
Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	5	Agree with methodology	Noted	Not amended
Mike Downes Antony Aspbury Associates obo Larkfleet Homes	5	By undertaken a site by site analysis around key settlements in particular Radcliffe on Trent, the Green Belt review moves away from the town settlement level assessment required by the NPPF and adds a greater degree of subjectivity to more strategic assessments previously undertaken. This gives rise to site specific scores that are higher than strategic assessment scores. The dispersed strategy currently being promoted by the draft Radcliffe on Trent Neighbourhood Plan would have less of an impact on the Green Belt given that the more strategic assessment rates most directions of growth of low-medium Green Belt impact.	Strategic decisions regarding housing targets and Green Belt implications were addressed through the Core Strategy and the supporting Green Belt Review Part 1 and Part 2a. Further strategic GB analysis is included within Part 2 for each Key Settlement. Differences occur between the strategic score and site score as they assess the Green Belt at different scales, with some sites scoring higher or lower than the wider strategic level. The NPPF is not prescriptive about how to undertake a green belt assessment other than in general terms. The methodology employed is consistent with that undertaken as part of the Core Strategy evidence base, which was found sound at	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			examination.	
Define obo William Davis	5	William Davis generally support the approach to the review of the Green Belt as it closely reflects the methodology used in the assessment undertaken to inform the allocation of the strategic sites in the Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy, and is consistent with the NPPF in taking into account of the purposes of the Green Belt.	Support noted and welcomed	Not amended
Guy Longley Pegasus Planning Group OBO Mrs B Mordecai	5	The proposed methodology is considered to be generally appropriate, however one of the assessment criteria is considered to be incorrect (refers to preserving the setting of historic settlements, this should read as towns). This Green Belt purpose was originally developed to protect places such as York and Cambridge and it therefore overstates the impacts on Green Belt purposes.	The methodology employed is consistent with that undertaken as part of the Core Strategy evidence base (Green Belt Review Part 1 and 2b), which was found sound at examination. There is no specific reference to what -historic towns' mean in the NPPF and it is considered appropriate to have an approach that has regard to its locality.	Not amended
Guy Longley Pegasus	5	The methodology sets out an assessment matrix with scoring to	To ensure fair and transparent comparison of each site's green belt	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Planning Group OBO Mrs B Mordecai		provide an indication of Green Belt value. It is important that an overtly mechanistic approach in terms of interpreting scores are avoided and that the results are used to inform a careful consideration of each parcel of land's Green Belt function.	value, an objective assessment is required. The methodology has sought to capture recordable features, when against the five purposes of including land within the green belt. Capturing these elements allows for a consistent comparison of Green Belt importance.	
Guy Wakefield Hunter Page Planning obo Miller Homes	5	Agree	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended
Featherstones Planning obo Various	5	It is considered that the approach to the Green Belt Review should clearly place into context the use of a scoring system. Such a system can often be blunt and ignore specific circumstances on individual sites. The process should clearly recognise the shortcomings of the approach adopted so that the results can be considered within this context and given appropriate weight.	The use of a scoring system enables comparison between sites within the Green Belt. The Council accept that the assessment of openness, urban fringe or open countryside appearance is subjective. However scoring each site according to set criteria does provide an element of objective comparison. The criteria for assessing performance against individual purposes does enable specific circumstances (pertinent to Green Belt issues) to be considered.	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Ian D Clarke	5	Yes	Noted	Not amended
Mark Bassett Freeths Obo Mr Sam Burt	5	It is widely recognised that not all of the purposes for including land within the Green Belt carry the same weight. For example the ability to check unrestricted sprawl of settlements and the prevention of merging of settlements are the key functions of Green Belt. The remaining three purposes, although clearly important considerations, are of lesser value and accordingly a weighting system should be attributed to the score system to reflect this.	Disagree - Whilst the fundamental aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, the NPPF places no greater or lesser weight upon any of the five Green Belt purposes.	Not amended
Liam Toland Heaton Planning Obo David Wilson Homes	5	David Wilson Homes consider that the methodology for assessing land around Rushcliffe's Key Settlements against the purposes for including land within the Green Belt is appropriate. However, as set out in our response with regards question 6, it appears that the assessment matrix methodology has been ignored in order to justify better scoring for the	Assessment matrix has not been ignored to justify removal of allocations proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan. For example assessment of KEY3 and KEY12 scores KEYC and KEYA negatively.	KEY1. KEY4, KEY7, KEY10, KEY11, and KEY12 have been amended (see further responses to Mr Liam Toland, Mr Michael Styles, Mr and Mrs Parker, Mr Ben Holmes, and Helen Broadhurst)

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		proposed Neighbourhood Plan allocated and safeguarded sites.		
Ben Holmes Oxalis Planning Obo various	5	It is considered that the approach to the Green Belt Review should clearly place into context the use of a scoring system. Such a system can often be blunt and ignore specific circumstances on individual sites. The process should clearly recognise the shortcomings of the approach adopted so that the results can be considered within this context and given appropriate weight.	The methodology is similar to that endorsed for the Green Belt review undertaken for the Core Strategy (Green Belt Review Part 1 and 2a). Critically the Green Belt review is one part of the evidence base, individual site circumstances will assessed through other evidence based documents e.g. LCA, access to services, highways, impact on heritage and biodiversity assets etc...	Not amended
Bob Woollard PDG Obo Mosaic Estates	5	The assessment criteria for sprawl should be given greater definition to what is a clearly defined boundary so that the matrix can apply some further weighting. For example a narrow hedgerow, must be considered to be a relatively weak boundary when compared to a major, physical, engineered boundary such as a railway embankment, trunk road or river. Hedgerows are impermanent,	The methodology and assessment matrix on P42 does account for the strength of physical boundaries when assessing sprawl. The measuring of distances between settlements alongside the visual and impression of merging is also part of the assessment and provides for a rounded approach in terms of assessing areas against this Green Belt purpose. It is agreed that physical features, topography	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>susceptible to encroachment and damage, and provide a limited visual edge to a settlement. The merging of settlements if entirely different from 'reducing the distance between' and takes no account of the existing physical barriers to merging of the perception of how settlements relate to one another. Where there are significant physical and impenetrable boundaries between settlements for examples railway lines or rivers, development which reduces the distance between settlements cannot necessarily be seen as merging. The methodology should apply greater weight to the perception of merging likely to arise by a direction for growth. While it is recognised that this brings in a more subjective assessment, it is less of a blunt instrument than simply measured distance. The perception of merging can be assessed more objectively by identifying any physical barriers</p>	<p>etc... Can greatly reduce the perception of merging. However focussing just on subjective perceptions is not supported by RBC.</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>between settlements e.g. railway lines, rivers, tree belts, topography that provide a visual separation which limits any perception of merging. The inter-visibility between settlements is another objective measure that can be used to assess perception along with whether clear breaks would be maintained between settlements along connecting routes. The assessment need to do more than look at a map, and give greater weight to perception.</p>		
<p>Bob Woollard PDG Obo Mosaic Estates</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>The overall conclusion on Green Belt Value has little logic or justification when set against the score. The objective score is rendered meaningless when there is little specific justification for the overall value assigned. For example, RAD1 scores 11 but is given an overall value of 12, with no further explanation or justification. Similarly, RAD4 scores 17 but is given an</p>	<p>Disagree - the conclusions have been clearly drawn from the score and the justification for that score. The score for RAD1 is 11, 12 relates to the wider Radcliffe West Strategic Green Belt score. The score for RAD4 is 17, whilst the wider north east strategic area score is 12. Each site assessment table has been amended to clarify this relationship</p>	<p>Site tables amended. Strategic Green Belt score is shown adjacent to name of Strategic Green Belt Area.</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		overall value of 12		
DPDS obo Wickmere Ltd	5	<p>Our clients consider that the methodology is incorrect in respect of both the Assessment Criteria and therefore the application of the Assessment Matrix. The particular area of concern relates to the application of assessment criteria relating to the purpose: “To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns”. It is submitted that this assessment criteria is flawed as it relates to the “setting or special character of the existing built up area of settlement” NOT for example the “setting or special character of the historic settlement” which would correspond correctly to the NPPF. As such, it is suggested that the Assessment Criteria written in its current form cannot be applied rationally as it bears little resemblance to the “historic towns” purpose.</p>	<p>The methodology employed is consistent with that undertaken as part of the Core Strategy evidence base, which was found sound at examination. There is no specific reference to what ‘historic towns’ means in the NPPF and it is considered appropriate to have an approach that has regard to its locality. In accordance with the NPPF, it is accepted that the purpose should read preserve special character of historic towns.</p>	<p>Alter assessment. Replace settlement with towns in Assessment Matrix.</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Michael Hewitt	5	The Green belt review scoring system is very subjective in that there is no definition for applying scores of 2 or 4. Even after using the scoring system the banding can be changed by a “professional opinion”. Many sites in Keyworth score between 14 and 17 and with the flaw to the assessment system a plot can easily move from the medium low to medium high banding or vice versa.	There is no definition for scores 2 or 4 as these identify sites that do not sit comfortably within 1, 3 or 5. This enables a degree of flexibility and allows for a more rounded assessment of sites where it does not wholly meet all the criteria within the assessment matrix. The similarity of scoring reflects the similarity in their importance to the Green Belt. A judgement has to be made on green belt importance at some point and the matrix provides a consistent means of undertaking the assessment.	Not amended
Mr and Mrs C Patrick	5	Why are Key 11-15 being scored individually and not as a whole? The land is very high and therefore development would have a visual impact on the village.	The Green Belt areas west of Keyworth reflect the land parcels being promoted by developers within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). These have been amended where boundaries do not create logical areas (e.g. it would leave isolated areas of Green Belt). KEY4 has been split to enable an	KEY10 score for restricting sprawl reduced from 3 to 2. Justification states: <i>"The site shares one boundary with Keyworth but is well contained between Hillside Farm and Keyworth. The site is below KEY11 and Bunny</i>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>equal comparison with land to the west.</p> <p>KEY10 to 15 have been reviewed. It is accepted that sites 11, 12, 13 are visually prominent and would be visible over a considerable distance, especially to the north and south.</p> <p>KEY11 score for checking sprawl increased from 3 to 4.</p> <p>KEY12 increased from 4 to 5.</p> <p>KEY10 scores against preventing sprawl and safeguarding countryside have both been reduced by 1 point to 2 and 2 respectively.</p>	<p><i>Lane and is screened by topography when approaching from the west and viewpoints to the north. Hedgerows to the south provide strong boundaries to the south and west."</i></p> <p>KEY11 score for restricting sprawl increased from 3 to 4. Justification identifies visibility to the south.</p> <p>KEY12 score for restricting sprawl increased from 4 to 5. Justification states: <i>"The removal of this site would necessitate the removal of KEY10 and result in a significant intrusion into the Green Belt. As with KEY11, whilst land is less</i></p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
				<i>prominent in the centre (where it is on the plateau and screened by trees and hedgerow) the area is visible over a considerable distance to the north and south.. This is evident in the visibility of Keyworth itself, and Greenhays Farm and the dwelling on Bunny Lane."</i>
Mrs A Toombs	5	Seems moderately sensible	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended
Robert Smith	5	<p>The methodology is flawed for 3 reasons.</p> <p>1. As Para 4.10 admits, 'the detailed reviews of specific parcels of land are based on potential sites submitted by landowners within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).' And that 'Given the purpose of the review is to inform decisions regarding allocations within the forthcoming Land and</p>	<p>The purpose of the Green Belt Review is to inform site selection through the LAPP. Whilst a comprehensive assessment of all areas of land around the outlying settlements would provide a complete picture of Green Belt performance, the assessment of land not being promoted and therefore not deliverable is not necessary. The assessment of strategic areas does provide evidence of Green Belt performance beyond individual sites.</p>	<p>Paragraph 4.9 amended to clarify that all the parcels of land were visited: <i>"All the parcels of land were visited and assessed against the criteria and matrix to determine their Green Belt importance."</i></p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>Planning Policies Development Plan Document, the assessment focuses on sites that are likely to come forward if removed from the Green Belt'. In effect therefore the review is a Green Belt assessment of submitted sites rather than a proper strategic review.</p> <p>2. In addition the use of only 4 categories means that there is only 1 point between Low-Medium and Medium-High and the assessment is highly vulnerable to minor differences in scoring.</p> <p>3. The desk-based nature of the assessment exercise does not reflect the reality of the landscape and topography on the ground, and renders some of the scores illogical.</p>	<p>The use of four categories has been used within numerous Green Belt Reviews and provides a simple categorisation of each site. It follows broadly how the Green Belt review was undertaken for the Core Strategy. The individual scores provide more detailed comparison of sites.</p> <p>The Green Belt Review was primarily desk based. With all sites visited to confirm desk based assumptions and assess openness, character, boundaries etc....</p>	
Timothy Parker	5	In the 5th part of the assessment - I feel more consideration should be given to any benefit to the settlement	Disagree - the Green Belt Review assesses the performance of land against Green Belt purposes. It does	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		if the land was developed. Your consideration is only thinking of the benefit / loss to the Green area.	not assess the benefits of development; this occurs through the LAPP which weighs these benefits against the harm to the Green Belt (itself informed by this review) and any other harm.	
Mr Hubbard obo Mr T Dickens	5	No concerns regarding assessments of Bingham, Cotgrave, Keyworth or Ruddington. There is however an opportunity to reconsider the GB boundary to the south of Radcliffe on Trent without any dilution of the purposes of the GB as set out in paragraph 80 of the NPPF.	See response to Mr Dickens comments on Question 6	Not amended
Thomas Bond	6	Support comments of Helen Broadhurst	Noted	Not amended
Darren Venables JLL obo Radcliffe on Trent Golf Club	6	Disagree with the detailed assessments for RAD9 and 10. Own detailed critique of the site assessments conclude that the sites should score lower in terms of sprawl, merging of settlements and countryside encroachment.	RAD9 and 10 merging - Agreed distance measured between existing boundaries. See response to Samworth Farms Ltd. The assessment of encroachment considers whether the land itself contains inappropriate development	Score for merging reduced to 1 for both RAD9 and RAD10. Due to the prominence of the Golf Club and visibility of residential dwellings on Cropwell

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>Detailed appraisals of other sites around Radcliffe on Trent have also been provided by the respondent together with their justification for reaching their conclusions.</p>	<p>and also whether the site is urban edge or open countryside in character. Whilst RAD9 and RAD10 are adjacent to inappropriate development, if this development is not prominent the site scores highly against this purpose.</p> <p>RAD9 is screened by extensive tree belts.</p> <p>RAD4 - disagree with suggested changes to sites merging and encroaching scores (see response to Samworth Farms). The site does not completely merge settlements (see assessment matrix). Score for encroachment complies with assessment matrix.</p> <p>RAD5 - disagree with proposed score for checking sprawl. Site borders Radcliffe on Trent two sides and has defensible boundaries. Regarding the merging of settlements, this has been re-appraised and a reduced score has</p>	<p>Road, RAD10's score for safeguarding encroachment is reduced from 5 to 4.</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>been applied (see response to Samworth Farms).</p> <p>Appraisals of land are being assessed according site submissions; consequently 'Bells Field' has been incorporated into RAD5.</p> <p>RAD7- due to the presence of a gap between the site and Upper Saxondale the site scores 4.</p> <p>RAD8 - Disagree that score for safeguarding against encroachment should be reduced to 3. The site contains no inappropriate development, however urban edge is visible.</p>	
Mr Michael Styles	6	SITE KEY1: Check unrestricted sprawl: This area would create significant sprawl as it is going away from BGS towards open land and is well separated by the road and screening trees around BGS. It	KEY1 - Disagree with suggested score for restricting sprawl as site adjoins Keyworth in two sides and has strong defensible boundaries. Site would score 1 if it did not rise slightly from Keyworth.	KEY1 - Reword justification for sprawl to emphasise that BGS is within Keyworth and that its GB status is not a primary factor when

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>should have a higher score 3 or 4.</p> <p>Prevent merging of settlements: BGS is mentioned as an intrusion into the Green Belt but the area in question is separate from BGS and closer to Plumtree and Normanton. The strategic review gave a value of 5 and as this site is closet to other villages to rate it as 2 here defies all logic, surely it should also be 5.</p> <p>Assist in safeguarding encroachment Again BGS is mentioned as an intrusion into the Green Belt and described as 'urban edge character'. This is nonsense as BGS is a relatively open site with lots of open space landscaping and in particular extensive screening by large mature trees separating it from the site in question. The Platt Lane site and the playing fields have a very open country feel. This should have a score more like 4 rather than 2.</p>	<p>Regarding merging the site does not extend beyond the BGS and cottages on Platt Lane or housing on Station Road. The railway provides a physical barrier which decreases the perception of merging.</p> <p>Agree that the score for safeguarding against encroachment should be increased. RBC believes this score should be 3, reflecting the visibility of the settlement edge and sports pavilions.</p>	<p>determining whether KEY1 would round of the settlement and reduce performance against checking urban sprawl. <i>"Whilst the British Geological Survey (BGS) is located within the Green Belt, it forms the physical and recognised edge of Keyworth. This review recommends the removal of BGS from the Green Belt. The removal of KEY 1 would create an opportunity to round off the north eastern settlement boundary of Keyworth."</i></p> <p>Increase score from 2 to 3 for safeguarding purpose. Justification states: <i>"The Green Belt designation has</i></p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>The scores for the other criteria are reasonable. If the assessment criteria were applied in a logical objective way this site would have a much higher score, maybe 17 or 18 and thus rated medium-high not low. This is much more in keeping with the general aspect location and feel of the site.</p>		<p><i>prevented the encroachment of inappropriate development within the site. Whilst residential dwellings on Nicker Hill and Platt Lane are visible and properties on Station Road and the British Geological Survey are partially screened by mature trees and hedgerow, they are not overriding features. Nor is the sports pavilion "</i></p> <p>Total score increased from 10 to 11 and revised score summarised in conclusion.</p>
Andrew Hiorns Planning obo Parkers of Leicester Ltd	6	Do not agree with the assessment under the Strategic Review Stage 1 that the eastern area scores highly (score 4) in relation to 'check	A comment on strategic area focuses on performance of client's site. The strategic assessment examines a wider area than the individual sites.	Strategic scores have been moved to the top of site tables. COT10 score against safeguarding

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>unrestricted sprawl of settlements'. The land has a varied character; the land to the north is a rolling landscape and screens the lower levels of the fields.</p> <p>Do not agree with the statement at paragraph 4.40. The land is more contained by the topography, woodlands and Colston Gate itself, and is set against the existing edge of the settlement – which makes it more capable of being contained without the development impacting on the wider landscape, rather than less.</p> <p>Specifically, in relation to site COT 10 (SHLAA 705) Land South of Colston Gate, the score of '4' relates to the opinion in the assessment that this would be a prominent intrusion; and refers to the gaps in the eastern boundary hedge. Development would not be prominent in the wider landscape as the site is effectively</p>	<p>Regarding COT10's contribution to restricting sprawl, RBC disagrees with proposed reduction in score. The land only shares one boundary and its development would constitute a noticeable intrusion into the countryside especially when viewed along Colston Gate. Whilst the contained boundaries and topography to the south would help contain development north and south, the weak hedgerow boundary on the external edge does reduce the overall strength of the boundaries. A score of 4 reflects the site's intrusion but also recognises the stronger boundaries and containment by topography.</p> <p>Regarding encroachment, assessment of inappropriate development only considers inappropriate development not the management of the land or use by residents.</p>	<p>countryside is reduced from 4 to 3. Justification amended as follows: <i>"Whilst inappropriate development has not encroached within the area, the proximity and prominence of properties on Firdale is an overriding feature which results in the land being urban fringe in character."</i></p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>only 'open' on the north side, and then is contained by Colston Gate road and its landscape, and further containment can be provided by landscape planting which would soften the edges of the development the approach to the village generally. This containment allows the development to be planned and designed to suit the setting and indeed would contribute to completing the edge of the town – it represents a logical extension to the town and would not encroach or threaten the wider landscape.</p> <p>The third assessment point – 'Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment' - appears to have judged that as the field is not in poor condition new development would represent an encroachment. Inevitably new development extends the boundaries of the town and all places grow at their edges - the</p>	<p>Assessment does not consider future measures that may reduce effects of development. The review can only assess the existing Green Belt performance of the site, not potential mitigation measures. It is agreed however that the prominence of the urban edge within COT10 reduced the sites performance against this purpose and consequently the site scores 3 not 4.</p> <p>The inclusion of the strategic score provides context for the site. We acknowledge that the inclusion of the strategic score at the bottom of the table has caused confusion, this score has been moved. The site scores for COT10 and 11 indicate that they score higher than the overall score for the eastern area. This supports the conclusion in paragraph 4.40 that this area performs better in Green Belt terms.</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>development of the field would not threaten the wider landscape. And, to repeat the point made above, the field already suffers from some encroachment by local people, but the land is well managed to avoid this degrading the land. It is perverse to value poorly managed land higher against the criteria – which surely encourages poor management.</p> <p>It is not clear in the assessment matrix why there is both a site score and then a Strategic Green Belt Assessment score for the site in addition to the Stage 1 Strategic Review. The results for the second site Strategic Review are higher for Site COT 10 at 14, than the 13 for the whole of the eastern area. And yet the site Strategic score for site COT 11 is 13, the same as the Stage 1 exercise but considerably below the site score at 16?</p>		

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Amy Stone (Nexus Planning) obo Commercial Estates Group	6	KPC and RBC Green Belt review largely consistent in conclusions therefore no concern in relation to the allocation of the client's site as outlined in the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted	Not amended
Liberty Stones Fisher German obo Samworth Farms	6	Providing of updated assessment stating agreement or disagreement to each site assessed in terms of their Green Belt importance, together with justification.	See response to representation on question 5.	See proposed changes
Petr Kysela	6	Disagree with land north and south of Bunny lane on the Western edge of the village being rated the same. Namely KEY11 v KEY10. The KEY11 area is on top of a hill and is without a doubt the highest point on the western edge of the village and can be viewed from significant distances away. On the other hand KEY10 is positioned much lower and its view is obstructed by Bunny Hill and other surrounding hills. I completely disagree with point 4.147.	Scores for KEY10 and KEY11 have been reviewed (see response to Mr and Mrs Patrick). Overall score for KEY10 has been reduced to 9. KEY11 has increased to 12. Concluding paragraph (formally 4.147) amended to reflect the visibility of the site from Bradmore Lane and Wysall Lane.	Scores for KEY10 and 11 amended (see response to Mr and Mrs Patrick)

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	6	<p>Representations relate exclusively to the sites around Keyworth in relation to the draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>There is no wish to agree or disagree with the assessment, but whilst acknowledging the Rushcliffe BC scores are reasonable for the sites as indicated in the consultation document, the sites in the Core Strategy assessment do not tally directly with the areas that are earmarked for development in the NP, so the green belt scoring is not fully relevant to the proposals of the NP, more a desktop exercise for the general purposes of the LAPP.</p> <p>It should be noted that in the draft Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan:</p> <p>a) Sites KEY11 and KEY12, taken as one area, west of Keyworth and north of Bunny Lane, are earmarked to provide development with planned</p>	<p>As described in the methodology the boundaries of each area broadly follow SHLAA submissions. However in some cases these have been amended to ensure logical areas of Green Belt are assessed. It is agreed that KEY4 should be separated into two areas to reflect their different characters and allow for an equal comparison with other sites in Keyworth. However these areas do not correspond with the suggested allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan. Instead they reflect logical boundaries within the site. They are assessed as KEY4 and KEY16.</p> <p>The boundaries of KEY3 reflect the SHLAA submissions. Assessment recognises that it would only be an outlier if developed in isolation. As a logical extension the Green Belt designation prevents a significant intrusion into the countryside.</p>	KEY4 has been divided (see response to Helen Broadhurst) KEY16 created and assessed. KEY4 re-assessed.

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>open space at the northern end of the site.</p> <p>b) Site KEY 4 on Nicker Hill is much larger in the green belt review than the proposed area for development in the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan, where the planned development area would be more sympathetic to the topography and more contained in the landscape than the scored area.</p> <p>c) KEY2 and KEY3 are taken together in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. KEY 3 would not be an outlying intrusion as it connects directly to KEY 2 and the settlement. Development is not planned to take place in the vicinity of the railway line, so it would not be making a significant reduction in the distance between Keyworth and Normanton but would leave the ridge area and slope towards the railway line beyond any development area.</p>		

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Mike Downes Antony Aspbury Associates obo Larkfleet Homes	6	RAD9 and RAD10 - Against an overall strategic score of 11 for land south east of Radcliffe these individual sites now score 16 and 17 respectively in the detailed review, equating to medium-high sensitivity. I would however seriously question scores against three of the purposes of Green Belt (sprawl, encroachment and merging), in particular the score given to unrestricted sprawl, merging and encroachment, all of which are too high for reasons specified in detailed response.	See response to representation by Radcliffe on Trent Golf Club	See response to representation by Radcliffe on Trent Golf Club
Robert Galij David Planning Director Barratt Homes	6	The assessment of Green Belt land around Keyworth is endorsed. A 'two stage' assessment involving: (1) Strategic Review Of Green Belt Importance – Broad Area Level; and (2) Detailed Review Of SHLAA Sites – Individual Land Parcels; is endorsed. The conclusions reached under	Welcome endorsement of 'two stage' approach and support for review's assessment of Keyworth West Strategic Area and Key 10. KEY10 score has been reduced further to 9 (see response to Mr and Mrs Patrick)	See response to Mr and Mrs Patrick

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>Stage (1) for 'Keyworth West' in paragraphs 4.130 – 4.133 with a score of "14", in terms of Green Belt Purpose, is welcomed. This score is the joint second lowest of the four (broad) strategic areas assessed around Keyworth with an overall conclusion land to the west are of "low-medium Green Belt Value."</p> <p>Regarding Stage (2), the assessment for and conclusions reached on Green Belt Site Reference KEY 10 (Hillside Farm, Bunny Lane) in paragraphs 4.142 - 4.145 on pages 93 - 94 is particularly welcomed. In achieving a Green Belt Score of "11", when judged against Green Belt Purposes, this represents the joint second lowest number of all the sites assessed around Keyworth. It reflects the overall conclusion this parcel of land is of "low-medium Green Belt Importance.</p>		

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Define obo William Davis	6	<p>Strategic Review: Support the assessment of the Radcliffe North and East Area which concludes with a score of 12: low-medium importance. That highlights that the area does not fulfil all of the purposes of the Green Belt, that there is an opportunity to “round off” the urban form without physical coalescence (or the perception of it), and that the existing landscape framework would provide strong defensible boundaries.</p> <p>Specific Sites: Generally support the assessment of Site RAD3. However, given the assessment criteria set out on page 44 of the Review, it is apparent that the site should have only scored 1 in relation to urban sprawl. It is contained on 3 sides by existing development, and as its development would extend no further east than that development, it would effectively consolidate the urban form. Moreover, the development</p>	<p>Support for assessment of Strategic Review noted and welcomed.</p> <p>The score of 2 for checking unrestricting urban sprawl, rather than 1, reflects the site's rising topography. Whilst it would not break the ridgeline development within the north eastern area of the site would be more intrusive. No change.</p> <p>The table's conclusion that site RAD3 is of low-medium importance is an error. In response to another representation score has increased from 9 to 10. A score of 10 however still signifies a site that is of low Green Belt importance.</p>	<p>RAD3 table amended - now reads "Low" Green Belt score.</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>would not extend over any significant topographical features, and would be well contained by the existing robust hedgerow framework. It should be noted that even based on the given total score of 9 the table in the assessment should state “Low” Green Belt importance rather than “Low-medium”. On that basis Appendix 1 of Review highlights that, other than a very small site on the northern edge of the settlement (that could not accommodate the required scale of development), Site RAD3 is the least important in Green Belt terms on the edge of Radcliffe. That conclusion is supported.</p>		
Stuart Williamson AMEC obo Crown Estate	6	<p>Additional site submitted adjacent to Radcliffe on Trent through the Issues and Options consultation that is not within the draft Green Belt assessment.</p>	<p>Additional site of Shelford Road (RAD11) on the edge of Radcliffe on Trent has been assessed within the updated Green Belt Review Part 2b.</p>	<p>RAD11 assessed and scored 16 (medium-high Green Belt importance).</p>
Guy Longley Pegasus	6	<p>Disagree with assessment of medium-high for client's area of land</p>	<p>Whilst within the Green Belt, it is agreed that the dwelling to the north</p>	<p>Score for safeguarding reduced from 5 to 4 to</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Planning Group OBO Mrs B Mordecai		(RUD6) and consider that the concerns in relation to the impact on conservation area are overstated, and the assessment does not acknowledge the existing developments to the north and to the south. We have provided a separate landscape report which assesses the contribution that the site makes to the openness of the Green Belt, which assesses the site as low-medium Green Belt importance.	<p>and care home to the south are part of Ruddington and not outlying buildings. Therefore the site shares three boundaries within Ruddington.</p> <p>However the removal of this land from the Green Belt would (if developed) extend Ruddington further beyond the A60 which currently provides a strategic and logical boundary. A score of 3 reflects the site's boundaries with Ruddington and its strategically located position beyond the A60. Regarding safeguarding encroachment, due to the visibility of the care home and to a lesser degree, the dwelling to the north, the countryside character of the site is reduced. Consequently the score has been altered from 5 to 4.</p> <p>The score for preserving character of historic towns is consistent with that undertaken as part of the Core Strategy evidence base, which was found sound at examination. There is</p>	reflect the visibility of the care home and dwelling and their impact on character of the site.

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			no specific reference to what historic towns means in the NPPF and it is considered appropriate to have an approach that has regard to its locality. Site is identified as a positive area of open space in the Townscape Appraisal. Score remains 5.	
Joanne Russell Barton Wilmore obo Taylor Wimpey	6	Based upon own assessment of COT4, other than for encroachment into the countryside, the performance of the site against Green Belt purposes is limited. It is therefore considered to be suitable for development.	Noted	Not amended
Matthew Ransome	6	Do not agree with the green belt scoring for Keyworth West and the land to the North of Bunny Lane (KEY11, KEY12 and KEY13). The land within KEY 11 is sited on top of a hill, and is the highest point on the western edge of the village, with views of over 15 miles, out towards the west, starting from the	Scores for KEY10 and KEY11 have been reviewed (see response to Mr and Mrs Patrick). Overall score for KEY10 has been reduced to 9. KEY11 and KEY12 have increased to 12 and 15 respectively. These increases reflect land's greater prominence and visibility.	KEY10, 11 and 12 amended (see response to Mr and Mrs Patrick)

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>north and moving anticlockwise for over 150 degrees towards the South. This significant visual impact is both looking out from the village and looking on from the surrounding area.</p> <p>The proposal for this site north of Bunny Lane will have a major visual impact on the local and wider area. I therefore think the scoring of KEY 11 needs to be reviewed, as I believe it has a Green Belt score of 14 not 11, and a Strategic Green Belt Assessment score of 17 not 14.</p>		
Guy Wakefield Hunter Page Planning obo Miller Homes	6	Agree in general terms but the site (Safeguarded Land off Platt Lane/Station Road (KEY1)) should score lower due to lesser impact on countryside encroachment and preserving the character of historic place for reasons given in supporting statement.	<p>Welcome support for assessment of KEY1's performance against restricting urban sprawl and merging.</p> <p>Disagree with suggested reduction in performance against safeguarding countryside from encroachment. Score has been increased from 2 to 3 to reflect the partial screening of neighbouring BGS and properties on</p>	Increase in safeguarding countryside is confirmed as 3 (See response to Michael Styles). Score of 2 against preserving character is not changed.

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>Station Road and Platt Lane.</p> <p>Disagree with suggested reduction in performance against preserving character. Score reflects site's contribution to setting of cottages on Platt Lane that are of Local Interest. Assessment focusses on performance of land against Green Belt purposes; it does not consider possible mitigation.</p>	
Featherstones Planning obo Various	6	<p>Agree in part, but consider that certain scorings should be re-visited based on the methodology. In the case of Cotgrave, site COT9 should score lower in relation to countryside encroachment and sprawl given that the site is surrounded on three sites by development. The assessment should also acknowledge that a permanent defensible boundary could be created.</p>	<p>Suggested reduction in score for preventing sprawl is agreed. Score reduced from 3 to 2 as site is contained on three sides.</p> <p>Regarding defensible boundaries, the Green Belt assessment examines the performance of land in its current form not possible mitigation measures and condition following development. Boundary proposed follows no existing permanent or defensible feature. This prevents a lower score.</p>	<p>Visual connectivity recognised in COT9 Table. Green Belt score lowered from 11 to 10. Overall Green Belt importance reduced from low-medium to low.</p>
Featherstones	6	In the case of Keyworth, the	The Green Belt review has scored	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Planning obo Various		assessment is inconsistent with the Keyworth Neighbourhood plan evidence base, which rates this area as the least sensitive. It is considered that due to factors outlined, the scores for KEY2 and KEY3 should be 10 and 12 respectively.	KEY3 and KEY4 12 and 17 respectively, this score has been determined according to set criteria which is different to the Green Belt review underpinning the Neighbourhood Plan. Altering the score to suit the Neighbourhood Plan would result in inconsistent scoring of Keyworth's sites.	
Featherstones Planning obo Various	6	In the case of Ruddington, land off Loughborough Road could be released from the green belt and developed in a way which would maintain the character of the area and not affect wider Green Belt purposes.	As an additional site (submitted prior publication of draft) RUD11 has been assessed within the updated Green Belt Review. Its allocation will be determined through Local Plan Part 2.	Site (RUD11) has been assessed within the updated review. Due to the land's outlying location between Ruddington and the main urban area the review determines that due to the perception of merging it is fundamentally constrained by the Green Belt designation.
Ian D Clarke	6	To sustain housing and economic development needs, it is highly likely at some point, development outside	Policies determining the future of Bunny Brickworks, including appropriate land uses, are being	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>settlement boundaries, probably green belt land, will be necessary. Therefore, clear benefits in meeting some of those housing and employment needs now, by the use of brownfield sites, and particular characteristics of the Bunny Brick Works site mean the totality of harm would be clearly outweighed by other considerations, and the very special circumstances necessary to justify development.</p> <p>Finally, we should question the idea that green belts are environmentally-friendly. They are mostly used for intensive farmland which generates negative or very low net environmental benefit, neither do they provide a social or amenity benefit. Urban parks and gardens provide far richer biodiversity, and have positively disproportionate benefits in terms of land area. Green space in urban areas provides environmental</p>	<p>developed through Local Plan Part 2. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.</p> <p>Once Green Belts have been defined, planning policy should positively enhance biodiversity and amenity within the Green Belt. It is not however a purpose of Green Belt and does not form part of this Review.</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		benefits for significantly greater numbers of local residents.		
Mark Bassett Freeths Obo Mr Sam Burt	6	RUD4 has a score of 13 which positions it as 4th out of 10 sites assessed in relation to Ruddington. A significant factor in the total of 13 is the award of '5' against the 'preserve setting and special character of the historic settlement category'. Whilst it is acknowledged that the site contains a listed building and lies adjacent to the conservation area, the development of this particular site is not of scale that would justify the highest score in terms of impact on the purpose of the Green Belt. The award of '5' appears disproportionate and does not allow differentiation to, for example, a scenario where a Green Belt site capable of accommodating several hundred dwellings was proposed adjacent to a historic town or settlement.	<p>Score against preserving character of historic towns is consistent with that undertaken as part of the Core Strategy evidence base which was found sound at examination. There is no specific reference to what historic towns' mean in the NPPF and it is considered appropriate to have an approach that has regard to its locality. Easthorpe House is a listed building which contributes significantly to the historical setting of Ruddington. Its grounds are designated at a local level as a Historic Park and Garden.</p> <p>Paragraph 135 states the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage should be taken into account. Consequently development that significantly affects the setting a listed building and locally important park and garden warrants a</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>On this basis it is recommended that the assessment score is re-evaluated for this particular category. A further point is that reference is made to the site including historic parks and gardens. No record can be found on Historic England's website and a search of the Council's records does not appear to identify the site as a registered park and garden.</p> <p>http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/conservation/historicparksandgardens/</p>	score of 5.	
Mark Bassett Freeths Obo Mr Sam Burt	6	<p>The 'final conclusion' for RUD4 results in an award of 'high Green Belt importance' but this does not appear to reflect the assessment against each of the five purposes for Green Belt. It is recognised that the North East as a strategic area scores a value attributed medium to high but the contribution of the site towards this score is low. This is evidenced by the fact that under 'preventing merging of settlements', the</p>	<p>The final conclusion for RUD4 that the land is of high Green Belt importance reflects the protection given to the setting of Easthorpe House, Conservation Area and locally designated park and garden. The assessment accepts that due to the size of the site and its containment its importance in terms of restricting sprawl and preventing merging is reduced. The site has been considered on its merits.</p>	No

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>justification remarks (P131) that this section of Green Belt is 1.5km in width and consequently 'the significant removal of land in this area would be contrary to this purpose'. It is accepted that this specific comment is on a more strategic basis but the site specific assessment should be considered on its merits, and its size and location means that the removal of RUD4 would have a very low impact on this section Green Belt.</p>		
<p>Liam Toland Heaton Planning Obo David Wilson Homes</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>The scoring as set out in the Green Belt review is poorly justified, the explanations appear somewhat engineered and in actual fact appears retrofitted to try and fit with the proposed allocation and safeguarded sites in the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan. A full reappraisal of the clients site and alternative sites is provided, together with justification.</p>	<p>Disagree - The scoring is compliant with the methodology used to assess the strategic allocations within Part 1 of the Green Belt Review. It also reflects the scoring used by neighbouring LPAs. The assessment and scoring of sites in Keyworth has independently determined sites and has not been retrofitted to support sites proposed through the Neighbourhood Plan. This is evidenced in the determination that</p>	<p>KEY2's score for restricting sprawl increased from 2 to 3. Total score increased from 12 to13.</p> <p>KEY4 split into two smaller parcels (KEY4 and KEY16) to allow more detailed assessment and</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>KEYC is of medium-high Green Belt value. The western half of KEY A scored 15, one point below a medium-high value site.</p> <p>Regarding KEY7, we disagree that score for restricting sprawl should be reduced to 3. The site only shares one complete boundary with neighbouring residential developments on the south of Selby Lane plus a short distance along Selby Lane to the north. Its remaining boundaries are adjacent to open countryside or allotments, which are not within Keyworth's physical boundary (nor are they inset from the Green Belt). The nearby school and church are not adjacent to the site. Whilst there is an established hedgerow south of site, there are no physical features along its outward facing boundary that constitute defensible or permanent boundaries. Green Belt prevents prominent intrusion into open countryside.</p>	<p>comparison.</p> <p>Scores for KEY10, 11, 12 and 13 have been reviewed and 10, 11 and 12 changed (see response to Mr and Mrs Patrick).</p> <p>Merging score for KEY7 reduced from 3 to 2. Total score decreased from 16 to 15 (Low-medium Green Belt importance).</p> <p>Safeguarding score for KEY1 increased from 2 to 3 (see response to Michael Styles).</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>Furthermore, the review can only assess the performance of the Green Belt, not mitigation measures that may make development acceptable in landscape or visual impact terms.</p> <p>Preventing Sprawl: Disagree with proposed score of 5 for KEY2's performance against restricting sprawl. However it is accepted that the sharing of one boundary (with the BGS which is part of Keyworth's settlement) increases the score from 2 to 3. Due to the screening of the site by topography and properties on Platt Lane and the established hedgerows the site does not score 5.</p> <p>KEY4 - it is accepted that the scale of KEY4 does not allow for detailed assessment and creates an uneven comparison with smaller sites. KEY4 has therefore been split into two smaller parcels, reflecting the different character of the land and robust</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>boundaries.</p> <p>KEY3 is scored 5 against restricting sprawl, as suggested in the representation.</p> <p>Disagree with score of 5 for KEY 1 and its performance against restricting sprawl. Score of 2 reflects the two boundaries it shares with Keyworth (BGS is considered part of Keyworth's main settlement area) and it has robust boundaries. KEY10 to13 have been reviewed and amended (see response to Mr and Mrs Patrick).</p> <p>Merging: It is agreed that KEY7's score for merging should be reduced, as there are no settlements south of Keyworth within the Green Belt.</p> <p>Disagree with proposed score of 3 for KEY2 against merging. It would be limited reduction between Keyworth and Normanton. Critically the existing</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>cottages on Platt Lane reduce the perception of merging.</p> <p>Disagree with proposed increase for KEY12 and performance against merging. 2 reflect a reduction in distance which though noticeable is not significant.</p> <p>Disagree with suggested score of 3 against merging for KEY1. This site shares two boundaries with Keyworth and would round off the settlement.</p> <p>Safeguarding: Disagree with proposed reduction in KEY7's performance against safeguarding countryside. Site does not contain any inappropriate development and whilst visible the edge of Keyworth is not prominent and land is open countryside. As stated previously, mitigation measures which may reduce a development's prominence are not considered within this review.</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>Disagree with increase in score for KEY3. The visibility of the BGS prevents a maximum score of 5.</p> <p>Agree that KEY1's score should be increased, however the score is 3 not 4, as proposed (see response to Michael Styles).</p>	
Ben Holmes Oxalis Planning Obo various	6	<p>The assessment of Green Belt around Keyworth appears to be inconsistent with the assessment work undertaken as part of the evidence base for the preparation of the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan. Specific consideration should be given to the Neighbourhood Plan Green Belt work in finalising the Green Belt Review. Specific comments on the assessment are:</p> <p>1. Paragraph 4.130 should refer to land <u>north</u> of Bunny Lane as on the same ridge as Keyworth and</p>	<p>Paragraphs 4.130 and 4.131 have been reviewed. It is agreed that these paragraphs should be amended. These changes should reflect prominence of KEY11 and 12, especially the areas which slope north and south from the ridgeline.</p> <p>The assessment of KEY14 accepts that the topography either side of Debdale Lane restricts the perception of sprawl to the local area.</p> <p>The inconsistency between RAD3, KEY11 and KEY12 has been resolved.</p>	<p>Paragraph 4.130 amended: <i>"Land west of Keyworth contains areas which are likely to score well against Green Belt purposes, especially areas which slope away from the top of the ridge upon which Keyworth is located to the north, west and south. The ridge and Keyworth itself is visible from a considerable distance, including locations within</i></p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>containing strong defensible hedgerows. This would then be consistent with the text in the Strategic Review table.</p> <p>2. Paragraph 4.131 should make it clear that land at Debdale Lane would not encourage prominent urban sprawl. Built development north of the ridge line (some distance north of Debdale Lane) would be prominent, and not the development of land promoted for development by Bloor Homes.</p> <p>3. In the assessment of KEY11 and KEY12 it is suggested that parts of the site are prominent in views from the north. The ridgeline that runs along the northern edge of Keyworth screens long distance views towards this part of the village. It is also difficult to understand why the assessment of this area differs so significantly to the assessment of</p>	<p>Both RAD3 and KEY12 contain a residential dwelling unconnected to agricultural activity (inappropriate development). KEY11 does not. This has been taken into consideration in their assessments.</p> <p>Amend 4.150 - it should read KEY11, not KEY10.</p> <p>KEY11 and KEY12 should not be merged as they represent definable Green Belt areas and reflect the SHLAA submissions. The Neighbourhood Plan will inform site selection, alongside the GB Review, it does dictate the boundaries of parcels of land in this review.</p> <p>Agree that KEY14's score for safeguarding countryside should be reduced to reflect prominence of settlement edge. 3 mirrors the score for KEY11.</p>	<p><i>Nottingham's main urban area."</i></p> <p>Paragraph 4.131 has been removed.</p> <p>KEY12 score for safeguarding countryside has been reduced from 5 to 4 to reflect presence of residential dwelling on Bunny Lane.</p> <p>KEY14 score for safeguarding countryside has been reduced from 4 to 3 and this score is justified within the table.</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>land around Radcliffe – in particular RAD3. RAD3 gets a score of 2 for safeguarding the countryside from encroachment because it contains a farmhouse and residential dwelling. However KEY11 and 12 also contain a farmhouse and residential dwelling but have a score of 3.</p> <p>4. KEY12. The assessment refers to KEY10 whereas it should refer to site KEY11. Indeed The assessment should be of KEY11 and 12 jointly, as proposed in the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan, with an overall scoring likely to be of 11 or less.</p> <p>5. KEY14 has been given a different score in relation to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment than other sites, such as KEY11 and KEY10, which has the same relationship and effect from the existing settlement edge. Its scoring should be the same in this regard.</p>	<p>Welcome support for approach around Ruddington</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		The general approach to the assessment of land around Ruddington is supported.		
Ben Holmes Oxalis Planning Obo various	6	<p>I do not agree with the green belt scoring for the area around Keyworth. Specifically Keyworth West and the land to the North of Bunny Lane (KEY11, KEY12 and KEY13).</p> <p>KEY11 specifically is on top of a hill, and is the highest point on the Western edge of the village. It has views out towards the west, for approximately 15 miles. The scoring of KEY 11 needs to be reviewed, as I believe it should have a Strategic Green Belt Assessment score of 17 and a Green belt score of 14</p>	<p>Scores for KEY11, 12 and 13 have been re-assessed and KEY11 and 12 have been amended to reflect the land's elevated position and prominence (see response to Mr and Mrs Patrick). KEY11 and KEY12 have increased to 12 and 15 respectively.</p> <p>Whilst KEY13 has increased in size to reflect landowner's representation, the score has not been altered as it already scored the maximum of 5 against restricting sprawl.</p> <p>Strategic Green Belt score should be increased to reflect the prominence of the ridge.</p>	<p>See response to Mr and Mrs Patrick regarding KEY11, 12 and 13.</p> <p>Strategic Green Belt score increased from 3 to 4. Justification states: <i>"Separating this broad area north and south of Bunny Lane, the area north consists of compact strip fields which are well contained by established hedgerows and a ditch along Debdale Lane. The topography of the area is dominated by the ridge upon which Keyworth is located and the Green Belt designation prevents</i></p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
				<p><i>further expansion of Keyworth which would be visible over a wide area to the north and south. However, provided development is contained on the ridge and is integrated with Keyworth (itself already visible) intrusion into the countryside could be reduced."</i></p>
<p>Bob Woollard PDG Obo Mosaic Estates</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>The strategic review assessment for the north east of Radcliffe is too low, and should score 15 and the assessment to the west is too high and should score 10 (detailed justification provided in representation). Based upon detailed assessment (see representation for justification), it is considered that site RAD1 should score 9.</p>	<p>Disagree with proposed increase in the North East strategic performance against restricting sprawl. Whilst hedgerows are a weaker boundary than a road, river or railway, if they are substantial they do offer opportunities to establish new Green Belt boundaries. The use of hedgerows as defensible boundaries is well established and has been used in numerous Green Belt reviews.</p>	<p>RAD3 - increase safeguarding score from 2 to 3. Justification has been amended.</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>Disagree that the score for merging should be the same for the north east and west strategic areas. Removal of land west would significantly reduce the distance between Radcliffe and Holme Pierrepont, which though in the Green Belt is a recognised settlement in the Core Strategy. This is consistent with the assessment of merging which examines the reduction in distance and/or perception of settlements merging irrespective of their Green Belt designation. There is also less opportunity to round off Radcliffe and thus avoid merging.</p> <p>RAD3 - disagree with proposed score of 3 or 4 against restricting urban sprawl. Site shares three boundaries with Radcliffe and has a mature and substantial hedgerow on its remaining boundary.</p> <p>Disagree with proposed score of 3 or 4 against merging as it does not extend</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>beyond residential development along the A52 and only fractionally on Shelford Road. There would be no physical or perception of merging. It is agreed that the performance against safeguarding was incorrect however the proposed score of 5 is too high given the prominence of Radcliffe and the urban edge character of the site. This score has been increased from 2 to 3 (see response to Samworth Farms Ltd).</p> <p>The strategic assessment of the area west of Radcliffe considers the wider area beyond RAD1 and the railway line. This looks at the wider value of the Green Belt and determines that this wider area is important as it prevents the merging of Radcliffe with Holme Pierrepont and the main urban area. Disagree that score should be reduced from 4 to 2.</p> <p>Disagree with proposed reduction in</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>RAD1 score against merging from 3 to 2. The justification clearly recognises the presence of the railway embankment and this is reflected in a reduction in the site's performance against this purpose. Without the railway line the site would score 4. Furthermore it is accepted that any reduction in the distance between Radcliffe and Gamston would be minimal.</p> <p>Regarding the comparison of safeguarding from encroachment between RAD1 and RAD2 and 3, RAD3 has been increased from 2 to 3. This reflects the presence of a dwelling and visibility of the urban edge. The score of 3 mirrors the score for RAD1 which conversely has a greater amount of inappropriate development but is less visually influenced by the edge of Radcliffe and more open countryside in character.</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Paul Stone, Signet Planning obo Aldergate Properties	6	<p>Disagree with assessment that site is medium-high Green Belt importance of 15 (KEY13) when adjacent site (KEY12) scores 14.</p> <p>Disagree with assessment in relation to sprawl and should score lower.</p> <p>Based on detailed assessment (see representation) the site should score lower, at 11.</p>	<p>Following reassessment of their scores against Green Belt purposes, both KEY13 and KEY12 scored a maximum against restricting urban sprawl due to their intrusion into the Green Belt and prominent locations. Detailed site score of 2 provided by landowner is justified on the basis of non-green belt issues (e.g. meeting housing need, sustainability, and objectives of draft NP). These issues will be considered at site selection alongside the site's Green Belt importance.</p> <p>Disagree with reduction in KEY13's score against safeguarding countryside from encroachment. Whilst countryside / Green Belt is required to meet the adopted Core Strategy target of Keyworth, the assessment of safeguarding countryside from encroachment examines whether inappropriate development has encroached and whether the land is open countryside that is not visually</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>influenced by the urban edge, or urban fringe where the settlement edge is prominent. Sites that are considered open countryside perform better against this purpose. KEY13 is not adjacent to the edge of Keyworth, the urban edge is not visible and the character is open countryside. In addition it does not contain any inappropriate development and is therefore deemed to perform well against this purpose.</p> <p>Whilst KEY13 has increased in size the score remains unchanged.</p>	
Geoffrey Prince obo Langridge Homes	6	The assessment score for the Strategic Green Belt Area Cotgrave West was 13 (out of 20), which indicated that this area is of low – medium Green Belt importance. We consider that the two of these conclusions are an over exaggeration.	Land between the sewage works and Main Road is adjacent to the historic core which includes the following properties which are visible from within the Green Belt: All Saints Church (Grade I listed), 14 Church Lane (Grade II listed), and 4 Church Lane. The Grade I listed church is a prominent feature within the area.	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>The impact on the setting of Cotgrave's historic core is very much a subjective matter, and clear conclusions can only be reached on this matter following a detailed examination in the context of specific sites.</p> <p>With regards to the narrowing of the distance with the strategic allocation at Tollerton, some 2.5 miles from the western edge of Cotgrave, small scale development will not give rise to any perceptible change to the reduction of this gap due to changes in levels between the two settlements with a slight rise providing a clear physical separation between the two locations.</p>	<p>Given their proximity and visibility, the Green Belt in this area provides a rural setting for these buildings which are themselves important to the historic rural character of Cotgrave. A score of 2 for this purpose is deemed appropriate as land adjacent to Plumtree Lane is less important to the setting of the historic core.</p> <p>The assessment of whether a strategic area prevents merging looks beyond individual parcels of land and their loss to small scale development. The score of 3 reflects the combination of development in this area and Gamston merging Cotgrave with the main urban area.</p>	
Geoffrey Prince obo Langridge Homes	6	Langridge Homes has reviewed its proposals for COT8 and is proposing two options for the development of this site. Option 1 (existing COT8) which extends across both fields	Whilst the landowner has proposed two options, the review only assess the larger option 1 as this will establish a more permanent GB boundary. RBC concurs that the score for safeguarding	Safeguarding countryside reduced from 4 to 3. Justification amended: " <i>Whilst inappropriate development has not</i>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>located immediately to the north of Church Lane and west of Main Road. This scheme has a capacity for around 148 dwellings on a gross site area of 6.3 ha. The detailed appraisal contained within the representation considers that this option should score 11.</p> <p>Option 2 which only involve development on the lower field adjoining the edge of the village. This smaller scheme has a capacity for approximately 80 dwellings on a gross site area of 2.9ha. The detailed appraisal contained within the representation considers that this option should score 7.</p>	<p>should be reduced from 4 to 3. The edge of Cotgrave is a prominent when looking south and east and character is one of countryside becoming village.</p> <p>Disagree with reduction in score against preserving setting. As described above this area provides the setting for the village's historic core, which includes Grade I, II and local interest buildings.</p>	<p><i>encroached, (the edge of Cotgrave along Main Road and historic core) is a prominent feature. The character is settlement fringe rather than open countryside."</i></p>
DPDS obo Wickmere Ltd	6	<p>In respect of the detailed reviews, our clients support the findings for COT3 and COT4 which confirm these land parcels to be of "low Green Belt importance" with both areas scoring "9". However, our clients consider</p>	<p>Disagree with proposed reduction in score for preserving historic character. However, as Grantham Canal is an undesignated heritage asset the score should be reduced to reflect its local status.</p>	<p>COT5's score against preserving special character of the settlement is reduced from 3 to 2.</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>that the score apportioned to COT5 which finds this area to be of “low-medium Green Belt importance” to be incorrect, we have considered the conclusions provided within the scoring table and comment with regard to the assessment provided in relation to “preserve the setting and special character of historic settlement”</p>		
Oliver Boyes	6	<p>Do not agree with the green belt scoring for the area around Keyworth, and in particular Keyworth West and the land to the North of Bunny Lane (KEY11, KEY12 and KEY13).</p> <p>The land within KEY 11 is sited on top of a hill, and is the highest point on the Western edge of the village, with views of over 15 miles, out towards the west, starting from the North and moving anticlockwise for over 150 degrees towards the South. This significant visual impact is both</p>	<p>Scores for KEY11, 12 and 13 have been re-assessed and KEY11 and 12 have been amended to reflect the land's elevated position and prominence (see response to Mr and Mrs Patrick). KEY11 and KEY12 have increased to 12 and 15 respectively.</p> <p>Whilst KEY13 has increased in size to reflect landowner's representation, the score has not been altered, as it already scored the maximum of 5 against restricting sprawl. Strategic Green Belt score should be increased</p>	KEY 11 and 12 amended (see response to Mr and Mrs Patrick)

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>looking out from the village and looking on from the surrounding area. The proposal for this site to house 200+ homes on this site North of Bunny lane will have a major visual impact on the local and wider area. I therefore think the scoring of KEY 11 need to be reviewed, as I believe it has a Green belt score of 14 not 11, and a Strategic Green Belt Assessment score of 17 not 14.</p>	<p>to reflect the prominence of the ridge.</p>	
Michael Hewitt	6	<p>The strategic Green Belt areas for Keyworth seem to be in error as the North area is labelled North West. It is not clear where the boundary is between North and West areas. What areas are Key14 and Key15 in?</p> <p>Keyworth to Bunny is 3 kilometres away. It is difficult to see why scores for preventing of merging of settlements on the western side of Keyworth should be different when the scale merging is similar. I.e. 100</p>	<p>There is no Keyworth North. The strategic assessment of Keyworth North West was incorrectly titled Keyworth North. It was stated that there are no sites in the North (North West). This is incorrect as KEY14 and 15 are within this strategic area (not Keyworth West). The boundary between the west and north west strategic areas is along Debdale Lane and continues along the ditch and hedge line which runs east/west between Sites KEY15, 14 and KEY11,</p>	<p>Title for the strategic assessment of the North West Area renamed Keyworth North West. Sites KEY14 and 15 relocated under the North West strategic area assessment within the review.</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		metres – 300 metres.	<p>12 and 13. They are split along this line as sites KEY14 and 15 are not on the ridge upon which the majority of Keyworth is located.</p> <p>The difference in score against merging for KEY11, and 12 and 13 reflects not only a physical reduction in distance but also the perception that distances between settlements are reducing.</p>	
Michael Hewitt	6	The 3 sites off Bunny Lane, KEY11, KEY12 and KEY13 are very reliant on each other and should be considered as one site as has been done for site KEY4. There is no clear reason why sites KEY12 and KEY13 should have different scores. The 1 point difference puts them in different assessment bands. If part of site KEY12 is visible over a longer distance its score for checking unrestricted sprawl of developments should be the same as for KEY13.	KEY11, 12 and 13 have been reviewed. Agreed that KEY12 and 13 should have the same score against restricting sprawl (see response to Mr and Mrs Patrick). KEY12 however has a dwelling house within it. This reduces its performance against safeguarding countryside from encroachment. To be consistent with the west of Keyworth KEY4 has been subdivided according to clearly definable parcels of Green Belt land.	KEY12 score for restricting sprawl increased to 5. KEY13 already scores a maximum of 5.

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		This would put both sites in the medium-high assessment band.		
Landmark Planning obo Flawforth Lane landowners	6	Support the development of site RUD5 based upon the Green Belt assessment, which scores the site the lowest in the Borough.	Support noted and welcomed.	Not amended
Barton in Fabis Parish Council	6	We agree with the policy in the Core Strategy that housing in other settlements should be for local needs only and in Gotham for example 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.	Support for existing Core Strategy housing policy for Barton in Fabis and Gotham noted.	Not amended
Mrs A Toombs	6	Seems a lot of areas and sites. Who are all the people that need village housing?	Housing need and the distribution of new homes to meet this need was discussed and agreed within the Core Strategy. In addition to strategic sites (identified in the Core Strategy), the LAPP will identify smaller sites in order to deliver these homes.	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
John Freeston	6	Additional site submitted adjacent to Radcliffe on Trent through the Issues and Options consultation that is not within the draft Green Belt assessment.	Site has been included within the 2016 SHLAA and assessed within the revised Green Belt Review which will inform site selection in the Preferred Options LAPP.	RAD12 added and assessed in review. Land scored 11 (low-medium Green Belt importance)
B Venes	6	Do not agree with change in Green Belt around RUD1 There is no reason to remove it to the north of Packman Dyke. The Children's playground should not be removed from the Green Belt.	Opposition to the removal of RUD1, land of Packman Dyke and playing field from the Green Belt noted. Decision to remove will be made through the LAPP and informed by the Green Belt review.	Not amended
Robert Smith	6	<p>Scores significantly underestimate the Green Belt value of KEY1.</p> <p>1. Check unrestricted sprawl of settlements. Too much weight is given to the proximity of the Platt Lane site to the BGS. This should be scored 4 at least, rather than 2.</p> <p>2. Prevent merging of settlements. Again far too much importance is attached to the BGS site on the other side of Platt Lane. Development</p>	<p>Disagree with proposed increases in KEY1's performance for restricting sprawl and merging of settlements. The presence of the BGS is a significant factor, due to its intrusion into the countryside, impact on openness and visual connectivity to Keyworth, development on the opposite side of Platt Lane offers an opportunity to round of the settlement.</p> <p>Development would not reduce the distance, or be perceived to reduce the</p>	KEY1 score for preventing encroachment increased from 2 to 3.

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>would manifestly reduce the gaps between Keyworth and Plumtree and Keyworth and Normanton. Again the score should be at least 4 and not 1.</p> <p>3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment The land at Platt Lane is clearly open countryside when viewed from Platt Lane or Station Road. Development at Platt Lane would therefore be an obvious encroachment on the countryside. Score 4 rather than 2</p> <p>This leads to an overall score of 17 rather than 10.</p>	<p>distance to Plumtree or Platt Lane due to developments on the opposite side of Station Road and Platt lane. The railway line provides a physical boundary that separates Keyworth from Plumtree, reducing further the perception of merging.</p> <p>Agree that the score for preventing encroachment should be increased (see response to Mr Michael Styles). However this score is increased to 3 not 4, in accordance with assessment matrix.</p>	
Timothy Parker	6	<p>With regard to COT 3 - I agree with the comments "if this plot was built on it would not put the town centre regeneration in jeopardy", but I feel if this land was built on it would do more - it would actually PROMOTE much needed regeneration. This plot is literally only 100metres from the</p>	<p>Welcome agreement. However additional comments regarding regeneration opportunities provided by COT3 are not pertinent to the Green Belt review which focusses on the performance of land against Green Belt purposes.</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		town centre! It is madness it has not already been accepted as a future development site.		
Mary Butler	6	Disagree with assessment on Key 10. Score should be 17 as Key 9. This area should be considered jointly with Key 9 and not as a separate entity. They are fields with the Buildings of Hillside Farm at their centre where they meet and the "main and substantial adjoining Barns" are apparently dividable one being located in Key 9 and one in Key 10. This farm should ideally be encouraged to be reunited by this greenbelt review. The farmhouse of Hillside farm (located in Key 10 having had its agricultural restriction inappropriately removed) and not further divided. The idea of the division between Key 9 & 10 constitutes a defensible boundary " to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment" is very weak and	Disagree with merging of KEY10 and KEY9. These sites were submitted separately by landowners. KEY 10 is a logical parcel of land contained by hedgerow, a farm track and Bunny Lane. Ownership and land holding issues do not form part of this review. The removal of the agricultural occupancy condition has been examined and this has resulted in a re-appraisal of KEY9's performance against safeguarding countryside. As an open market dwelling it is inappropriate development and the score is reduced. Whilst the existing boundary does provide a robust Green Belt boundary, this is the case for all sites on the edge of the village. It is the purpose of this review to inform site selection and identify where new	Reduce score for safeguarding from 3 to 2. Justification amended: <i>"The presence of an open market dwelling (resulting from a removal of an agricultural occupancy restriction) means some inappropriate development is present on site. Of greater significance is the proximity and visibility of Keyworth's settlement edge. This is an overriding feature within the site."</i>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		in any case insubstantial as a defensible when compared to the existing Western boundary to Keyworth.	boundaries could be established, this includes using tracks, roads and hedgerows.	
Tamsin Armour	6	Site KEY4 is crucial for separation between Keyworth and Stanton on the Wolds and the score should be higher.	KEY4 does increase development adjacent to Stanton on the Wolds and would therefore increase the merging of the two settlements. This is reflected in the assessment of KEY16. KEY16 is the southern half of what was previously KEY4.	KEY4 has been divided (see response to Helen Broadhurst) KEY16 created and further merging of settlements recognised.
Mr Hubbard obo Mr T Dickens	6	Purple strategic area does not extend all the way up to the south west edge of Cropwell Road which would be a logical, appropriate and defensible boundary. No logical reason as to why the LPA would consider the removal of the GB from the fields and open land to the south west of the dwellings that front this side of Cropwell Road, but not remove the Green Belt from 'washing over' the actual dwellings and built from itself which surely has the degree of	<p>The Strategic Area is not proposed for removal. Their boundaries are purely indicative. It provides a strategic score for a wider area against which the smaller parcels of land (possible allocations) are assessed. It is not intended to leave a small area of Green Belt along Cropwell Road between the South West and South East Strategic areas.</p> <p>Regarding the removal of properties on Cropwell Road from the Green Belt,</p>	The decision to maintain the Green Belt boundary along the A52 and continue to wash over properties on Cropwell Road is explained in the Green Belt Review (see minor amendments to Radcliffe in Trent's Green Belt boundary).

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>permanence as desired by the LPA. Retention of ribbon development has no benefit.</p> <p>There is a clear logic for removing the Green Belt from washing over the dwellings on Cropwell Road as this would include built form, has the degree of permanence and buildings do not contribute to checking unrestricted sprawl, does not prevent merging and doesn't help safeguard the countryside from encroachment.</p>	<p>the A52 and Harlequin residential area currently provide a robust and permanent southern GB boundary for Radcliffe. Insetting properties on Cropwell Road would result in a long thin intrusion into the Green Belt, weakening the importance of the Green Belt designation in this area and remove properties within extensive grounds which contribute to the openness of the Green Belt and prevent further urban sprawl.</p>	
Richard Ling obo Mrs P Myles	7	<p>The release of the area to the north of the Nottingham Knight roundabout is justified as it does not fulfil essential purposes for including land within the Green Belt.</p>	<p>The Green Belt Review Part 2b does not examine sites adjacent to the main urban area. These areas were assessed within Part 1 of the Green Belt Review which informed strategic site selection. The area north of Nottingham Knights Roundabout was determined to be of low-medium Green Belt importance within Part 1. This will be considered alongside other issues (landscape, access etc...) when</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			allocating sites.	
Cllr Rod Jones	7	Given the loss of green belt to the large allocated sites – the replacement area of green belt should match that lost. Ideally it should be designated as favourable to tree planting/forestry use. The green belt land to the west of Sharphill Wood and north of the A52 ring road – should be designated for future community park use. Every conurbation needs its green lungs/space. When decades of expansion of West Bridgford from Compton Acres to Gamston and the next two major expansions are complete, there will be no major natural available countryside accessible to the Public. Hence this area should be designated and provided for this use.	Including additional land within the Green Belt can only occur in exceptional circumstances. Land must meet the five purposes and should not be extended purely on the basis of replacing land removed from the Green Belt. The proposed use of land west of Sharphill Wood is consistent with Green Belt objectives and purposes, it is not the intention of the Green Belt review to determine land use within, this will occur through the Local Plan Part 2. These comments will inform that process.	Not amended
Liberty Stones Fisher German obo Samworth	7	Support the inseting of St James Business Park. Detailed justification provided within full response.	The removal of St James Business Park from the Green Belt depends on decisions regarding RAD4. Removal of	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Farms			the Business Park on its own would result in a small outlying inset within the Green Belt. Decisions regarding further development within this business park can occur in accordance with paragraph 89 of the NPPF. Removal of Green Belt designation would weaken the Green Belt in this locality and encourage inappropriate development.	
Tom Beavin JVH Planning obo Southwell and Nottinghamshire Diocese	7	Disagree with the assessment and scoring for site COT 7. It is considered from the glossary that the assessment is a derivative of Para 80 of the NPPF and not local tests and the document should make this clear. Furthermore it is argued that the only tests that apply to the site from the NPPF is protecting the countryside from encroachment	Disagree - The Green Belt review must consistently assess the performance of all possible allocations against the five Green Belt purposes. This approach complies with Part 1 of the Review and ensures a fair comparison of each area of land.	Not amended
Tom Beavin JVH Planning obo Southwell and	7	In terms of Cropwell Bishop/East Bridgford/Gotham/, the review should be wider and amendments to existing insets or new insets should allow for	Decisions regarding allocating sites on the edge of other settlements will be made through the preferred options consultation. In order to inform these	Assessment of SHLAA sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Nottinghamshire Diocese		development and for safeguarded land, particularly at Fern Road/Kirk Hill/Leake Road.	decisions the Green Belt Review has assessed sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton. These settlements have been included in the review as they could support further development. The same methodology used for the assessment of sites on the edge the Key Settlements has been applied and this is compliant with NPPF Paragraphs 84 and 85.	Tollerton have been included within the Green Belt Review
Mike Downes Antony Aspbury Associates obo Larkfleet Homes	7	<p>Piecemeal alterations around individual sites will not secure a comprehensive outcome. Larger areas can and should be removed around the key settlements and that can include areas that should be protected from development and /or are not needed for development in this current plan period, e.g. Edwalton golf course.</p> <p>The Council's review has identified that the Green Belt all around</p>	Welcome support for Strategic Review. The site level assessments do not contradict strategic assessment. As stated in other responses, they assess GB at different scales, examining the strategic value of the Green Belt around each settlement and the performance of individual sites within this context.	Not amendments

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>Radcliffe on Trent has medium- low Green Belt importance. The emerging Neighbourhood Plan also seeks to spread the housing distribution around the settlement and this approach would not appear to materially conflict with the purposes of Green Belt as set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>On behalf of Larkfleet Homes, we support only the merits off the Council's Stage 1 Strategic Level Review which has generated outcomes consistent with the earlier and respected Tribal Assessment which informed options for growth including Green Belt release within Greater Nottingham including Rushcliffe Borough. We particularly support Green Belt release to the south east of Radcliffe-on-Trent as the area with the lowest Green Belt sensitivity.</p> <p>However, we do not support the</p>		

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		detailed site level approach which is a more contrived approach and which interpretation and subsequent scoring by the Council contradicts the outcomes of the higher level appraisal.		
Robert Galij David Planning Director Barratt Homes	7	Clarification is sought over Green Belt Site Reference KEY 10 (Hillside Farm, Bunny Lane, Keyworth), as depicted on pages 70 and 152, and its association with SHLAA Reference 434. Notwithstanding the commentary in paragraph 4.142 on page 93, this parcel of land should be referenced 376 numerically, in line with previous SHLAAs, given it can be considered on its own (planning) merits and is capable of being developed on its own.	Agreed - Paragraph 4.142 should refer to KEY10 as SHLAA site 376.	Paragraph 4.142 amended: <i>"This parcel of Green Belt land is SHLAA site 376 and is located between Hillside Farm and Keyworth."</i>
Guy Longley Pegasus Planning obo several landowners	7	Further land should be released to the south of the existing strategic allocation east of Gamston/North of Tollerton. This would better reflect most appropriate and defensible	Decisions regarding allocating sites on the edge of other settlements will be made through the preferred options consultation. In order to inform these decisions the Green Belt Review has	Assessment of SHLAA sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton have been

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		boundaries in order to assist shortfalls in delivery.	assessed sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton. These settlements have been included in the review as they could support further development. The same methodology used for the assessment of sites on the edge the Key Settlements has been applied and this is compliant with NPPF Paragraphs 84 and 85.	included within the Green Belt Review
Tollerton Parish Council (Bill Banner)	7	It is vitally important that the green belt between Tollerton village and the strategic allocation North of Tollerton is defended and the parish council would welcome opportunities to work with the borough council to secure this. The parish council strongly supports the creation of “significant green infrastructure” on the southern part of the allocation site and “significant green buffer” between the allocation and the village. The parish council wish to see similar additional efforts being taken to secure the	The delivery of green infrastructure within the Gamston Strategic Allocation will be addressed through pre-application consultation by the applicant and the determination of the planning application. These will provide opportunities to discuss these issues with the Council. The creation of similar green infrastructure buffers on land between Tollerton and West Bridgford are not addressed through the Green Belt review, which focusses on whether land performs a valuable green belt function. The use of land	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		green belt to the west of the village to ensure no coalescence between West Bridgford and Tollerton and would welcome further proposals to strengthen this through similar significant green buffers as part of the green belt review.	within the Green Belt is addressed through the Local Plan Part 2 and is determined by national policy in the NPPF.	
Jennifer and Donald Anderson	7	Sites should be located closer to the village centre. We do NOT agree that land between Platt Lane and Station Road should be "demoted" to Safeguarded status. Would not this make it more vulnerable to future development? It should stay as Green Belt.	Noted. Safeguarded land is set aside for development beyond the plan period to meet longer term needs. It enables the establishment of more permanent boundaries and reduces the need for continuous review of the Green Belt as plans are updated or replaced. Safeguarding does remove Green Belt protection and increase likelihood of development in the longer term. Decisions regarding safeguarding will be made through Local Plan Part 2. This will be informed by the Green Belt Review.	Not amended
Liam Toland Heaton Planning Obo	7	Land South of Selby Lane should be taken forward as an allocated site in Keyworth. However, if this is not the	DWS's promotion of Land South of Selby Lane is noted and evidence supporting its allocation or	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
David Wilson Homes		case, the site at the very least should be safeguarded land as it provides a more sustainable and accessible site than the 2 sites set out in the draft Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan.	safeguarding will be considered prior to publication of the LAPP Preferred Options. This will also be informed by the Green Belt review and other evidence, including landscape character appraisal. In accordance with the NPPF the most sustainable sites will be selected, these should be the least environmentally and Green Belt sensitive locations.	
Paul Stone, Signet Planning obo Aldergate Properties	7	It is considered that the Green Belt review is contradictory as that on one hand it says that the review should ensure that the boundary will not have to be altered at the end of the plan period, but on the other hand it states that if there is a demonstrated need for housing development to meet local need then a more comprehensive review will need to take place.	Part 2 of the Green Belt review provides evidence to support delivery of development targets as set out in the Adopted Core Strategy. The review is not contradictory; rather it reflects the current position regarding housing supply issues and the need for flexibility. It recognises that meeting local needs (or possible borough wide needs) within non-key settlements (other villages) may require removal of land from the Green Belt. Decisions regarding allocating sites on the edge of other settlements will be made	Assessment of SHLAA sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton have been included within the Green Belt Review

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>through the preferred options consultation. In order to inform these decisions the Green Belt Review has assessed sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton. These settlements have been included in the review as they could support further development. The same methodology used for the assessment of sites on the edge the Key Settlements has been applied and this is compliant with NPPF Paragraphs 84 and 85.</p>	
<p>Paul Stone, Signet Planning obo Aldergate Properties</p>	<p>7</p>	<p>Using the Green Belt methodology and assessing our client's site at Closes Side Lane, East Bridgford, it is considered that the site would be of low importance to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. Full appraisal against the 5 purposes provided in the full response.</p>	<p>Aldergate properties promotion of Closes Side Lane is noted and evidence supporting its allocation will be considered prior to publication of the LAPP Preferred Options. Decisions regarding allocating sites on the edge of other settlements will be made through the preferred options consultation. In order to inform these decisions the Green Belt Review has assessed sites on the edge of East</p>	<p>Assessments of SHLAA sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton have been included within the Revised Green Belt Review for reasons contained within Local Plan Part 2 Further Options consultation</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton. These settlements have been included in the review as they could support further development. The same methodology used for the assessment of sites on the edge the Key Settlements has been applied and this is compliant with NPPF Paragraphs 84 and 85.	documents relating to those settlements..
East Leake Parish Council	7	East Leake Parish Council considers that loss of Green Belt should be replaced by compensatory Green Belt. Rushcliffe needs to maintain a 5 year housing land supply therefore some safeguarded land around key settlements should be identified.	Disagree - the addition of further Green Belt land can only occur in exceptional circumstances. The land must deliver Green Belt purposes and cannot be designated purely on the basis that it replaces removed Green Belt elsewhere. Strategic review undertaken to inform the Core Strategy concluded that there was no justification to add additional land to the Green Belt and it is considered that this is still the case.	Not amended
Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council	7	Agree with the analysis for the directions for growth. Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council does not	Note RoT PC's recommendation that development is spread around the settlement, including within the South	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>promote any specific development sites and recommends that the new housing development should be spread around the village.</p> <p>RPC agrees with the Draft Neighbourhood Plan that, in all cases, development sites should directly adjoin the current settlement edge, with sites bounded on two or more sides by existing built form being considered the most appropriate.</p> <p>While the Neighbourhood Plan further states that the new housing should reflect a broad locational strategy of 60% (approximately 240 dwellings) to the North East strategic area, 30% (approximately 120 dwellings) to the West strategic area, and 10% (approximately 40 dwellings) to the South East strategic area, RPC does not agree with there being no development in the South East</p>	<p>East Strategic Area. This will be taken into account when identifying sites through the LAPP.</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		strategic area.		
Bob Woollard PDG Obo Mosaic Estates	7	Additional evidence provided in support of RAD1. Includes reference to Inspector's report on the 2006 Non Statutory Plan and planning officer's report on application for the site.	Additional evidence considered in response to representation by Mosaic on question 7 (see above)	See response to Mosaic's representation on Question 7.
John Church Planning obo Mr Mourtzis	7	<p>Do not support the Green Belt Inset boundaries recommended by the draft Rushcliffe Green Belt Review (Part 2b) for Bunny.</p> <p>Previously-submitted representations have evidenced the early availability of the clients land at Loughborough Road, Bunny wherein it is considered that a new housing development should be permitted by means of an adjustment to the inset that is proposed in respect of Bunny. It is an expectation of Green Belt boundaries that they should follow easily recognisable, defensible boundaries and it is submitted that the boundary at the southern end of Bunny should</p>	<p>Decisions regarding allocating sites on the edge of other settlements will be made through the preferred options consultation. In order to inform these decisions the Green Belt Review has assessed sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton. These settlements have been included in the review as they could support further development. The same methodology used for the assessment of sites on the edge the Key Settlements has been applied and this is compliant with NPPF Paragraphs 84 and 85. Due to the limited services and facilities, housing sites will not be allocated in Bunny.</p>	<p>Assessments of SHLAA sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton have been included within the Revised Green Belt Review for reasons contained within Local Plan Part 2 Further Options consultation documents relating to those settlements..</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>be extended to include the land shown on the attached plan up to the junction between Loughborough Road (A60) and the minor road that leads in an easterly direction towards Wysall.</p> <p>The very tightly drawn Inset boundary for Bunny will facilitate the development of only very small areas of land.</p>		
Oxalis Planning obo John Wells	7	<p>West of Sharphill. This area was previously considered by the Council at the Core Strategy but not pursued at the time principally because it was considered not to be required to meet development needs. Circumstances have now changed and the Council should now allocate the site for development and remove the land from the Green Belt. This area of land had a very low score in the Council's Strategic Green Belt Assessment, acknowledging that the area does not</p>	<p>The Green Belt Review Part 2b does not examine sites adjacent to the main urban area. These areas were assessed within Part 1 of the Green Belt Review which informed strategic site selection. The area west of Sharphill was determined to be of low-medium Green Belt importance within Part 1. Decisions regarding allocating additional sites on the edge of the main urban area will be made prior to publication of the preferred options. The methodology is compliant with</p>	Not amended.

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>perform a strong Green Belt function. An area of about 30 acres of land is considered appropriate for development. This land sits low in the landscape and would relate well to existing development. The remaining land in this area, much of which is prominent higher ground, could be given over as community open space, adding to the existing space to be provided by the Edwalton scheme and providing a comprehensive approach to the land in this area around Sharphill Wood.</p>	<p>NPPF Paragraphs 84 and 85.</p>	
<p>Ken Mafham associates obo Gotham Parish Council</p>	<p>7</p>	<p>If land is safeguarded this pre-empts the review of and decisions on future land allocations in any review of the Local Plan</p>	<p>Whilst the removal of land from the Green Belt and safeguarding does pre-empt future reviews beyond the plan period, it provides certainty and establishes more permanent Green Belt boundaries (as required by the NPPF). Safeguarding land will only be developed when required to deliver development targets as set out in the reviewed/updated development plan.</p>	<p>Not amended</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Mr J Potter	7	Object and disagree with the need and justification to allocate sites in the Green Belt for housing around Ruddington	Objection noted. The adopted Core Strategy identifies a housing target of 250 new homes. The delivery of these homes requires Green Belt release.	Not amended
DPDS obo Wickmere Ltd	7	Should the site not be allocated, we invite the Council to consider the merits of “safeguarding” the land at COT4 for longer term development.	Decisions regarding allocating safeguarded land will be made prior to publication of the preferred options. As with allocated sites, the methodology for selecting safeguarded land will comply with NPPF paragraphs 84 and 85.	Not amended
CPRE	7	We would like to have a dialogue with Rushcliffe Borough Council about the review of Green Belt boundaries.	Opportunities to discuss GB boundaries will be provided during consultation on the preferred options and publication draft.	Not amended
Natural England	7	Although we recognise that the green belt designation is not made for the purpose of natural environment protection as such, we would nevertheless suggest that there is potential for it to deliver more positive benefits for the natural environment and people’s enjoyment of it and to play a role in climate change	The Green Belt review is restricted to the assessment of its performance against Green Belt purposes. The value of Green Belt designation to the positive protection of the natural environment and climate change adaptation will be considered as these issues are addressed within the LAPP, proposals map and supporting	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>adaptation.</p> <p>We would like the study to consider any opportunities that could be taken for the green belt to link into green infrastructure and ecological networks both within the urban areas and with the open countryside and that wherever possible that the land should be used for positive purposes.</p>	Sustainability Appraisal.	
Radcliffe on Trent Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee	7	<p>The RNPSC 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.</p> <p>The RNPSC agrees with the four broad strategic areas of North East, South East, South West and West for</p>	<p>Support for broad strategic areas, assessment of RAD2, RAD3, RAD 4, RAD5 and RAD7 welcomed.</p> <p>The existing Green Belt boundary follows the A52 and rear of properties at Harlequin. It is agreed that whilst Cropwell Road is in the Green Belt, the recognised southern edge of Radcliffe includes properties on Cropwell Road. Given the location adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site, Golf Course and significant tree belt, development of RAD9 is not considered infill</p>	The following words removed from justification of preventing sprawl score for RAD9: <i>"As the site is disconnected from Radcliffe's recognised urban edge..."</i>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>the Green Belt Review around Radcliffe on Trent and comments on each of them as follows:</p> <p>North East: Agree that developments along the A52 could reduce the Green Belt between Radcliffe on Trent and Bingham, especially RAD 4, part of RAD 5 and RAD 7. Agree that development of RAD 2 and RAD 3 would “round off” the village boundary without coalescence to adjacent settlements of Shelford and Newton.</p> <p>South East: Agree that this area prevents the merging of Radcliffe on Trent with Upper Saxondale and Cropwell Butler, and that Dewberry Hill Local Wildlife Site and Radcliffe on Trent Golf Club contain development to the south. The RNPSC does however, have a concern about the words “disconnected from Radcliffe’s</p>	<p>development.</p> <p>Positive comments regarding RAD1 noted.</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>recognised urban edge” and suggests that another form of words is used such as “the area is currently washed over by the green belt and should remain so.” That said, the RNPSC believes that a case can be made for RAD 9 to be considered as “infill development”.</p> <p>South West: Agreed that this area is open in character, containing large open fields which do not provide robust defensible boundaries, and if this land was developed it would result in a perception of urban sprawl.</p> <p>West: Agreed that development of land to the west of the former railway line to Cotgrave would significantly reduce the distance between the small green belt settlement of Holme Pierrepont and Radcliffe on Trent and is therefore not supported. However, land to the north of the Nottingham Road and east of the former railway</p>		

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		line to Cotgrave is directly adjacent to the urban edge of Radcliffe, is enclosed by the railway embankment and already contains significant elements of development such as power lines, RSPCA animal shelter, and development is supported		
Cllr Nigel Lawrence	7	Land between the new A46 and the Fosse Way (old A46) in the parish of East Bridgford is removed from the Green Belt. The arguments for this will be the subject of a separate communication.	The outer boundary of the Green Belt does not form part of the Green Belt Review. Exceptional circumstances have not been established.	Not amended
Brian Bush	7	All the Villages in Rushcliffe should have their share of new developments. Places like Bunny, Bradmore, Cropwell Bishop and Butler, West Leake, Langar, even smaller villages like Clipston, Owthorpe, Shelford etc. could have small developments say 40/50 houses. Could the parachuting at Langar be transferred to Tollerton Airfield and then Langar be used for	Decisions regarding allocating sites on the edge of other settlements will be made through the preferred options consultation. In order to inform these decisions the Green Belt Review has assessed sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton. These settlements have been included in the review as they could support further development. The same methodology used for the	Assessments of SHLAA sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton have been included within the Revised Green Belt Review for reasons contained within Local Plan Part 2 Further Options consultation

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		Housing? Or could the spare land surrounding these Airfields be used for development? Larger towns Bingham, Cotgrave, Radcliffe on Trent, Keyworth, Ruddington, and East Leake should now only have infilling and brown field sites.	assessment of sites on the edge the Key Settlements has been applied and this is compliant with NPPF Paragraphs 84 and 85. The Issues and Options Consultation on the LAPP includes Question 25 on the future of Langar Airfield. Responses will inform allocations on these sites. Restricting development within the Key-Settlements to infilling and brownfield sites would not comply with the Core Strategy which requires the development of greenfield land to meet housing targets (Bingham and East Leake already have sufficient greenfield sites allocated and/or permitted).	documents relating to those settlements..
Mrs A Toombs	7	Concerned that suitable housing for the less well-off is not the main consideration.	Comment is not pertinent to Green Belt review which assesses Green Belt performance against purposes, not the homes that may or may not be built upon the sites. These issues have been addressed within the Core Strategy and further policies will be	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			contained in the LAPP.	
T Gashe obo Mr and Mrs Ryland	7	<p>The definition of the green belt boundary following the identification of the strategic housing site is flawed and fails to follow guidance on the proper identification of green belt boundaries. This is especially the case with respect to the boundary around the settlement of Tollerton. The proposed strategic allocation is not sustainable and there will inevitably be pressure to adjust the development area in the near future. The proposed green belt boundary will then need to be adjusted. It would be most sensible to define a long term appropriate boundary which is truly defensible. The attached paper indicates the line of a more sensible long term boundary.</p>	<p>The Strategic Allocation East of Gamston North of Tollerton was established through the Core Strategy. It is not the intention or purpose of the LAPP, informed by Part 2 of the Green Belt review, to amend the Green Belt boundaries around strategic allocations.</p>	
Charles Pleasants	7	<p>It is a relief to hear that the existing envelope of Upper Saxondale village is now settled and will preclude any further building on the fringes of this</p>	<p>Supporting comments on the review's suggested Green Belt boundary for Upper Saxondale is noted and welcomed.</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>area, thereby maintaining the rural aspect. The process of development in the 1990s was intrusive and took a long time, disrupting life for existing householders, but at least when completed stayed within the boundaries of the original Saxondale Hospital. To add other development and to allow other building on or beyond those boundaries would spoil the character of the settlement and threaten the Green Belt so your review is welcome in its understanding of the residential nature of the area and its place in the countryside.</p>		
Karen Greenaway	7	<p>I am writing to object to the consideration of building upon RUD8 Land west of Pasture Lane. As a nearby resident the existing roundabout at the end of pasture lane cannot cope with the existing traffic let alone the footfall that would be created by building on RUD8 land.</p>	<p>Comments focus on highways impacts and do not address the Green Belt performance of RUD8s. Comments will be taken into consideration as part of site selection through LAPP.</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>This option would create further chaos on Clifton Lane which is also crammed with traffic all day every day and particularly at rush hour. I will continue to oppose any building on this land as it creates a number of problems: traffic congestion, health and safety issues for the children accessing local schools, further parking issues and a level of traffic on the road that also adds extra maintenance costs.</p>		
Mr Hubbard obo Mr T Dickens	7	We have no further comments to make.	Noted	Not amended
Nicole Penfold. Gladman	1 and 2	<p>Would recommend that when creating new insets, in accordance with paragraphs 85 and 86 of the NPPF, the boundaries should be drawn to enable some sustainable growth.</p>	<p>Decisions regarding allocating sites on the edge of other settlements will be made through the preferred options consultation. In order to inform these decisions the Green Belt Review has assessed sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton. These settlements have been included in the review as they could support further development.</p>	<p>Assessments of SHLAA sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton have been included within the Revised Green Belt Review for reasons contained within Local Plan Part 2 Further</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			The same methodology used for the assessment of sites on the edge the Key Settlements has been applied and this is compliant with NPPF Paragraphs 84 and 85.	Options consultation documents relating to those settlements..
Tom Beavin JVH Planning obo Southwell and Nottinghamshire Diocese	1-6	Disagree with all questions asked.	Disagreement noted - responses provided to representations on Question 6.	Not amended
Ben Glover Savills	1-6	Agree with reviews and methodologies	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended
Charles Pleasants	1-6	Support	Support noted and welcomed	Not amended
Emma Marksman obo B Wragg	1-7	Support methodology and boundary for Upper Saxondale	Support noted and welcomed	Not amended
Nicky Mellows	1-7	Support methodology and boundary for Upper Saxondale	Support noted and welcomed	Not amended
Radcliffe on Trent Neighbourhood	2 and 5.	The RNPSC agrees that Radcliffe shall remain “inset” from the green belt and that to accommodate the	Support noted and welcomed	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Plan Steering Committee		new housing, the existing green belt boundary (which is drawn tightly around Radcliffe), will need to be significantly changed. It also agrees with the proposed new “inset” boundary for Upper Saxondale to allow for suitable infill development.		
Nicole Penfold. Gladman	3 and 4	The Green Belt review only suggests minor amendments for key settlements and does not suggest any areas to release from the Green Belt to allow for sustainable development.	Section 4 examines the Green Belt performance of land around key settlements; this will inform any release for development. Decisions regarding allocating sites on the edge of other settlements will be made through the preferred options consultation. In order to inform these decisions the Green Belt Review has assessed sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton. These settlements have been included in the review as they could support further development. The same methodology used for the assessment of sites on the edge the Key Settlements has been applied and this is compliant with	Assessments of SHLAA sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton have been included within the Revised Green Belt Review for reasons contained within Local Plan Part 2 Further Options consultation documents relating to those settlements..

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			NPPF Paragraphs 84 and 85.	
Gaynor Cottee	3-7	Agree	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended
Dr C Davenport chair of Cropwell Bishop Parish Council	3-7	Agree	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended
Nicole Penfold. Gladman	5 and 6	Do not consider that the detailed review of green belt boundaries should be limited to key settlements and should have encompassed other villages too, as several of these are of a size and with a range of services to accommodate some development. Gladman also believes that a full strategic review should have been undertaken in order to allow for a comparison of sites across the Borough and the wider HMA.	Decisions regarding allocating sites on the edge of other settlements will be made through the preferred options consultation. In order to inform these decisions the Green Belt Review has assessed sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton. These settlements have been included in the review as they could support further development. The same methodology used for the assessment of sites on the edge the Key Settlements has been applied and this is compliant with NPPF Paragraphs 84 and 85. There is no requirement to undertake a full review of the Green Belt. The	Assessments of SHLAA sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton have been included within the Revised Green Belt Review for reasons contained within Local Plan Part 2 Further Options consultation documents relating to those settlements..

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>review is required to inform the selection of sites in accordance with the distribution of development in adopted Core Strategy, which directs development towards the main urban area, key settlements and strategic sites. The Core Strategy was informed by Part 1 and 2b of the Green Belt Review. A complete review, including land not required for development, is therefore not necessary.</p>	
Carter Jonas obo Crown Estate	5 and 6	<p>The Crown Estate supports the proposed Green Belt inset boundaries for Shelford as shown in Figure B7 of the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies – Issues and Options consultation document (page 95). The majority of Shelford's built form is located within the inset boundaries, with physical features being utilised as defensible boundaries. This complies with paragraph 85 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</p>	<p>Support for Shelford's inset boundary noted and welcomed</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>which sets out criteria for those Local Planning Authorities defining/amending Green Belt boundaries.</p>		
<p>Darren Abbott Freeths obo Saint Gobain</p>		<p>Core Strategy Policy 3 sets out the Council's housing requirements and a component of this, in the region of 1980 dwellings, is directed towards 'other villages' not otherwise listed in the settlement hierarchy. Gotham is considered to be a sustainable, larger village able to accommodate associated services and facilities such that it would be suitable for residential development that would valuably contribute towards the Council's housing supply in a rural location. The suggested amendments to draft inset boundary for Gotham to accommodate the clients four sites would not impact on the various roles of the Green Belt and such development would accord with NPPF requirements insofar that rural</p>	<p>Decisions regarding allocating sites on the edge of other settlements will be made through the preferred options consultation. In order to inform these decisions the Green Belt Review has assessed sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton. These settlements have been included in the review as they could support further development. The same methodology used for the assessment of sites on the edge the Key Settlements has been applied and this is compliant with NPPF Paragraphs 84 and 85.</p>	<p>Assessments of SHLAA sites on the edge of East Bridgford, Cropwell Bishop, Gotham and Tollerton have been included within the Revised Green Belt Review for reasons contained within Local Plan Part 2 Further Options consultation documents relating to those settlements..</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		communities and enterprises should be supported and their vitality enhanced or maintained.		
Robert Wilson		<p>Concerned about the integrity of the green belt extending 10 miles to the south of Nottingham, and consider that it should be reduced in this review to extend to 6 miles only. We are also concerned that whilst the methodology in the scoping document may provide a basis to assess sites, there appears to be some legal, moral or ethical issues needing to be addressed with the final scoring and justification, of the 'Key Sites', as they have been made acceptable to fit the selection process, whereas the same scoring has rendered other (possibly) smaller sites unsuitable for selection or development.</p> <p>Further, as the housing allocations in these 'Key' villages are a MINIMUM</p>	<p>The general extent of the Green Belt does not form part of this review. A reduction in the extent of the Green Belt would have significant sustainability implications and jeopardise compliance with the Core Strategy's development distribution. The sites selected for assessment were identified through the SHLAA as being currently constrained by the Green Belt but potentially suitable if policy changes. Sites within the Green Belt which are non-deliverable or developable (often isolated sites in the countryside which if removed would result in small inset areas within the Green Belt) were not assessed as they were unlikely to be developable in planning terms. SHLAA sites 363, 551 and 577 were therefore not assessed.</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>figure, many of the other unselected SHLAA sites should be inset, otherwise as per the 'Core Sites' the developers can ransom the Council, by delaying building for various reasons not least waiting for prices to rise. Having regard to all the points raised in this submission, and especially with the Local Plan not being reviewed again till at least 2028, and the green belt not being reviewed at that time, we feel it appropriate to put forward our property (SHLAA reference 363), with the possibility of other areas (SHLAA 551 / SHLAA 577) now for development.</p>		
<p>Helen Broadhurst obo Nicker Hill residents (Messrs Wells, Fahy, Needham,</p>		<p>It is acknowledged that in order to meet the on-going housing needs of Keyworth during the Local Plan period, land within the Green Belt will need to be released for residential development. Considering the importance attached to Green Belt, it</p>	<p>KEY4 has been split into two separate parcels of land (KEY4 and KEY16). This creates a more logical pair of sites based upon recognisable and logical parcels of Green Belt land. This will allow a comparison with other Keyworth sites within the review. Agree</p>	<p>Green Belt Review contains new site - KEY16 (KEY/E in final document) (Land north of Nicker Hill). KEY4 has been re-assessed and scored 11 (low-medium)</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Bond, Hill, Batchia, Tompkins, Hopkinson, Armour et al)		<p>is imperative that the revision of Green Belt boundaries around Keyworth is well considered and based upon a clear approach.</p> <p>Site Key B, forms an important break between Keyworth and the village of Stanton-on-the-Wolds, and the full development of Site Key B would lead to these neighbouring settlements merging into each other, in direct contravention with Green Belt policy.</p> <p>In addition, Paragraph 85 of the NPPF stresses that, in reviewing Green Belt boundaries, Local Planning Authorities should “define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.” The Site identified as Key B comprises open arable fields, with some blocks of conifer planting; however, the boundaries of the proposed allocation</p>	<p>that the removal and development of KEY16 would increase the merging of Keyworth with Stanton. It is located behind dwellings on Nicker Hill which already merges these settlements. This is reflected in the assessment of KEY16. KEY4 would round off the settlement between residential development on Nicker Hill and the BGS. However KEY16 would encroach. The scores are set out in the individual assessments of KEY4 and KEY16.</p>	<p>and KEY16 scored 15 (low-medium).</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>appear to have been drawn indiscriminately and without reference to any strong, recognizable or permanent features, which would provide any long term physical or visual barrier or enclosure to the proposed development of this Site.</p> <p>The development of Site Key B would encroach into the open countryside and would not form a logical 'rounding off' of the existing built form to Keyworth.</p>		
Andrew Butcher		Residents of Home Farm Lane are making representations to remove the paddocks comprising part of their land holding from the Green Belt. I outline the reasons this would not be in the interests of the remaining residents as it would significantly affect the openness of the Green belt as existing, the copse in front of Daintree Lodge, 61 Saxondale Drive adequately forms a natural boundary	Agreed in part. The Green Belt boundary to the rear of properties on Home Farm Lane will follow the access track to the rear of the properties' gardens. The paddock north of this track will remain in the Green Belt. The proposed boundary is robust and includes a line of tall prominent trees. The inclusion of the gardens provides greater permanence, avoiding the need to amend the boundary in the	Green Belt boundary behind Home Farm amended.

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>between the domestic gardens and the open countryside to the north east of the village. Removing this paddock area of land from the Green Belt would have no beneficial impact and could leave the area vulnerable to additional development in the future.</p>	<p>long term. It is considered however that the wider paddock area contributes to the openness of the Green Belt and should not form part of the inset</p>	
Ben Openshaw		<p>I am writing on behalf of, and at the request of, a number of the owners of properties on Home Farm Lane, Upper Saxondale (more specifically the owners at house numbers 7, 9 and 17). We have reviewed the proposals for our homes and would like to ask you to consider moving the green belt boundary so that instead of it running immediately adjacent to the back of each house, it would run along the perimeter of the modestly sized gardens attached to the rear of each of these properties. This would leave the paddocks, which are subject to a separate title deed to the gardens, remaining within the green</p>	<p>Agreed - The Green Belt boundary to the rear of the properties on Home Farm Lane will follow the access track to the rear of their gardens. The paddock north of this track will remain in the Green Belt. The proposed boundary is robust and includes a line of tall prominent trees. The inclusion of the gardens provides greater permanence, avoiding the need to amend the boundary in the long term.</p>	<p>Recommended inset boundary for Upper Saxondale behind Home Farm amended.</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		belt and the gardens, outside of the green belt. A number of photos have been submitted to support the case.		

Appendix B: Responses to Green Belt Review Local Plan Part 2 Further Options

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
East Bridgford Parish Council	1	<p>Scoring System</p> <p>In general, the criteria are appropriate but sites in very rural communities may need further recognition of a wider range of fundamental issues, for example the quality of farmland or examples of historical farming developments, such as ridge and furrow.</p> <p>PC feels that the descriptors of the score ranges, i.e. Low, Low/Medium, Medium/High and High are not helpful. However, if these words are needed at all, they should be restricted to Low, Medium and High only. The ranges suggested could be Low 7-10, with Medium 11-15, and High 16-20+, since a rural community site would be comparatively unlikely to score greater than 20 with the criteria defined as they are.</p>	<p>Agree - The presence of ridge and furrow will inform the assessment of the Green Belts performance against the forth purpose (preserving the setting and special character of historic settlement). They are a non-designated heritage asset which would, if developed, be completely lost. This loss warrants a score of 3 (see amendments to assessment of GOT7). A separate assessment approach for rural villages within Part 2b of the Green Belt Review would result in an overly complex Green Belt assessment. Whilst it is accepted that within the rural villages, issues such as merging are less critical (due to greater distances from the main urban area) and each other, other factors such as preserving open countryside and heritage are likely to be of greater importance.</p> <p>Scoring system is consistent with</p>	<p>Yes – score against third purpose increased to 3 where Green Belt prevents the loss of ridge and furrow.</p> <p>Text reads <i>“The Green Belt designation prevents the loss of ridge and furrow. Ridge and furrow contributes to the historic agricultural setting of the village.”</i></p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>Sites around East Bridgford It is disappointing that the sites selected for consideration are those on which the owners have indicated that they wish to seek planning permission for development. This leads to a random approach which is unlikely to lead to the best outcomes. A planning-based approach, for example identifying a specific site or sites which might match local and regional needs e.g. a development of affordable, integrated housing shielded by a tree belt etc. might have been preferable.</p>	<p>previous review. The approach ensures a fair comparison of sites and determination of a sites importance to Nottingham/Derby Green Belt. As the Green Belt review's purpose is to inform site selection (as well as identify settlement boundaries and minor amendments), it should only review sites that are being promoted by landowners as they are available for development under the SHLAA process, where land that is not being promoted for development is not. The further options stage includes all the potential sites and therefore can appear random. Informed by the Green Belt review, housing needs and other evidence, the site selection process ensures a planning based approach is applied.</p>	
Andrew Kordecki	1	<p>Green Belt should be retained. Villages and towns are moving closer. Development should be away from Newton and Bingham and better</p>	<p>Merging with Newton and Bingham is considered within the individual assessment of sites south and east of East Bridgford.</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		suited along the ridge along the Kneeton Road		
Sheila Brunt	1	EBR6 and 8 are "infill" and therefore not Green Belt	EBR6 (EAS4 in the draft review) and 8 (EAS5 in the draft review) are within the Green Belt. The boundary was last reviewed in 1996. 'Infill' would reflect the site's physical location between developments, not its planning status as Green Belt.	Not amended
Councillor Lawrence (East Bridgford Ward)	1	Piecemeal fashion creates a risk that the settlements of East Bridgford, Newton and Bingham might coalesce. Once current plans are complete Newton and Bingham will meet across the A46, and be connected by a footbridge. East Bridgford and the main settlement of Newton are currently no more than 1.1 Kilometres apart via Brunts Lane EB and FP in Newton.	Merging with Newton and Bingham is considered within the assessment of sites south and east of East Bridgford and scored accordingly.	Not amended
Richard Grimes	1	Facilities are stretched to the limit - cannot accommodate an increase in demand. Roads cannot accommodate additional traffic.	The capacity of services, facilities and infrastructure (including roads) are considered through the site selection process, not within the Green Belt	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>Closes Side Lane (EAS4) - Checking sprawl should be 4 not 3 as there are no defensible boundaries as far as the A46 which is the first natural defence.</p> <p>Preserving setting and special character should be 5 due to close proximity to both Mulberry Court (Grade 2 listed) and Fosse Court (building of local interest).</p> <p>Planning condition for affordable housing contained a condition that no housing development should take place on adjacent green fields.</p>	<p>Review.</p> <p>Disagree with proposed increase in score for checking sprawl. The weak boundary is recognised within the assessment. However by itself, it does not warrant a higher score, given the containment of the land and possibility of rounding off the settlement boundary between Fosters Close and Closes Side Lane.</p> <p>The decision notice for the development of the affordable units under planning reference 06/02127/FUL does not contain any conditions relating to surrounding land. The setting of Mulberry Court and Fosse Court will not be adversely affected as more modern 20 Century properties separate EAS4 from these heritage assets. Impact on the setting of Conservation Area and views out of it is recognised in the review.</p>	
Dr John Rieley	1	Disagrees with the review of the additional Green Belt sites around	The requirement to develop Green Belt land on the edge of East Bridgford will	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>East Bridgford because this is not supported by the village plan and design statement. A recent survey of residents during the preparation of the new East Bridgford Community Plan showed overwhelming support to maintain the existing Green Belt. It also showed little support for any housing in the Green Belt except affordable housing that must be justified and only in small numbers.</p>	<p>be examined and confirmed through the Local Plan and examination process. Resident's concerns regarding the principle of developing Green Belt will be addressed through this process. Representation does not address specific Green Belt purposes.</p>	
Taylor Wimpey	1	<p>EAS1: Green Belt importance should be reduced as impact on heritage can be mitigated. It directly adjoins the settlement and Manor Business Park forms a second boundary. Openness of the Green Belt together with the five purposes set out at paragraph 80 of the NPPF would not be wholly compromised by development of the sites. Doesn't merge unlike to the south. River Trent is a natural barrier.</p>	<p>Mitigation of impacts are not considered within the review as the assessment must focus on the performance of the land in its current form against Green Belt purposes. The land provides an open agricultural setting for the Conservation Area, Manor and Manor Lodge and the historic rural setting of the village itself. The consideration of mitigation would complicate the review and prevent a fair comparison of sites. The location of EAS1 between the</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>Manor and Manor Industrial Estate is recognised and results in a reduction of 1 when considering checking sprawl. Due to the sites scale and location on the escarpment above the River Trent it still however scores 4.</p> <p>The presence of the River Trent is reflected in the minimum score for preventing merging.</p>	
Michael Verner	1	<p>Disagree with the review of the additional Green Belt sites in key villages around Rushcliffe.</p> <p>Without significant upgrade of the main infrastructure including roads and schools etc... the smaller villages in the area cannot sustain a major increase in population.</p>	<p>Representation does not address specific Green Belt purposes.</p> <p>Infrastructure issues will be considered at part of site selection and informed through the Sustainability Appraisal.</p>	Not amended
Iba planning - Nick Baseley	1	<p>In addition to suggested minor amendments, the remove land off Walnut Tree Court as requested.</p>	<p>EAS1 (EBR3) - welcome agreement.</p> <p>EAS2 (EBR4) - comments on sprawl and encroachment are reflected in the second highest score against the first purpose and a maximum score against the third purpose.</p> <p>EAS3 (EBR5) - rural character is</p>	<p>Yes – Following assessment of the property in question, the green belt review recommends that a minor amendment to the inset boundary around 18</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>recognised in a high score of 4 against the third purpose.</p> <p>EAS7 (EBR2) importance to the setting of East Bridgford is recognised in a maximum score against the forth purpose.</p> <p>Walnut Tree Court has been revisited. It is agreed that the Green Belt boundary should be amended at 18 Walnut Tree Lane to incorporate the garden and establish a more recognisable and permanent Green Belt boundary.</p>	Walnut Tree Lane should be made.
Susan Page	1	<p>Methodology is flawed in a number of respects:</p> <p>(a) Greenbelt legislation was developed for the purposes of preventing urban sprawl around major conurbations. It was never intended to be applied to rural village settlements.</p> <p>(b) You have come up with a scoring system that extends the concept of greenbelt assessment to rural</p>	<p>(a) Disagree - The Green Belt includes settlements inset within it and purposes apply equally to land surrounding these settlements as they do to land on the edge of Nottingham.</p> <p>(b) The methodology was consulted upon in 2016 as part of the Green Belt Review of the Key Settlements. It also broadly reflects Part 1 and 2a of the Green Belt review which informed the selection of strategic sites. The general</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>settlements. This is an artificial system and does not appear to have been the subject of any external evaluation or appraisal.</p> <p>(c) The scoring system has inconsistencies. The assessment matrix does not use categories 2 and 4 . But these are then used (i.e. scores 2 and 4) in the matrix evaluation tables for land parcel assessment. I cannot find any justification for the use of these matrix scores. The scoring system is highly subjective and qualitative and seems not to take account of existing assessments or plans (e.g. the 2004 East Bridgford Parish Plan, the Village Design Statement, or to the current village community plan (which is in development)). Resident's views are overwhelming against any further development UNLESS it is affordable housing on a very small scale that meets the needs of current village residents.</p>	<p>approach to undertaking a Green Belt assessment supported allocations within the Core Strategy which was found sound at examination.</p> <p>(c) Scores 2 and 4 are applied where performance against a purpose does not sit comfortably within 1, 3 and 5. This is made clear below Assessment Matrix.</p> <p>(d) The Review is undertaken in isolation and cannot consider other plans or strategies, or local resident's views (unless they comment on Green Belt purposes). These are considered through the site selection process.</p> <p>(d) / (e) The Green Belt Review does not consider wildlife value, ecosystem services or amenity. These are matters that will be considered during site selection and informed through the Sustainability Appraisal. PPG9 has been replaced by the NPPF. Selection must comply with the NPPF.</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>(d) There is no account taken of the wildlife/biodiversity value of land in the assessment. This is in contradiction to planning guidance (PP9) and RBC's nature conservation strategy.</p> <p>(e) No account is taken of ecosystem services including amenity values. This would seem to also be in opposition to RBC & national planning guidance.</p>		
East Bridgford Community Plan	1	There is a strong desire to keep East Bridgford as it is and a two thirds majority oppose more development, particularly within the Green Belt.	The principle of removing land from the green belt to enable development on the edge of East Bridgford will be examined and confirmed through Local Plan Part 2 and its examination. Although resident's views are important the planning system does not make decisions based purely on the level of support or not for development. Resident's concerns regarding the principle of developing Green Belt will be considered through the plan making process should any	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			allocations of land be proposed	
Russell Tor	1	Current extent of the GB provides characteristic open feature of Tollerton distinguishing it from the suburbs of Nottingham thus preserving its status as a rural village. Significant merging issue.	Noted - As the prevention of merging and sprawl is a Green Belt purpose, it is considered within the Green Belt review. This is particularly reflected in the high scores for TOL1 and TOL2.	Not amended
P Cooper	1	TOL4 - hedge will not form a northern defensible boundary.	The weak hedgerow boundary is recognised in the review of TOL4 and results in a higher score against the first Green Belt purpose (checking sprawl). A stronger more robust boundary would have resulted in a lower score than 3.	Not amended
Ryland c/o Ferax Planning	1	The assessment of potential sites fails to provide a balanced assessment of the suitability, sustainability and deliverability of each site. Check unrestricted sprawl. Planned development should not result in “unrestricted sprawl”, as that is the point of the “Plan-led approach” to planning. Following allocation, sites of	The Green Belt review requires a degree of planning judgement. It does not consider suitability, sustainability and deliverability of each site. These issues are considered during the site selection process. Check unrestricted sprawl: Master-planning of sites may mitigate/prevent sprawl, however the Green Belt assessment can only consider the performance of land in its	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>appropriate scale can be “master-planned” to provide good, landscaped, defensible and permanent boundaries and thereby avoid any tendency towards “sprawl”.</p> <p>Merging of settlements. The merging of settlements is assessed on the basis of the extent to which any potential site “closes the gap” to existing allocated sites. As indicated above, properly planned development will ensure, through “master-planning” that settlements do not merge and that defensible and sustainable gaps are maintained between them. In the case of the northern part of TOL2 (TOL1 within review), there are good defensible boundaries to the north (Little Lane), and the northern part of the west boundary adjoins Jubilee Wood. The gap to the Gamston/Tollerton strategic allocation, although reduced in part, would be effectively protected by the TOL1 site as an allocation.</p>	<p>current form. The site selection process (plan-led approach) and any design requirements will determine whether a site should be allocated and what mitigation is required. Merging of settlements: Disagree. The allocation of TOL1 would significantly reduce the physical distance between the village and the strategic allocation and increase the perception that Tollerton and the strategic allocation to the north are merging. In effect joining Tollerton to Nottingham. Safeguarding countryside: Disagree. The assessment of impacts on heritage assets is pertinent to Rushcliffe. Whilst Rushcliffe does not contain any world heritage sites, the NPPF makes no distinction between the treatment of the setting of York or Chester and the setting of settlements of Rushcliffe. The preserving the historic setting of towns (settlements) is a Green Belt purpose. Assisting urban regeneration: Disagree. As the</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>Safeguarding the Countryside. It is essential to avoid a two-dimensional approach to consideration of development of countryside. Analysis based on a plan is frequently flawed. Just because a site appears to have development along two or three of its sides does not make it any less important as countryside than land which has development only along one side. Indeed to the people who live there such a parcel of land may be extremely important. It is often more important than a site which may only adjoin existing development on one side. All new development, apart from where previously developed land is used, is likely to involve a loss of countryside.</p> <p>The setting and special character of historic settlements. Some green belts were designated specifically to protect the setting of towns such as Chester, York, Oxford and Bath. The purpose was not intended as a</p>	<p>promotion of urban regeneration is a universal purpose across all the Green Belt, all sites are scored 3. Whilst there are no urban regeneration projects in Tollerton, there remains a need to direct development to urban areas where opportunities arise. Disagree with significant removal of land between the main urban area and Polser Brook as it is contrary to the Core Strategy's distribution of development. It would merge Tollerton with the main urban area.</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>mechanism for protecting listed buildings in villages which are not even defined as conservation areas. Well-designed and properly planned new development will help to protect and enhance the older core of villages such as Tollerton, and nearby designated historic Park and Garden, and help the whole village to become a better integrated settlement.</p> <p>Assist in urban regeneration. This purpose is intended to seek to prevent unnecessary development in the green belt so as to direct investment into urban areas where regeneration is needed. When development in the green belt becomes necessary, then this purpose can have no application. It is irrelevant that there are no urban regeneration projects in Tollerton.</p> <p>Re-iterated representation on Core Strategy - Further proposals for housing development & GB Review - proposes Polser Brook as</p>		

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		GB boundary. This runs north south and is east of Tollerton and the Airport.		
Martin Judson	1	<p>I disagree with the score for area TOL 3 as low/medium</p> <p>Preventing merging of settlements The scoring of TOL3 is inconsistent with TOL1 and TOL 2. There is no evidence that the removal of TOL1 would require the release of TOL2 land also which appears to be the reason for scoring these two so highly.</p> <p>TOL1 and 2 should not be scored so disproportionately high compared to TOL3, in fact they should be given the same scores given your somewhat odd criteria about merging with settlements some distance away.</p> <p>Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment Yes there was inappropriate development near the TOL 3 site - you are not building on that area, you</p>	<p>TOL1 would not be removed in isolation as it would result in an outlying area of land inset from the Green Belt. Its removal would weaken the remaining area of Green Belt between this new inset and Tollerton (TOL2) and most likely resulting in its future removal from the Green Belt. To ensure longer term permanence, TOL2 would be released prior to TOL1.</p> <p>Disagree that TOL1, TOL2 and TOL3 should be given the same score against merging. TOL3 extends a limited distance east (no further than existing properties on Tollerton Lane), whereas TOL1 and TOL2 extend to Little Lane, beyond which the strategic allocation (the edge of the main urban area) is separated by one field.</p> <p>Agreed that the affordable housing adjacent to TOL3 cannot be</p>	<p>Assessment of TOL3 against safeguarding countryside amended as follows:</p> <p><i>“Affordable housing was granted permission under rural exceptions policy. Whilst very special circumstances were proven, residential development is inappropriate development and constitutes encroachment. Whilst affordable housing (inappropriate development) was permitted within the same field, these are not within the site that has been</i></p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>are building either side so you cannot include the inappropriate building which you approved despite significant resistance in 2008. The area and site is clearly open countryside and development here would clearly be a significant encroachment and destroy the character of this area of the village. The affordable housing was supposed to be an exception, not a Trojan horse to allow the complete development of this area and a reason to score the area under consideration lower than would otherwise have been the case. There is footpath into the open countryside which would need to continue to go through any development. The score should be a 5. You cannot include inappropriate development when it is not in the area under consideration.</p> <p>Preserving the setting and special character of historic towns</p>	<p>considered when determining whether the land has prevented encroachment. Score increased to 4. Reference to inappropriate housing within the site is removed.</p> <p>Disagree that TOL1 and TOL2 should have the same as TOL3. TOL1 and TOL2 provide the setting to 'old Tollerton' which contains listed buildings, buildings of local interest and although not a conservation area comprises an area of valued historic character. Merging old and more modern Tollerton would significantly affect the setting of both areas. TOL3 is adjacent to the more modern area of Tollerton and is not adjacent to any areas of significant historic merit. They cannot be scored the same.</p>	<p><i>assessed.</i>"</p> <p>Score has been increased from 3 to 4 against the third purpose. Total score increased to 13 (low/medium).</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>Once again TOL1 and 2 have been over scored - separating old and new areas of the town is not a reason for such a high score. The criteria are not being applied correctly to TOL1 and 2. Adjacency to the 'historic core' of Tollerton is not relevant - you cannot apply a score of 4 for these sites, they should be a 1 as per TOL3. You must show consistency when scoring as the selection will be about the relative merits of the sites selected.</p>		
Langridge Homes Ltd c/o Geoffrey Prince	1	Repeated representation, including scoring of COT3 against purposes, on Issues and Options (see rep).	See response to previous representations.	Not amended
Havenwood Construction c/o Brown Jacobson	1	<p>We disagree. We believe that the most sustainable development opportunities not yet allocated and yet which can deliver development in the early years of the plan are those around Gamston and Holme Pierrepont. The case we made to the previous</p>	See responses to previous representations.	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>Local Plan Inquiry remains as strong as before and if the Green Belt had been rolled back at that stage, as it ought to have been done, there would now be houses being delivered on land within the proposed Green Belt roll back.</p> <p>We do not intend at this stage to update the representations previously made but resubmit these and they also address issues in the Part II Sites consultation which you are undertaking.</p> <p>Therefore this representation and, that for the sites and our previous representations (on the GB Review Part 1 and Part 2a) should be read as a whole as our clients response to the Review.</p>		
Parker Strategic Land Ltd	1	Have no comments to make on the Green Belt Review of the additional sites. However, comments on sites COT10 and COT11 (now COT8 and COT7) of the previous January 2016	See response to representation on previous consultations.	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		Part 2(b) Review have been re-iterated.		
Wickmere Nottingham Ltd c/o DPDS	1	Re-iterate that the assessment criteria are flawed. Specifically the assessment on historic town. The Canal is not a designated heritage asset and has no special relationship to the setting or character of an historic town. Cotgrave is not a historic town - no Conservation Area and limited number of listed buildings. Council concerns relate more to recreational enjoyment which can be addressed through careful master-planning. Development provides an opportunity as S106 monies could assist restoration. Score should be 1 not 3. Site therefore of low GB importance.	See response to representation on previous consultation. Score for Green Belt preservation of historic setting (i.e. Canal) has been reduced from 3 to 2 as it is a non-designated heritage asset.	Green Belt Review amended (see response to comments on January 2016 review and amendment)
Ball, S	1	TOL1 has been identified as having the highest importance to the Green Belt of all sites considered. I agree with this. However, the score for "Preserve setting and special	Whilst TOL1 is adjacent to the historic core, the 'old village' is not designated a Conservation Area (unlike RUD12) and as indicated by the Heritage Assessment the setting of the listed	Additional text added <i><u>"Although the listed buildings are separated from TOL1 by Tollerton Lane and screened by</u></i>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>character of historic settlement” should be 5 since there are 6 listed buildings, including the Grade II listed Tollerton Hall, and 8 local interest buildings close by. Furthermore, the Green Belt Review fails to take into account the site of Tollerton Mill which lies within the TOL1/TOL2 site and dates back possibly as far back as the twelfth century. A score of less than 5 would not be consistent with the corresponding score of 5 for RUD12 which has only Easthorpe House in the vicinity.</p> <p>TOL3 should also have a score of 5 for “Preserve setting and special character of historic settlement”, being at the southern end of the historic Tollerton Estate. This estate has the wooded area known as “The Decoy” to the south and this needs separation from the more modern</p>	<p>buildings are unlikely to be affected as the majority, including the Hall, Church and Bassingfield House, are on the eastern side of Tollerton Lane. RUD12 is adjacent to Easthorpe House (Grade II listed) and contains land within the Conservation Area. There are a number of local buildings of interest west of Tollerton Lane and their agricultural setting would be affected. The evidence supporting the presence of a Mill within TOL1 and TOL2 is noted however, the authority can identify no further evidence of a mill being located within TOL1 or TOL2. Given the conclusion that impacts on the listed buildings are less significant, the assessment of TOL1’s performance against the forth purpose has been amended. However due to the impact on the setting of ‘old Tollerton’ as a whole the Green Belt still performs an important function against this purpose. Disagree that TOL3 should score 5 for</p>	<p><i>trees, collectively ‘old Tollerton’ represents a traditional linear settlement and TOL1 preserves the setting and historic rural character of this area.”</i></p> <p>Site references altered to new referencing system Score remains 4.</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>part of Tollerton village to retain the historic boundaries and setting of the Tollerton Estate. If TOL3 had houses built on it, this separation would be lost. For a similar reason, TOL2 should also have a score of 5 for “Preserve setting and special character of historic settlement”. TOL4 should have a score of 4 instead of 3 for “Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment” since the proposed north-west external boundary is a weak hedgerow.</p> <p>The NPPF states that “authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term”. Therefore sites TOL1, TOL2 and TOL4 should not be considered for review again at this time, given that they were subject of the 2013 Green</p>	<p>preserving the historic setting. TOL3 is not adjacent to the Decoy, unlike TOL1 and TOL2 which are in close proximity to designated heritage assets in 'Old' Tollerton. If removed a buffer between TOL3 and the Decoy would be maintained.</p> <p>Disagree that TOL2’s performance against the forth purpose should be increased from 4 to 5. As with TOL1, the land preserves the setting and linear character of this traditional ‘village.’</p> <p>TOL4 - the weak boundary is recognised in the assessment, resulting in a greater score than would otherwise be the case. Regarding the need to undertake a second review to inform the Local Plan, the first review (Part 1 and 2a) assessed possible strategic allocations which extended the main urban area, the second (Part 2b) (this review) assesses possible allocations on the edge of proposed and existing inset settlements. As</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>Belt Review.</p> <p>Furthermore, all these sites were reviewed in the 2006 Green Belt Review. Both previous reviews concluded that this area should remain within the Green Belt. If any different conclusion should be reached now, this would cast doubt on all the conclusions of the 2013 Green Belt Review. Tollerton should not be treated differently to other areas (e.g. the Key Settlements) by being subjected to more Green Belt Reviews.</p> <p>The Inspector's Report of December 2014 stated that there were "concerns about the potential effects of bringing development closer to Tollerton" and that "With provision for 4,000 new homes altogether up to 2034, I see no need for safeguarding additional land and removing it from</p>	<p>Tollerton is located close to the edge of the urban area and has been identified as a settlement that could accommodate limited development in its own right, land within the parish has been reviewed twice. The Core Strategy Inspector's concerns regarded the extension of the strategic allocation, not extensions of Tollerton village.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this difference the inspector's concerns regarding merging are mirrored within the assessment, most noticeably TOL1 and TOL2.</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>the Green Belt in this part of the Borough". In 2013/14, we were told that the Inspector's view regarding areas for development meant that RBC had no choice but to allocate 4000 houses in Tollerton. Given that the Inspector's directions must be followed, RBC cannot possibly now remove further Tollerton land from the Green Belt.</p>		
TABU	1	<p>TOL1 has been assessed as having a Green Belt score of 21, indicating high importance to the Green Belt. Indeed, this is the highest score of all land considered in the January 2016 and February 2017 Green Belt Reviews. We agree with this assessment other than that the score for "Preserve setting and special character of historic settlement" should be 5, not 4: Evidence (Pendock map, Throsby's drawing, Potter's nineteenth century plan and field names and</p>	See response to Ball, S above.	See response to Ball S

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>the current position of rights of way) all strongly suggest that the Tollerton mill, certainly from 1683 and possibly from the twelfth century was sited in TOL1 on the slope of the hill on which Jubilee Wood now stands. The site is at or close to National Grid Reference SK 6125 3504. There are few identifiable mediaeval or early modern archaeological sites. Mill sites, close to mediaeval communities, but not now built over are rare. Together with the fact of its final burning, its remains should be identifiable by geophysical examination and would certainly merit archaeological excavation. An application has been made to have this included in the Historic Environment Record. This historical site was not taken into account in the Green Belt Review. Certainly, the Green Belt score for "Preserve setting and special character of historic settlement" for</p>		

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>TOL1 should be no lower than that for RUD12 (which is 5) since Tollerton Hall, like Easthorpe House, is a Grade II listed building for which the surrounding land forms the setting. Whereas RUD12 has only Easthorpe House in the vicinity, TOL1 has a further 6 listed buildings in close vicinity as well as 8 local interest buildings.</p>		
TABU	1	<p>TOL2 has been assessed as having a Green Belt score of 18. Out of all sites considered in the January 2016 and February 2017 Green Belt Reviews, only TOL1 has a higher Green Belt score. We agree that this land is important to the Green Belt. However, the score for “Prevent merging of settlements” should be 5, not 4, since the site is very close to the new strategic allocations and the northern</p>	<p>Disagree - TOL2 would not result in the complete or near merging of Tollerton and the strategic allocation, unlike TOL1. Robustness of boundaries is considered when assessing performance against the first purpose (checking sprawl)</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		boundary of the site is neither robust nor defensible.		
TABU	1	<p>In addition to being part of an area of arable farmland landscape, the northern end of TOL3 is in close proximity to a wooded area called “The Decoy”, which lies adjacent and to the west of Tollerton Wood. These features are both natural habitats and mark historical boundaries in relation to the Tollerton Estate which contains Tollerton Hall (as documented on the 1928 map from the sale particulars of Tollerton Estate, as well as in much earlier maps). It is important to protect the setting of this natural habitat from development on TOL3. This has not been taken into account in the scoring of “Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment”, suggesting that this score should be</p>	<p>If removed a buffer between TOL3, The Decoy (which is part of Tollerton Hall’s locally designated Park and Garden) and the historic core would be maintained. Hall Farm is also located between The Decoy and TOL3. The gap between TOL3 and the historic core of the village is already reduced by development west of Tollerton Lane which extends closer to the old village than TOL3.</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>increased from 3 to 4 for TOL3. These features also need to be taken into account in the score for “Preserve setting and special character of historic settlement”.</p> <p>The gap between TOL3 and the historic core of Tollerton, including St Peter’s Church (with current foundations dating back to the 12th century), the Old Rectory (approx. 1700) and Tollerton Hall and the lake, is important to preserve the setting and character of that historic core. Therefore it is important to prevent development that causes the older and newer parts of Tollerton to merge. The score for “Preserve setting and special character of historic settlement” should be increased from 1 to 5, particularly in light of the fact that TOL3 has no defensible boundary to the north. This would be consistent with the equivalent score for</p>		

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		RUD12 which is adjacent to Easthorpe House and which, like Tollerton Hall, is a Grade II listed building for which the surrounding land forms the setting		
TABU	1	The current boundary of TOL4 prevents urban sprawl due to the topography of the site. Therefore the score for “Check unrestricted sprawl of settlements” should be 4, not 3.	Disagree – whilst the current boundary prevents sprawl (it follows the settlement edge), the purpose of this review is to assess existing Green Belt land (beyond these boundaries) and the existing opportunities to establish a new boundary. TOL4 is well contained by development on two sides and this significantly reduces the perception of sprawl. The weak defensible external boundary and elevated position however increase the importance to 3.	Not amended
TABU	1	Paragraph 85 of the NPPF states that when defining boundaries, local planning authorities should “define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent”. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TOL1 has weak hedgerows to the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TOL1. Disagree - whilst there are weaker boundaries, these are located in less sensitive areas, i.e. south were the land would likely be removed alongside TOL2 and half the western boundary. The critical northern boundary is formed by 	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>southern and eastern boundaries. Only half of the western boundary is robust.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TOL2 has weak hedgerows to the north and west. • TOL3 has no physical feature for its external southeast boundary and has a weak post and wire fence for its northern boundary. • TOL4 has weak hedgerow as its external boundary to the north-west. <p>So none of these sites have boundaries that are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. Replacing Tollerton Lane as a boundary with weak hedgerows or no recognisable physical features is not consistent with paragraph 85 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>Little Lane which is a robust and permanent boundary. This stronger boundary results in a score of 4 rather than 5.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TOL2, TOL3 and TOL4 - Weak boundaries have been identified and are reflected in the increased score against the first purpose (checking sprawl). 	
Cross c/o	1	The Local Plan Inspector found merit	The Green Belt Review assesses the	Additional site titled

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Heaton Planning		<p>in “the argument that environmental features rather than land ownership should set the boundaries of the Green Belt” and we submit that the inclusion of our clients landholding (west of TOL1) as part of the assessment afforded to Tollerton would allow full consideration of environmental features. This is particularly the case for the assessment afforded to TOL1 where it is concluded: “Jubilee Woods forms a robust boundary for half the site’s western boundary” and “Little Lane provides a robust northern boundary”. In respect of the potential development of our client’s land, it is important to note that the site contains a proportion (approximately 0.6Ha) of land which is covered by hard standings, buildings and other structures. This built form, in consideration with the buildings at Hoyland’s Farm already</p>	<p>strength and permanence of Green Belt boundaries, focussing on environmental/physical features. Regarding land west of TOL1, the robust northern boundary (Little Lane) and western boundary (Jubilee Wood) have been considered and have resulted in a reduction of Green Belt importance against this objective. Without these features the site would have scored a maximum of five against this objective. The presence of hard standing does not reduce openness within the site and farms and farm buildings are appropriate developments in the Green Belt and do not detract from the open countryside character. Furthermore these buildings are screened by Jubilee Wood. The additional site submitted west of TOL1 has been assessed and included within the review.</p>	<p>‘Jubilee Wood’ (TOL/C) has been assessed and is included in the review.</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>results in an impact on the overall openness of the green belt, albeit when viewed from the South, these structures are seen against the robust boundaries that exist. This aspect should be afforded positive consideration in any further assessment of the green belt in this location.</p>		
Smith, C	1	<p>Impact on infrastructure, overlooking and traffic impacts means TOL1 (LAPP) should be medium high impact.</p>	<p>Representation does not address specific Green Belt purposes. Infrastructure and traffic issues will be considered as part of the site selection process and informed by the Sustainability Appraisal</p>	Not amended
Wilson, R	1	<p>Cotgrave, Radcliffe on Trent & Ruddington: - We have reviewed these sites, and largely agree with RBC's scoring. Cot 13 and adjoining land appears to extend unnecessarily into the green belt, and all the various sites will lead to a loss of good productive farm land, with few if any buildings thereon. Some will include</p>	<p>The extension of COT13 into the Green Belt has been considered and resulted in a high score of 4 out of 5 against the first purpose. The intrusion into the open countryside and its subsequent rural character has resulted in a maximum score of 5 against the third purpose (safeguarding countryside).</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>Ribbon Development and back land development.</p> <p>Cropwell Bishop, East Bridgford, Gotham & Tollerton: - Our scoring is a little higher and in most instances will lead to quite a loss of good quality farm land, with few if any buildings thereon.</p> <p>SHLAA 363 (and the larger SHLAA 577 site) is promoted. This would be a limited infill of unused land, ready for immediate development, set back from the road to overcome Ribbon Development. The site is identified as 'could be suitable if policy changes', and it has clearly defined boundaries. It is clear that there has been a policy change, not least by the Government in the form of the NPPF and the 2017 Housing White Paper, but also with RBC putting forward other Green Belt sites to meet the 900 homes shortfall.</p>	<p>Loss of productive farmland will be considered during site selection prior to the publication of the preferred options Local Plan Part 2. Whilst the visual quality of countryside (its character) is considered, its productivity does not inform the review.</p> <p>SHLAA sites 363 and 577 are isolated within the green belt. As such they have not been considered as possible allocations in the Local Plan and have not been assessed within the Review. The sites on Platt Lane (and other sites) are adjacent to the settlement of Keyworth.</p>	
Leech, Amanda	1	Tollerton - Green Belt is protected land joins our village with Gamston –	Impacts on the character of Tollerton and increased congestion will be	Additional text added within assessment of

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>therefore the village will lose its village status. Major traffic congestion already, would require major roads infrastructure. Tollerton would take on a higher % of the housing shortage – unfair as 6000 homes already allocated.</p> <p>Check the Unrestricted Sprawl: The proposed site (TOL2) is adjacent to residential properties which although within the Green Belt are within the settlement of Tollerton. The site shares one boundary with this area (properties west of Tollerton Lane)</p> <p>Encroachment: TOL 1 would join both sides of the village together. Therefore encroaching on farmland TOL 2 would join the new settlements already agreed, therefore encroaching on farmland and joining the two settlements together.</p> <p>TOL 3 – least impact</p> <p>To prevent neighbouring towns merging: The removal of this land would significantly reduce the</p>	<p>considered as part of site selection process, informed by the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The merging of Tollerton and Gamston has been considered and TOL1, TOL2, TOL3 and TOL4 have been scored accordingly. TOL1 is deemed fundamentally constrained and TOL2 is of medium-high Green Belt importance.</p> <p>Check unrestricted sprawl: TOL2 shares one boundary with properties on Medina Drive. It does not share a boundary with properties west of Tollerton Lane. Tollerton Lane and properties east of Tollerton Lane (Tollerton Hall and Church) do however provide a strong eastern boundary. This is recognised in the review.</p> <p>Encroachment: Encroachment of TOL1 is recognised in a maximum score of 5 against this purpose. It is also recognised in the assessment of TOL2. Comments on TOL3 noted.</p>	<p>TOL1 against the forth purpose (preserving historic character)</p> <p><i>“Although the listed <u>buildings are separated from TOL1 by Tollerton Lane and screened by trees, collectively ‘old Tollerton’ represents a traditional linear settlement and TOL1 preserves the setting and historic rural character of this area.</u></i>”</p> <p>Score remains 4.</p> <p>TOL1 re-referenced to new referencing system. (see response to Ball, S)</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>distance between Tollerton with the Gamston/Tollerton Strategic Allocation (part of Nottingham's main urban area). It is considered that the release of TOL1 would not occur in isolation and would in all likelihood also require the release of TOL2. This would result in almost merging of Tollerton with the strategic allocation East to Gamston/North of Tollerton.</p> <p>To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns: The site is adjacent to the historic core of Tollerton which, although not a Conservation Area, includes six listed buildings/structures, eight local interest buildings (directly adjacent to the land) and Tollerton Hall, a locally designated historic park and garden.</p>	<p>Score of 3 recognises that it doesn't perform as well as TOL1 and TOL2 against this purpose.</p> <p>Merging: The merging of the Tollerton and the strategic allocation has resulted in TOL1 being considered fundamentally constrained and TOL2 scoring 4 out of 5.</p> <p>Preserving setting of historic towns: The importance of TOL1 and TOL2 to the setting of old Tollerton and buildings of local interest is recognised within the assessment of these sites against the forth purpose (see response to Ball S above).</p>	
Wilson, C	1	I disagree with the extra 600 housing plan for Tollerton.	Noted - Representation does not address specific Green Belt purposes. The total number of homes developed in Tollerton will be determined through	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			Local Plan Part 2 and informed by the Green Belt review and other evidence.	
Ray	1	Completely disagree. The amount of building within Rushcliffe, particularly close to town is disproportionate to other boroughs. This is clearly because developers charge more for the housing and can therefore pay for road improvements. There is also a massively disproportionate amount of housing allocated to housing within Tollerton already without this additional plan.	Noted - Representation does not address performance of land against Green Belt purposes. The total number of homes developed in Tollerton will be determined through Local Plan Part 2 and informed by the Green Belt review and other evidence.	Not amended
Hallsworth	1	I disagree with the Green Belt scores. It seems that the analysis has been done by someone who has the remit to find as much building land as possible. I hope that Rushcliffe Borough Council ask another body such as the CPRE to redo the scoring and see what results they come up.	Noted - Representation does not address performance of land against Green Belt purposes. The council considers that there are exceptional circumstances to undertake a Green Belt Review. CPRE are a non-statutory consultee who we consult during plan preparation and their comments are considered at each consultation stage.	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
White K	1	<p>Enough development within the Green Belt has been approved in Part 1 of the Local Plan, particularly for the village of Tollerton and Bassingfield. My comments for plan 2 are specific to the Tollerton land proposals. Compared to other villages proposed in plan 2, Tollerton suffers from a severe lack of amenities and road and public transport links (including cycle pathways). Plan 2 proposes to more than double the size of the village. Not only would this destroy the rural nature of Tollerton, particularly the old village, but the residents will be left woefully under served by schools and amenities and suffering (and at risk) under the heavy weight of traffic around the village.</p>	<p>Comments regarding the impact of further development noted. Representation does not address performance of land against Green Belt purposes. Infrastructure provision will be assessed during plan progression.</p>	Not amended
Richardson, H	1	<p>I disagree. Tollerton has insufficient green space accessible to all and the infrastructure does not support the increase in housing</p>	<p>Noted - Representation does not address performance of land against Green Belt purposes. Infrastructure provision will be assessed during plan</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			progression.	
Hefford, J	1	<p>Green Belt should have permanence beyond existing plan periods. The Green Belt around Tollerton was only reviewed in 2014 and should NOT be reviewed again so soon during the lifetime of the current plan.</p> <p>All sites in Tollerton remain of importance to Green Belt and should not be removed from it. This is consistent with the findings of the Inspector when considering the potential effects of bringing housing closer to the village.</p>	<p>The 2014 Green Belt Review was the first part of the review which informs the Local Plan. This assessed Green Belt performance within possible locations for strategic allocations, identified in the Core Strategy, which would extend the main urban area. The second stage of the review focuses on non-strategic allocations on the edge of inset settlements. In the case of Tollerton this has led to two assessments, the first informed the selection of the Gamston/Tollerton Strategic Allocation, the second examined possible Green Belt sites on the edge of Tollerton itself. The 2014, 2016 and 2017 reviews constitute one single review.</p> <p>The Inspector's Core Strategy Report referred to further expansion of the strategic site, not the identification of sites on the edge of Tollerton itself.</p>	Not amended
IM Planning c/o	1	COT12. Check Sprawl = 2,	COT12: Disagree with proposed score	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Turley		<p>preventing merging = 2, safeguarding = 2, preserving character = 1, assist regeneration = 3. Total = 10.</p> <p>Representation has also assessed Bakers Hollow (COT9) - agrees site is low-medium.</p> <p>COT1 performs better against preventing urban sprawl as it is ribbon development when experienced alongside Hollygate Park. Should be 3 (12 overall).</p> <p>COT3, 4 and 5 perform well against sprawl due to rising landform between Hollygate Lane and Colston Gate. Should score higher against the 3rd purpose (safeguarding countryside).</p>	<p>of 2 against the first purpose (urban sprawl). Robust boundaries are recognised in the score of 4 out of 5, not a maximum of 5 out of 5.</p> <p>Development would result in a moderate reduction in the distance between Cotgrave and Clipston. This reduction would be experienced along the right of way which connects these villages. Disagree with reduction in score from 3 to 2.</p> <p>Disagree with reduction of score against the third objective (safeguarding countryside) from 3 to 2.</p> <p>3 reflects the site's absence of inappropriate development and urban fringe character.</p> <p>COT1: Site is not considered ribbon development as it is contained between Hollygate Park, industrial units on Hollygate Lane and residential development within Cotgrave. Score of 1 is retained against the first purpose (checking unrestricted sprawl).</p> <p>COT3, 4 and 5: COT3 and COT4 are</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>contained by development on two sides (assuming all of sites are developed). Score of 1 for COT3 and COT4 reflect this containment and their robust boundaries. COT5 scored higher as it intrudes further into the open countryside and is less contained.</p>	
Venes, B	1	<p>RUD13 and RUD5 are incursions into the Green Belt. RUD1 is supported, provided playground is retained. RUD3 has poor access on the main road. RUD2 and RU8 would result in coalescence with Clifton. RUD7 is accessed only through the village. RUD11 is too steep site.</p>	<p>The incursion of RUD13 into the Green Belt is recognised in the review, as is the encroachment of RUD5 along Flawforth Lane. Comments regarding RUD1 and RUD3 do not address specific Green Belt purposes. The coalescence resulting from the removal of RUD2 and 8 is recognised and both sites are deemed to be fundamentally constrained due to merging. Comments on RUD 7 do not address Green Belt purposes. The steepness of RUD11 is not a Green Belt issue, however its prominence and the subsequent visual intrusion (urban sprawl) is recognised in the review.</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Lowe, D	1	Oppose the use of green belt land in general. If there has to be further house building in Ruddington I would prefer Flawforth Lane as the impact on traffic and congestion would be smaller. I strongly oppose the land next to Pasture Lane as this joins Ruddington to Clifton and would create a huge mass of housing.	Noted - Representation does not address specific Green Belt purposes. Traffic issues will be considered as part of site selection and assessed within the Sustainability Appraisal	Not amended
Wright, G	1	See comments on LAPP (repetition of Non Green Belt issues)	Noted - Representation does not address specific Green Belt purposes. Traffic issues will be considered at part of site selection and assessed within the Sustainability Appraisal	Not amended
Powell	1	Areas RUD3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13 and 14 are ideal areas to build as it would keep the village 'compact' rather than stretching it out towards Clifton/Gotham/West Bridgford. Also it would keep the increased flow of traffic down as there would be easy access to the A60 so traffic would not have to drive through the village to 'get out.'	The merging of Ruddington and the main urban area of Nottingham is a significant consideration and this has been recognised in the assessment of RUD1, RUD2, RUD3, RUD8, RUD9, RUD10 and RUD11. Access and school capacity issues will be considered during the ongoing plan preparation process.	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>These dwellings would fall into the catchment area of the new school at Edwalton. Village schools are already full.</p>		
Burnett, P	1	<p>The ratings for RUD 11 should be: check unrestricted sprawl - Score should be 5 - The density of sprawl, proposed in Local Plan Part 2 of around 40 dwellings, is too intensive for this prominent site, and so should be prevented by protection within the Green Belt. The prominence of this site in the Green Belt is greater than the only site in this review (TOL 1) having a High Green Belt Score. Prevent merging of settlements - Score should be 4 - This site is on the boundary of Ruddington village already, having only Field House separating it from the main A60 road and St Peter's School, and this sprawl should not be extended. Preserve historical setting - Score</p>	<p>As the review seeks to determine the performance of existing Green Belt land against Green Belt purposes, it does not consider the type of development or mitigation that may occur on the site in the future. It simply seeks to identify land which is more or less important to the preservation of the Green Belt. Disagree that RUD11 is as prominent as TOL1. RUD11 is within a less open landscape, where the site is partially screened by trees. Agree that merging score should be increased to 4. The land is in a prominent location within a strategically important area of Green Belt which prevents the merging of Ruddington with the main urban area. Whilst the Old Road is a historical route, this is screened from view by</p>	<p>RUD11 score against second purpose (prevent merging) is increased from 3 to 4.</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>should be 3 - The Old Road right of way is a historic route of national importance dating from 907AD when the first Trent Bridge was built. It was an important pack horse road. Subsequently it was an important turnpike road, as evidenced by the special construction of White Lodge as a toll cottage on the bridleway. This gives a total Green Belt Score of 20 (High). Taking account of the factors already correctly identified by RBC, the conclusion has to be that this site is of high Green Belt importance.</p>	<p>thick vegetation.</p>	
Thomas, P	1	<p>Against the use of the very small sites proposed within the green belt and feel that they cannot add much to the housing stock of this area. Amenity to the existing residents will be blighted (extra traffic, pressure on already sparse services) with very little gain in terms of addressing the housing problem nationally. I would identify</p>	<p>The contribution of each site to meeting the Borough's housing need will be considered through the progression of local plan part 2. The Government advises that a range of sites, including smaller sites, are allocated in order to provide flexibility. Impacts on the highway network, pollution and local services will be</p>	<p>Not amended</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		RUD9, RUD10, and RUD11 as being in this category, being situated as they are around the ancient woodland of Mickleborough Hill and Ruddington Hall and are part of the 'green lungs' which help to protect the village from the growing pollution of the A52 road which is situated only metres from these proposed sites.	considered through the site selection process.	
Thornton, L	1	Disagree with some of the scores in relation to the purpose of the Green Belt RUD11 score against checking unrestricted sprawl . This should score 5. As a result of the Green Belt, planning permission has been refused in the past for building on Old Road which shows on the skyline above the fields. Consequently the openness of the Green Belt remains intact. Prevent merging of settlements - this should score 5. The open space is of vital importance to prevent the merging of Ruddington with West	Agree - RUD11's performance against the first purpose (checking unrestricted sprawl) is increased to 5. Whilst the site has strong defensible boundaries, it is disconnected from Ruddington and in a prominent location on Mickleborough Hill. Performance against merging has been increased to 4 (see response to Burnett, P). Whilst the Old Road is a historical route it is screened from view by thick vegetation.	RUD11 score against first purpose (checking sprawl) increased to 5. RUD11 score against the second purpose increased to 4 (see response to Burnett, P).

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>Bridgford. The green field within the green belt is highly valued by local walkers. Building on this part of the Green Belt will degrade any feeling of being in attractive countryside. The existing screening will be null and void if houses are built in the field.</p> <p>Preserve setting and special character of historic settlement.</p> <p>This score should increase to 3. Ruddington Hall is a local interest building and it and its grounds make an important contribution to the setting of the Green belt.</p>		
Oliver, J	1	Don't want development on the designated green belt areas.	The need to remove land from the Green Belt on the edge of Rushcliffe's towns and villages will be established through Local Plan Part 2. Green Belt review focuses on the performance of possible housing sites against Green Belt purposes, inset boundaries and minor amendments to existing	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			boundaries.	
Oliver F	1	Green belt was designated to protect the countryside and the status of villages and existing settlements. The local authority are going back on their promise to retain these areas and are developing vast areas of these protected sites in order to provide additional extensive housing areas and amenities across Rushcliffe.	The need to remove land from the Green Belt on the edge of Rushcliffe's towns and villages will be established through Local Plan Part 2. Green Belt review focuses on the performance of possible housing sites against Green Belt purposes, inset boundaries and minor amendments to existing boundaries.	Not amended
Seaton	1	I disagree with the proposal of additional green belt sites. The main reason is traffic concerns. Loughborough Road traffic at peak times is horrendous now.	Traffic and congestion are not Green Belt issues, these will be considered through site selection within the Sustainability Appraisal (informed through advice from Nottinghamshire County Council).	Not amended
Terry	1	Disagree	Noted	Not amended
Oliver K	1	No land should be taken out of Green Belt. Despite housing demand this is still government policy as reiterated by the minister of housing and the prime minister. They said councils could only apply to take land out of the green	The release of Green Belt land on the edge of Ruddington is required by Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy policy 3 and 4, which was adopted in 2014 and which underwent independent examination. Government policy permits the release of Green Belt land	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>belt “in exceptional circumstances” and after exhausting all other options including higher density building in urban areas and developing brownfield sites. I see no evidence that these other options have been exhausted in Nottinghamshire. In addition Ruddington is already a very busy and congested village with infrastructure at the limit. Further development would make this worse and ruin its village character.</p>	<p>in exceptional circumstances, these circumstances exists were more sustainable locations outside the Green Belt are not available. Further releases within Local Plan Part 2 will also undergo scrutiny at examination.</p>	
Oliver K	1	<p>Rejects the Council's approach to scoring greenbelt since this implies that some must be built on based on some random, unscientific scoring system. All the greenbelt sites around Ruddington are important in terms of retaining its character as village and preventing urban sprawl. Housing demand does not constitute "exceptional circumstances."</p>	<p>The scoring system is consistent with the approach taken within Part 1 and 2b of the review. This was found sound during the examination of the Core Strategy. The Council considers that it must, in order to deliver the housing targets as set out in the Core Strategy, release Green Belt sites. A review of the performance of land against Green Belt purposes is therefore required in order to inform site selection. This requires a standard assessment to</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			fairly differentiate and compare sites. The need to meet housing targets (based on housing need) can constitute exceptional circumstances where no more sustainable options exist.	
McKenzie-Small	1	<p>RUD11: Disagree with score of 16 (medium-high). We have found the following: Bats, eagles, green woodpeckers, badgers and many different types of amphibian in the smaller field, particularly in the mature copse of trees in the North-East corner.</p> <p>This is one of very few unmolested habitats in the area and I would rate it as more valuable for its wild fauna. The fields and bridleways form a natural boundary to our community to the south and east, balancing the rather hard (and noisy) boundaries of the A52 and A60 to the North and West and giving our children a safe space to explore and play when there</p>	Ecological issues do not form part of the Green Belt Review. Green Belt has five purposes, none of which include the protection or enhancement of biodiversity. Ecological issues will be addressed through the Sustainability Appraisal which will inform site selection. The rural character of RUD11 is reflected in a maximum score against the third purpose (assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment). Security issues do not inform the Green Belt review.	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>are no other amenities close. These two fields (and the grounds of Ruddington Hall) are an important part of this and this would justify a higher rating.</p> <p>Security: The scrub fences and hedgerows are a key part of the security for the houses on Old Loughborough Road and those at the top of Old Road. Residents rely on the field, to an extent, as a security buffer between us and the dark part of the Old Loughborough Road, where there are always people parked-up late at night and sleeping in lorries etc. To residents, therefore, this part of the greenbelt is of a different type of value.</p>		
Bramely, E	1	<p>Infrastructure of Ruddington will need addressing. How will the traffic problem is to be addressed, as Ruddington Village is almost at bursting point already? With regards to the proposed possible site of Asher</p>	<p>Traffic and congestion are not Green Belt issues, these will be considered through the development of Local Plan part 2 in terms of potential mitigation measures (informed through advice from Nottinghamshire County Council,</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		Lane, access to the site would be dangerous and I cannot see how access could possibly be improved. If we must have more housing then do it on the outskirts of the village where additional traffic would not necessarily need to enter the High Street to access the main roads.	as Highway Authority).	
Terra Strategic	1	An amendment of the Green Belt Review is required to reflect the revised parcel of land for which is proposed for development in Cropwell Bishop (CBI5/CR03). A revised scoring assessment of the reduced site accompanies the submission. In summary, the site scores a total of 7 points in its assessment; having regard to the Council's scoring system, the site is of low value to the Green Belt. It is requested that the revised scoring is taken into account by the Council.	As the landowner is proposing a smaller site area it has been assessed as a separate area of Green Belt to the larger CRO3. Consultee's suggested scoring and justification has been taken into consideration when assessing the site.	Land east of Church Road (CRO7) has been assessed and scored 10 against Green Belt purposes.
Aldergate Properties	1	Broadly agree with the Council's overall assessment of the sites that	EAS3 - Disagree with proposed increase from 2 to 3 against first	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>scored medium-high in East Bridgford (EAS1, EAS2, EAS7) but not the assessment of EAS6 (low-medium). This site has a much greater impact on the Green Belt than has been assessed by the Council. A revised score and assessment for this site and the other 'low-medium' sites (EAS3, EAS4, EAS5, and EAS6) is submitted as part of the representation.</p>	<p>purpose (sprawl). Site shares two boundaries and is contained by established hedgerows. Character of the site (prominence of settlement edge) is considered when assessing performance against 3rd purpose (protecting countryside). Disagree with decreased score of EAS3 against 3rd purpose. Land does not contain in appropriate development and the edge of East Bridgford, though perceptible is screened by established hedgerow.</p> <p>EAS4 - Disagree with reduction in score for preventing sprawl from 3 to 2 as mitigation to address the weak boundary is not considered within the review, which must focus on the performance of land in its current form. Disagree with reduction in score for safeguarding countryside from 3 to 2. Small stables are not inappropriate development and therefore their presence does not suggest a weak performance against this objective. Their presence is however recognised</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>as contributing to an urban fringe character. Disagree with reduction in score for preserving historical setting from 3 to 2. Mitigating effects upon the setting of the Conservation Area are not considered within the review which assesses the performance of land in its current form.</p> <p>EAS5 - Disagree with increase in score against restricting sprawl from 4 to 5. The single boundary and weak hedgerow warrant a score of 4. The character of the site is addressed when assessing performance against the third purpose. Disagree that score against third purpose should be increased from 3 to 4. The urban edge is a prominent feature and the single dwelling on its eastern boundary contributes to the land's settlement fringe character.</p> <p>EAS6 - Disagree with increase in score against the first purpose (checking sprawl). The presence of hedgerows, though a weaker boundary than other</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>features prevent a maximum score. Character of the lane is considered against the third purpose and this resulted in a maximum score. Disagree that score for performance against the prevention of merging should be increased to 3. Whilst a 20% reduction in distance may be considered a moderate reduction, as there is no visual or physical connection between the site and Newton, the perception of merging is reduced.</p>	
Jackson, Mr and Mrs	1	<p>GOT7 greatly underscored. Historic should score 4 because of ridge and furrow. Also sits next to tithe barn. Score should be equal to GOT1 if not higher. There are no urbanising features and similar to GOT 6 in the description so should score a 3 not 2.</p>	<p>GOT7: The presence of ridge and furrow has resulted in a re-appraisal and the score against the forth purpose (preserve historic setting). Score increased from 1 to 3 to reflect the loss of ridge and furrow which is important to the agricultural setting of the village. Tithe Barn is already adversely affected by the neighbouring Bus Depot and industrial extensions to it. Agree that GOT7 should score 3, this is the same as GOT6 against the</p>	<p>GOT7 against third purpose (safeguarding countryside) increased from 2 to 3. Justification amended: <i>“Whilst the edge of Gotham is visible and prominent within the field adjacent to properties on Pygall Avenue, the character of the field to the south is open</i></p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>fourth purpose (safeguarding countryside). The edge of Gotham is prominent; however the Green Belt has prevented inappropriate development.</p>	<p><i>countryside.”</i> GOT7 score against fourth purpose (preserving historic character) increased from 1 to 3. Justification amended: <i>“The Green Belt designation prevents the loss of ridge and furrow. Ridge and furrow contributes to the historic agricultural setting of the village.”</i> Total score increased from 8 (low) to 11 (low-medium). Conclusion amended: <i>“Although the edge of Gotham is a prominent feature within the adjacent field the remaining field is open countryside in character. The presence of ridge</i></p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
				<i>and fire is recognised and the Green Belt designation protects these features. The land's poor performance against the first two purposes and better performance against the remaining three reflects the land's low-medium Green Belt importance."</i>
Smith, PF	1	GOT4. Land borders old railway line which should be regarded as a heritage asset. Some of the fields are ridge and furrow and also a heritage asset. More appropriate total score would be 15	Disagree that the presence of old railway adjacent to GOT7 (GOT4 in Local Plan consultation) should increase the sites score against the forth purpose (preserving special character). The line is inaccessible and its setting would not be adversely affected. Ridge and furrow has been recognised and score increased to 3.	GOT7 score against fourth purpose increased from 1 to 3 (see response to Jackson, Mr and Mrs above)
Arris, D	1	Disagree with Green Belt score for GOT7 in the document. The land in question has ridge and furrow	Disagree that presence of old railway adjacent to GOT7 should increase the sites score against the forth purpose	GOT7 score against forth purpose increased from 1 to 3 (see response to

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		heritage assets and bounded by the old Gotham railway line	(preserving special character). The line is inaccessible and its setting would not be adversely affected. Ridge and furrow has been recognised and score increased to 3.	Jackson, Mr and Mrs (above)
Gotham Parish Council	1	<p>It is not an appropriate starting point to use SHLAA sites.</p> <p>Analysis assumes all five purposes are of equal value and the scoring system is relatively rough and ready, the purposes of protecting the open countryside and checking unrestricted sprawl should be seen in the context of the settlement concerned.</p> <p>The category 'Preserve setting and special character of historic settlement' seems to have been interpreted very narrowly as the immediate setting of heritage assets. Settlement size, shape and in particular relation to the landscape and the historic value of landscapes are all relevant issues. Issues such as current use e.g. value as</p>	<p>As the Green Belt Review informs site selection within the LAPP, the assessment must focus on sites which have a prospect of delivery. The starting point therefore must be those sites which are available for development, as they have a more reasonable prospect of delivery, subject to satisfying other planning considerations.</p> <p>In order to ensure a fair comparison between sites the assessment of sites should be the same. The Green Belt serves five purposes and NPPF does not suggest that purposes should be weighted, depending on the specific character or location of settlements within it.</p> <p>RBC disagree that the assessment of</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		agricultural land and biodiversity are ignored.	impacts on historic setting should include wider historic landscape issues, these have been examined within the landscape character appraisal of each site. Presence of designated and non-designated assets or areas allows a fairer comparison and does identify those settlements with greater heritage concerns. The loss of agricultural land and biodiversity will be considered during the site selection process, as identified through the SHLAA and the sustainability appraisal process.	
Wilkins	1	The scoring system is flawed: 1 .The analysis assumes all five purposes are of equal value. 2. The scoring system is relatively rough and ready. 3. The purposes of protecting the open countryside and checking unrestricted sprawl should be seen in the context of the settlement concerned. An area of housing that	See response to Gotham Parish Council above. The presence of ridge and furrow has resulted in an increase in the score of GOT7 against the forth purpose (preserving special character and historic setting) from 1 to 3.	GOT7 score against fourth purpose increased from 1 to 3 (see response to Jackson, Mr and Mrs above) Site re-referenced together with all other sites

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>would not be “sprawl” in a large urban area would be perceived as that in a small settlement such as Gotham.</p> <p>4. The category 'Preserve setting and special character of historic settlement' seems to have been interpreted very narrowly as the immediate setting of heritage assets. In settlements such as Gotham settlement size, shape and in particular relation to the landscape and the historic value of landscapes are all relevant issues.</p> <p>GOT 7 should score at least the maximum of 5 for its historic assets, and for some reason you seem to want to score the site the lowest in the whole Green Belt Consultation</p>		
Gotham Parish Council	1	Green Belt review is clearly a matter of subjective opinion. In the spirit of localism residents need to have a major input. The Neighbourhood Plan will allow them to do that in an informed way with adequate time for	Disagree - The Green Belt review is an evidence based document to support site selection process and the removal of land for development can only occur through the Local Plan (as sites are in the Green Belt) and where exceptional	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>reflection and discussion. We see no need for firm decisions on the value of parts of the greenbelt in Gotham at this stage and we propose that the examination of the greenbelt around Gotham should be one of the tasks undertaken by the Neighbourhood Plan although we recognize that the Neighbourhood Plan cannot of itself amend greenbelt boundaries.</p>	<p>circumstances are demonstrated by the Borough Council. If land on the edge is required to meet the boroughs housing supply and this is established through the Local Plan process, the review and plan itself cannot be dependent on the progress of the Neighbourhood Plan. The review has been subject to consultation and these comments have been taken into consideration.</p> <p>Whilst there will be no further consultation on the Green Belt review, there will be two further consultations on possible site allocations (preferred options and publication draft) and an examination of the submitted plan.</p>	
Gotham Parish Council	1	<p>Notwithstanding our objections to the methodology we set out below our own assessment of the value of a number greenbelt areas dealt with in the review against greenbelt purposes. We get different results and this underlines our point that the</p>	<p>The difference in scores between Gotham's assessment and the Green Belt review reflect the added historic value of ridge and furrow and greater concerns regarding sprawl. Scores have been amended to reflect presence of ridge and furrow (GOT7).</p>	<p>GOT7 against third purpose (safeguarding countryside) increased from 2 to 3. (see response to Jackson, Mr and Mrs above) GOT7 score against</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review																																																															
		<p>detailed review is best carried out in the context of the Neighbourhood Plan which will allow time for a properly informed process of public consultation.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="568 550 1133 925"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="568 550 689 582">GB</th> <th data-bbox="689 550 772 582">Spr</th> <th data-bbox="772 550 855 582">Mer</th> <th data-bbox="855 550 938 582">Enc</th> <th data-bbox="938 550 1021 582">His</th> <th data-bbox="1021 550 1104 582">Urban</th> <th data-bbox="1104 550 1133 582"></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="568 582 689 614"><u>Total</u></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="568 614 689 646">GOT2</td> <td data-bbox="689 614 772 646">1</td> <td data-bbox="772 614 855 646">1</td> <td data-bbox="855 614 938 646">4</td> <td data-bbox="938 614 1021 646">1</td> <td data-bbox="1021 614 1104 646">3</td> <td data-bbox="1104 614 1133 646">10</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="568 646 689 678">GOT1</td> <td data-bbox="689 646 772 678">3</td> <td data-bbox="772 646 855 678">1</td> <td data-bbox="855 646 938 678">2</td> <td data-bbox="938 646 1021 678">4</td> <td data-bbox="1021 646 1104 678">3</td> <td data-bbox="1104 646 1133 678">13</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="568 678 689 710">GOT7</td> <td data-bbox="689 678 772 710">3</td> <td data-bbox="772 678 855 710">1</td> <td data-bbox="855 678 938 710">3</td> <td data-bbox="938 678 1021 710">5</td> <td data-bbox="1021 678 1104 710">3</td> <td data-bbox="1104 678 1133 710">15</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="568 710 689 742">GOT6</td> <td data-bbox="689 710 772 742">3</td> <td data-bbox="772 710 855 742">1</td> <td data-bbox="855 710 938 742">3</td> <td data-bbox="938 710 1021 742">1</td> <td data-bbox="1021 710 1104 742">3</td> <td data-bbox="1104 710 1133 742">11</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="568 742 689 774">GOT4</td> <td data-bbox="689 742 772 774">4</td> <td data-bbox="772 742 855 774">1</td> <td data-bbox="855 742 938 774">4</td> <td data-bbox="938 742 1021 774">2</td> <td data-bbox="1021 742 1104 774">3</td> <td data-bbox="1104 742 1133 774">14</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="568 774 689 805">GOT5</td> <td data-bbox="689 774 772 805">4</td> <td data-bbox="772 774 855 805">1</td> <td data-bbox="855 774 938 805">3</td> <td data-bbox="938 774 1021 805">1</td> <td data-bbox="1021 774 1104 805">3</td> <td data-bbox="1104 774 1133 805">12</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="568 805 689 837">GOT3</td> <td data-bbox="689 805 772 837">2</td> <td data-bbox="772 805 855 837">1</td> <td data-bbox="855 805 938 837">4</td> <td data-bbox="938 805 1021 837">1</td> <td data-bbox="1021 805 1104 837">3</td> <td data-bbox="1104 805 1133 837">11</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	GB	Spr	Mer	Enc	His	Urban		<u>Total</u>							GOT2	1	1	4	1	3	10	GOT1	3	1	2	4	3	13	GOT7	3	1	3	5	3	15	GOT6	3	1	3	1	3	11	GOT4	4	1	4	2	3	14	GOT5	4	1	3	1	3	12	GOT3	2	1	4	1	3	11	<p>There is a limited explanation for the scores, especially sprawl which has increased scores for GOT1, GOT3, GOT6, and GOT7.</p> <p>Disagree that GOT1's score should be increased as site is enclosed on 2 sides and the external boundary is the old railway line and public right of way.</p> <p>GOT3 is contained by development on three sides.</p> <p>GOT6 and 7 are contained by Gypsum Way.</p> <p>Disagree that GOT4's score against preserving character should be increased by one from 2 to 3. The edge of Gotham is a dominant feature and the land is urban fringe.</p> <p>Agreed that GOT7's score against the third purpose (safeguarding) should be increased to reflect the open countryside character of the southern field (see response to Jackson Mr and Mrs).</p> <p>Disagree that GOT5's score against the third purpose should be decreased</p>	<p>fourth purpose increased from 1 to 3 (see response to Jackson, Mr and Mrs above)</p> <p>Sites re-referenced in final document</p>
GB	Spr	Mer	Enc	His	Urban																																																														
<u>Total</u>																																																																			
GOT2	1	1	4	1	3	10																																																													
GOT1	3	1	2	4	3	13																																																													
GOT7	3	1	3	5	3	15																																																													
GOT6	3	1	3	1	3	11																																																													
GOT4	4	1	4	2	3	14																																																													
GOT5	4	1	3	1	3	12																																																													
GOT3	2	1	4	1	3	11																																																													

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>from 4 to 3 as there are no inappropriate developments within the site and the edge of Gotham is screened from view.</p> <p>Disagree that GOT6's score against the third purpose should be increased. Presence of residential development reduces the green belts importance. Disagree that GOT3 should be increased from 3 to 4. The character is urban fringe.</p>	
Peat	1	<p>The Green Belt score for GOT4 The Orchards appears to be too low. The reasons being that the fields here have some of the last ridge and furrow heritage assets in the area. It is also bounded by the old Gotham railway. We think that a total score of 15 is more appropriate.</p>	<p>GOT4 (GOT7 in GB Review) score against the forth purpose (preserving historic setting) has been increased from 1 to 3 due to presence of ridge and furrow. Score against countryside encroachment also increased from 2 to 3.</p> <p>Total score increased to (11 low-medium)</p>	<p>GOT7 against third purpose (safeguarding countryside) increased from 2 to 3. (see response to Jackson, Mr and Mrs above)</p> <p>GOT7 score against fourth purpose increased from 1 to 3 (see response to Jackson, Mr and Mrs above)</p> <p>Site re-referenced together with all other</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
				sites.
Simes, M	1	Agree as more housing is needed	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended
ST Projects Limited (DPDS)	1	Fully supports assessment that the site of Moor Lane(GOT 3 in the green belt review) is of low greenbelt importance	Support noted and welcomed	Not amended
Woolley (DLP planning)	1	Support councils assessment of GOT5 in the green belt review	Support noted and welcomed	Not amended
Wheeldon Brothers (PDG)	1	Disagree with Green Belt assessment. The site [GOT1] should score 9. Countryside encroachment should be lower. There is not a substantial telephone exchange building on the client's site and the school and adjacent development has had an urbanising effect. For historic character, the score should be lower. The setting of the school has already been eroded to the west.	Disagree with proposed reduction in GOT1's score against the forth purpose (preserving special character...). The area identified as GOT1 extends east beyond the consultees land and includes the telephone exchange. As both these areas have also been submitted as allocations they have been combined as a logical Green Belt area. GOT1 contains ridge and furrow and provides agricultural setting to Home Farm and the centre of the village. It is also adjacent to the former School which is grade II listed. Combined these factors result in a score of 4 (loss	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			of ridge and furrow alone has resulted in scores of 3 for other sites, including GOT 7).	
Smith, R	1	<p>Disagree with the Scoring of RAD12. Unrestricted Sprawl. The land does not have two or more boundaries adjoining the settlement. A settlement cannot be defined as the open green recreation ground. The dug out is not a permanent heavily developed feature. Given that the area to the west of Island Lane would score 5, and the area to the east would only share one boundary with the village this should also score 4. Therefore, this score should be between 4 and 5.</p> <p>Safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The score of 3 reflects the criteria that the land contains some inappropriate development. I would argue that the surrounding fields, used as a livery with a single dwelling owned and</p>	<p>It is agreed that the open recreation ground does not define the settlement edge, as the area is open in character and that the dugout and floodlights do not detract from this openness. Consequently the land shares only one boundary with Radcliffe. Score is increased to 3. A high score of 4 is avoided due to the presence of the railway line and river which separate Radcliffe from Nottingham and prevent merging.</p> <p>Agree that as the residential unit is tied to the livery stables it is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Score increased from 3 to 4.</p> <p>Disagree that score against the fourth purpose should be increased. Green Lane is not within the historic core of the village. 14 Green Lane is the only</p>	<p>Score for RAD12 against checking sprawl increased from 3 to 4. Justification amended: <i>"The land only shares half a boundary with Radcliffe on Trent, as the recreational ground is within the Green Belt and beyond the recognised settlement edge, which follows Wharf Lane"</i></p> <p>Score for RAD12 against safeguarding countryside increased from 3 to 4. Justification amended: <i>"Whilst the land contains a residential unit associated with Oakfield Livery, this is not deemed inappropriate"</i></p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>used by the farmer running the livery, alongside associated stabling and livery buildings are very much an appropriate development for the agricultural and stable site. It is a residential unit, that hasn't inappropriately encroached but forms part of the character, use and management of the livery site. Therefore, this score should be 5. Preserve the setting and special character of historic settlement There are a number of buildings of historic character along The Green, and this area could be considered for designation as a Conservation Area. Therefore, the area is more sensitive than the current score of 2 and would suggest a score of 3 would be more appropriate.</p> <p>To conclude, the eastern half of the site should be scored as 4, 1, 5, 3, 3 = 16 The western half of the site should be scored as 5, 1, 5, 3, 3 = 17, resulting in RAD12 being of Medium-</p>	<p>building of local interest which would be adversely affected if the land were removed from the Green Belt. This property is directly adjacent to RAD12. Assessment will not split this site east and west of Island Lane.</p>	<p><i>development as it is tied to an existing use acceptable within the Green Belt."</i></p> <p>Total score increased from 11 to 13 (low-medium).</p> <p>Site re-referenced together with other sites.</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		High Green Belt value.		
Smith, J	1	As 1073724 Smith, R	See previous response to Smith, R	See previous response to Smith, R
Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council	1	<p>RPC notes that two additional sites for housing development have been submitted for development during previous consultations on the Local Plan Part 2.</p> <p>Site RAD11 lies on open countryside to the immediate north east of Radcliffe-on-Trent. We note that in the Green Belt Review Part 2 (b) this area of land is rated as being of medium high greenbelt importance meaning that it scores well in terms of greenbelt purposes. We believe that removal of this site from the greenbelt would be significantly detrimental to the greenbelt's purpose.</p> <p>Site RAD12 lies in an area of flood risk on the west side of Radcliffe between current housing development and a used and disused railway line. RPC in its draft</p>	Welcome comments by Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council which support the scoring for RAD11 and RAD12, however score for RAD12 has been increased in response to other representations received (see response to Smith, R)	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>Neighbourhood Plan has identified this site as being in its designated "Leisure Arc." Dropping of this site from the greenbelt would leave it more vulnerable to housing development which would remove permanently the use of the land for leisure. This is particularly important given Radcliffe-on-Trent's general lack of leisure facilities. We note, also, that leisure facilities can be developed within the existing greenbelt. When all the required housing development can be accommodated within other sites around Radcliffe-on-Trent, we believe that it is completely unnecessary to remove this area from the greenbelt.</p>		
Machin obo landowner	1	<p>Site at 110A Cropwell Road could be contained within an amended green belt boundary as it relates to the built up area more than the Green Belt.</p>	<p>Disagree - This site cannot be removed in isolation as it would result in an isolated inset area. It would only be removed as part of a wider inseting of land either side of Cropwell Road, which was examined following</p>	<p>Consideration of Cropwell Road as possible inset area is included within the Green Belt Review Part 2b. Concluded that the area</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			consultation on the Green Belt Review undertaken in January 2016. It is concluded that this area should remain within the Green Belt (see response to representation on the January 2016 Review).	should remain within the Green Belt as it contributes to the openness of the Green belt given the nature of development in this location..
Samworth Farms	1	Reiterated comments in relation to the January 2017 review and Local Plan Issues and Options consultation	See previous response to representation on January 2016 Green Belt Review.	Not amended
Samworth Farms	1	North of Shelford Road not supported. Scores poorly in greenbelt terms. It would lead to significant sprawl and very visible intrusion into the countryside. Agree with Councils assessment	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended
Samworth Farms	1	North of Holme Lane not supported. Provides separation between Radcliffe on Trent and Nottingham. Disagree with council's assessment in relation to merging. Should score 5 not 1.	Disagree - as stated whilst there would be a reduction in the distance between Radcliffe and the main urban area, the presence of the railway embankment and river behind act as unbreachable barriers and reduce any perception that Radcliffe and Nottingham are merging.	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Mosaic Estates	1	Reiterate comments for site RAD 1 (North of Nottingham Road) Site should score lower for sprawl and encroachment and should be of low green belt importance.	See previous response to representation on January 2016 Green Belt Review. Disagree - no changes made.	Not amended
Oglesby (Savills)	1	<p>RAD2 and 3 would be the most appropriate location for development for a number of reasons. We consider that the release of these sites from the Green Belt would not significantly impact on its five purposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It would not encroach further into the countryside as development would not extend beyond the furthest edges of the existing settlement; 2. Will not constitute unrestricted sprawl as it will create an even edge of the settlement; 3. There are no towns to the east that development at this location could merge into; 4. There is no historic town that could be affected; and 5. Radcliffe on Trent does not have 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As the land is urban fringe and contains residential developments, the importance of the Green Belt in preventing encroachment into countryside is reduced 2. The limited sprawl (contained by development) is recognised in a score of 2 for both RAD2 and RAD3 (see response to representations on previous draft review) 3. The absence of merging is recognised in a score of 1 for both RAD2 and RAD3. 4 It is agreed there are no historic features; therefore both sites score 1 against the fourth objective (the lowest score). 5. The absence of brownfield land was established during the examination of 	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		enough brownfield land to accommodate 400+ dwellings.	the Core Strategy, which subsequently determined that Green Belt land would need to be released to accommodate the housing target for the settlement.	
Crown Estate	1	RAD12 (RAD 11 in FO document). The Green Belt assessment underscores the importance of the site in preventing the merging of settlements. It confusingly uses the presence of a strong boundary in mitigation of this purpose, when such features are properly associated with the tests of sprawl/encroachment. The merger test is a relatively simple one of proximity and a higher score of 4 or 5 should be awarded to reflect this giving a total of 16.	Disagree - as stated in the assessment whilst there would be a reduction in the distance between Radcliffe and the main urban area, the presence of the railway embankment and river behind act as unbreachable barriers and reduce any perception that Radcliffe and Nottingham are merging.	Not amended
Crown Estate	1	Methodology incorrect and alternative methodology provided. Notwithstanding this the site (RAD11) should score lower against the green belt purposes resulting in a lower overall score of 9, with lower scores for all but urban regeneration criteria.	Disagree that methodology should be amended. RBC considers the current methodology compliant with the NPPF and broadly follows the Green Belt review undertaken to inform the selection of strategic sites allocated in the Core Strategy (Part 1 and 2b). It is	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			therefore considered to be a robust and consistent approach. Proposed score of 9 (low Green belt importance) does not reflect the site's openness and elevated position, the subsequent sprawl that would occur and encroachment into open countryside.	
Radcliffe on Trent Golf Club	1	Reiterate comments on previous Green Belt review (January 2016).	See previous response to representation on Issues and Options Green Belt Review. Merging of settlement score has been reduced.	Yes
Barratt Homes	1	Support Green Belt review around the key settlements and other villages.	Support welcomed	No
Simpson R	1	Disagree with assessment. Does not recognise the character of the proposed development. Site forms a gap in a built up area. There is no reason that the site could not be allocated for development and remain washed over. It would not result in sprawl as is well contained. Whilst at a higher level the area between Ruddington and the urban area is sensitive, a site specific	The Green Belt Review does not consider the type of development that would occur. It focuses on the performance of the land in its current form against Green Belt purposes. The land could not be allocated for development and remain within the Green Belt, as this would result in a conflict with Green Belt purposes which seek to preserve openness. Unlike other sites in the Green Belt, the	RUD11 score against the third purpose is reduced from 5 to 4. Site referencing changed throughout document

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>assessment would conclude that there would be no merging as development exists on all sides. The site is not open countryside and development would not change the character of the area, and would not extend the built form. The site should therefore score 1 against merging, sprawl and encroachment and score 7 overall.</p>	<p>land is greenfield and there are no existing buildings on the site which would enable development without reducing openness.</p> <p>Disagree that the site should score 1 against the first purpose (checking sprawl). The site is prominent in the Green Belt and isolated from the main built up area.</p> <p>Disagree that the score against merging should be 1. The site is within a strategically important area which separates Nottingham from Ruddington. The size of the site and its location means it makes a notable contribution to the prevention of merging.</p> <p>Disagree that the contribution of the site towards safeguarding countryside should be 1. Neighbouring development is screened by development within the larger field and there is no inappropriate development within the site. The character of the land is open countryside, not</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			settlement fringe. Score is reduced to 4 however given the prominence of the property adjacent to the smaller field.	
Hurst and Richards	1	<p>Approach to sites around Cropwell Bishop is inconsistent. Approach does not consider the scale of development. E.g. CRO1 would lead to sprawl and has development on 1 side. Whilst the canal provides a backdrop it is some distance from the edge of the village.</p> <p>CRO6 has development partially on 3 sides. There is inconsistency in relation to historic setting. CRO6 scored 3 where CRO5 only scored 1 despite being next to the historic core. The score for CRO6 should be sprawl - 2, merging - 1, countryside - 2, historic setting - 2 and urban regeneration – 3. Total score 10.</p>	<p>Agreed that CRO1 only shares one boundary with Cropwell Bishop. Given the scale of the site and distance to the Canal (the exterior boundary) there would be a moderate intrusion into the Green Belt.</p> <p>A revised boundary has been resubmitted for CRO6. Sprawl has increased from 3 to 4 as a result. Following re-assessment, safeguarding countryside has reduced from 3 to 2 due to prominence of settlement edge. Preserving the historic setting has remained 3.</p> <p>Regarding CRO5, it is agreed that the proximity to the historic core should result in a higher score of 2 against that purpose.</p> <p>Notwithstanding reduction in score for safeguarding countryside, RBC disagrees with the proposed</p>	<p>CRO1 score against sprawl increased to 3. Justification amended: <i>“The site shares one boundary with Cropwell Bishop (with properties on Hoe view Road) as the memorial hall and playing field are within the Green Belt and due to the openness they are not part of Cropwell Bishop’s recognisable settlement boundary.”</i></p> <p>CRO5 score against preserving historic character is increased from 1 to 2.</p> <p>Total score increased to 11 (low-medium) and conclusion altered</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			assessment of CRO6.	accordingly. Site referencing throughout document amended.
Loughborough Road Consortium	1	RUD3 should score 13. Score 3 for sprawl given strong boundaries and 2 for urban regeneration as development would allow for expansion of St Peters Junior School.	Disagree with reduction of RUD3's score against checking sprawl. The site does not adjoin Ruddington, separated by St Peters School and playing fields. It would result in significant sprawl along the Loughborough Road. As St Peters School is in the Green Belt, not within the urban area, facilitating its expansion does not deliver urban regeneration.	Not amended
Southwell Diocese	1	Object to proposed inset boundary for Gotham. Should include site east of Leake Road within the inset. Relates more to the settlement rather than the wider countryside. It has a mature hedgerow along the eastern boundary which would contain development. Development does not rate highly against any of the	Disagree that the inset boundary should be amended to include land east of Leake Road (GOT4). The inset boundaries are determined according to the physical separation of open countryside and the built up area. This is informed by the Green Belt review. Leak Road forms the current logical boundary between open countryside	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>purposes for including land within the Green Belt.</p>	<p>(Green Belt) and the built up area. Removal of land beyond this boundary will occur through the allocation of sites. This is also informed through the review of Green Belt land. The review concluded that GOT4 is of low-medium Green Belt importance. This was not altered, following the expansion of the site, as requested during consultation on the further issues and options.</p>	
Southwell Diocese	1	<p>Site COT7 (COT4 in the further options document). The site does not represent sprawl of the settlement and the assessment fails to give sufficient weight to the containment made by Woodgate Lane to the west, the treatment works to the north and a defensible strong hedgerow boundary to the east. There is no cogent contrary score relating to the merging of settlements this score should be 0. It is difficult to understand how the land cannot be urban fringe typology when it lies</p>	<p>Disagree - the containment of the site by Woodgate Lane and the sewage works results in a reduction in Green Belt importance against the first purpose (checking sprawl). If the site was less contained it would score a maximum of 5. Regarding merging, there is no score of 0, minimum score is 1. The site scored 2 against this objective due to the minor reduction in the distance between Cotgrave and the Strategic allocation at Gamston. Whilst the sewage treatment works are visible they are not an urbanising feature,</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		between the urban area and the treatment works. There can be no cogent contrary scoring to the item preserving the special character of an historic settlement this should be 0. If as stated the release of the site from the green belt will not prejudice any regeneration proposals then the score is too high and should be lower.	given their limited height and screening. The edge of Cotgrave is visible but not an overriding feature. Therefore a score of 4 is appropriate. As stated there is no lower score than 1, therefore this score for protecting historic setting cannot be any less. A minimum score of 3 is applied to all Green Belt sites as all Green Belt prevents development that should be located within urban areas.	
Aldergate Properties	1	In respect of East Bridgford the three "Medium- High" importance sites (EAS1, EAS6 and EAS7) all project out into what is clearly open countryside that bears no logical relationship to the existing settlement boundary of historic growth patterns. Their loss to development would have adverse impacts on the principles of including land within the Green Belt. We agree with the Council's assessment of these sites.	Agreement noted and welcomed	Not amended
Aldergate	1	EAS6. This site scores 15, just one	Disagree - EAS6 scores highly against	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Properties		point less than site EAS2. EAS2 is an extensive northern extension of East Bridgford which sits even further north than EAS1 which in itself is a large northerly extension of the settlement. Loss of Site EAS6 has a much greater impact on the green belt than has been assessed by the Council.	the first and third purposes which seek to prevent sprawl and safeguarding countryside. As there is an absence of historic features which contribute to the settlement's character and absence of merging, beyond a limited reduction between East Bridgford and Newton, it does not score highly against these purposes. A low-medium Green Belt value reflects these mixed performances.	
Aldergate Properties	1	Green belt assessment carried out for sites EAS3-6 by agent. Based upon the analysis contained within the representation, EAS3 scores 14, EAS4 10, EAS5 15 and EAS6 17. Detailed justification provided in representation.	EAS3 - Disagree with proposed increase from 2 to 3 against first purpose (sprawl). Site shares two boundaries and is contained by established hedgerows. Character of the site (prominence of settlement edge) is considered when assessing performance against the third purpose (safeguarding countryside). The open countryside character of the land and neighbouring area is reflected in score of 4. Suggested scores by Aldergate Properties total the same score as set	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>out in the review (13). EAS4 - Disagree with reduction in score for checking sprawl. Measures to address the weaker northern and eastern boundaries cannot be considered as the assessment can only focus on the performance of land against purposes in its current form. Small stables were cited as appropriate development within PPG2. The NPPF does not refer to stables. Disagree that score should be reduced. Assessment does recognise the urban fringe character. Disagree with reduction in score against the forth purpose, the land is adjacent to the conservation area and it is identified as providing views from within this designated area. Planting would not mitigate the loss of views or impact on the setting of the area.</p> <p>EAS5 - disagree with increased score against the first purpose (sprawl) as character of the land is not a consideration (this is considered when assessing performance against the</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			third purpose). Disagree with increased score of 4 against the third purpose (safeguarding countryside), the land is settlement fringe and property to the east increases the sense of containment. EAS6 - see previous response to Aldergate Properties.	
Aldergate Properties	1	Detailed comments relating to site KEY13 Bunny Lane (3) reiterated	See previous response to representation on January 2016 Green Belt Review.	Noted. See consultation response to first stage of consultation
William Davis	1	RUD 13. The existing Green Belt on the eastern edge of Ruddington is broadly defined by the alignment of the A60. Although the A60 presents a 'physical feature' and includes sections that are lined by existing vegetation, the current extent largely ignores the characteristics of the existing settlement edge whereby it extends further east along Flawforth Lane and at various points around the site. Disagree with total score of 14. Checking unrestricted sprawl: it is important to note that the site is	Whilst developments on Flawforth Lane break the Green Belt boundary along the A60, further south around Belmore House the A60 forms a clearer robust boundary between Ruddington and the open countryside. RUD12 is more contained by development along Flawforth Lane and Easthorpe House. RUD13 is not contained by development to the south or east and these are the more sensitive external boundaries. A score of 4 reflects the openness of the site and the absence of containment and	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>located adjacent to number of properties which, as previously described, form part of the settlement edge and extend east of the A60. To be consistent in the approach and scoring of adjacent land parcels that note this (namely RUD12) it is considered that the score related to 'urban sprawl' for the site should be reduced from four, to two.</p> <p>Safeguarding the countryside: it should be noted that the assessment criteria for this includes reference to landscape quality. As noted, the AECOM study concludes that the site is of 'medium' landscape sensitivity and 'low' visual sensitivity. Given the context of 'landscape quality' in relation to the scoring criteria it is clear that the site is of lower sensitivity overall and as such should have scored only two rather than four in relation to 'safeguarding the countryside'.</p> <p>Considering the revised scores the</p>	<p>strong boundaries.</p> <p>Regarding safeguarding countryside the assessment does consider the visual prominence of the settlement edge and the degree to which the land is considered urban fringe or open countryside in character. As the landscape assessment considers wider landscape and visual issues its conclusions do not dictate the assessment of whether a site is urban fringe or open countryside.</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		overall conclusion for RUD13 would be 10, which would fall within the category of 'low' Green Belt importance.		
East Leake Parish Council	1	Comments made to previous Green Belt reviews in respect of East Leake apply.	See previous response to representation on Green Belt Review January 2016.	Not amended
East Leake Parish Council	1	Process of releasing land from the Green Belt need to speed up	Concerns regarding the release of Green Belt land are noted. However RBC must follow due process with the resources available to it.	Not amended
East Leake Parish Council	1	Concerns in relation to merging with Gotham if particular sites are released n Gotham for development.	GOT5 is the only site which could contribute to the merging of Gotham with East Leake. However this merging would be minor and therefore scores 1. Text added to reflect this.	GOT5 text amended within justification for merging score : <i>"There are no inset settlements south of Gotham within the Green Belt. <u>East Leake is 2km and the removal of GOT5 would result in a only a very minor reduction in the distance between these settlements"</u></i>
Bagguley, C	1	Should not take sites out of the Green	The need to remove land from the	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		Belt.	Green Belt on the edge of Rushcliffe's towns and villages will be established through Local Plan Part 2. Green Belt review focuses on the performance of possible housing sites against Green Belt purposes, inset boundaries and minor amendments to existing boundaries.	
Horner, S	1	Assessment does not have regard to the existing pattern of the settlement as outlined in the Village Design statement and the assessment should factor in such local circumstances. For sprawl, GOT2 would enhance the irregular pattern of the village whilst GOT7 and 6 would impact on the irregular shape.	The Green Belt Review does not consider the contribution land makes to settlement character unless it effects historic features which themselves contribute to the historic character of the village (the forth Green Belt purpose). Any impacts on character will be considered through the site selection process, informed by the landscape character appraisal and other evidence. Agreed that extension north would represent an intrusion north beyond the existing built up boundary. Neighbouring Community Hall and sports facility is predominantly open area and text amended	GOT2 score against checking sprawl increased from 1 to 2. Justification amended: <i>“This parcel of land shares one boundary with Gotham – the former British Legion to the south. Whilst the sport pavilion is located to the east, this area is predominantly open and has not been inset (this is recognised in the proposed settlement boundary for Gotham).”</i>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>accordingly and score increased from 1 to 2.</p> <p>GOT6 and 7 preserve the irregular shape of the village in this area. As stated however, the purpose of Green Belt is not to preserve the setting unless there is a heritage issue.</p>	<p>Total score increased to 11, raising site to low-medium importance.</p> <p>Conclusion amended:</p> <p><i>“The site is enclosed by development on two sides with the Community Centre and Sports Pavilion to the east and Telephone Exchange to the west (on the southern half of this boundary). Whilst these do not form the physical boundary between open countryside and the built up area, the presence of these existing features/boundaries reduce the Green Belt’s importance against restricting sprawl and preventing the merging of settlements.</i></p> <p><i>...The overall score of 11</i></p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
				<p><i>reflects land which is of low-medium Green Belt importance.”</i></p> <p><i>All sites in document re-referenced in order to distinguish between other consultation documents.</i></p>
Horner, S	1	In other villages sites are scored higher due to visibility. Gotham sits in a horseshoe Given the densities sited in the SHLAA it would mean that developments would be visible from all directions if viewed from high points around the village. Whereas those that sit on slopes around other villages in the assessment will only be viewed from one direction.	The visual impacts when viewed from surrounding hills will be reduced due to distance and the sites would be seen as extensions to the village.	Not amended
Horner, S	1	In terms of encroachment, CRO1 in Cropwell Bishop has the following assessment: 'The land does not contain inappropriate development. The edge of Cropwell Bishop is however visible prominent within the	Agreed GOT7 has been amended to reflect both the absence of inappropriate development and visibility of the countryside character of the southern field (not adjacent to Pygall Avenue).	GOT7 score against third purpose increased from 2 to 3 (see response to Jackson, Mr and Mrs above)

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>site. The edge is not soft and consists of a mixture of fencing and brick walls. The wider countryside to the west is screened from view by the route of the Grantham Canal and the hedgerows along it.' You could say the same for the parcel of land at the end of Hall Drive. But CRO1 scores 3 but GOT7 scores 2.</p>		
Horner, S	1	<p>In terms of heritage, The disused Grantham Canal is used as a reason for elevating the scores around Cropwell Bishop. The railway line (and the Logan Trail) is as important as a 'historic non-designated heritage asset' to Gotham. For GOT7, there is the statement; 'apart from ridge and furrow' there are no heritage assets within the site. Why apart from? These heritage assets are important.</p>	<p>Agreed - ridge and furrow contribute to the heritage setting of Gotham. Score is increased from 1 to 3 for GOT7 as these non-designated assets would be completely destroyed if the site were removed from the Green Belt and developed.</p>	<p>GOT7 score against forth purpose increased from 1 to 3 (see response to Jackson, Mr and Mrs above)</p>
Horner, S	1	<p>Having regard to comparisons above, site GOT4 should score as follows. Sprawl - 3, merging - 1, encroachment -3, historic setting - 5,</p>	<p>Presume representation refers to LAPP site GOT4 and GB site GOT7. Disagree within increase in sprawl from 1 to 3. Site is contained by Gypsum</p>	<p>GOT7 score against third purpose increased from 2 to 3 (see response to Jackson, Mr and Mrs</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		detailed justification provided in representation, urban regeneration 3.	Way and hedgerow. Agreed that safeguarding encroachment should be increased to 3 to reflect absence of inappropriate development. Disagree with increase from 1 to 5 against preserving historic setting/character. However due to presence of ridge and furrow, the site has increased to 3 for this purpose.	above) GOT7 score against forth purpose increased from 1 to 3 (see response to Jackson, Mr and Mrs above)
Daniel	1	Appreciate that there is a housing shortage but do not need to build on Green Belt land. Should look at higher density as there is not enough space for everyone to have a detached house.	The release of Green Belt land on the edge of Ruddington is required by Core Strategy policy 3, which was adopted in 2014 and which underwent independent examination. Higher densities are appropriate within urban locations, however in rural areas of Rushcliffe such densities would be out of character in most circumstances.	Not amended
Toombs	1	Most seem ok	Comment noted	Not amended
Anderson, J	1	This quantitative analysis of sites in the green belt is flawed for the following reasons: 1. It is analysed against the NPPF criteria alone. There is no analysis	As a review of Green Belt importance, the review must focus on the purposes of Green Belt as set out in the NPPF. Other environmental issues are considered through other	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>against the value of the sites as 'land' e.g. there is no value associated as to landscape and current use.</p> <p>2. It is quantified against an unstandardised score of 1-5 which are then aggregated. There is no justification as to the relative weight of a score of say 3 in one criterion against a score of 3 in another.</p> <p>3. The presentation is formalised and presented in a traffic light manner who gives undue prominence to what is a simplistic analysis.</p> <p>4. The scores have not been carried out to an appropriate depth. I note that the scores for the Gotham sites are generally lower than those in other towns and villages. This is simply because all the other sites other than Gotham are on the periphery of the settlements and these score highly against the 'sprawl' criterion. With the prominence of the table that highlights this difference I feel these</p>	<p>assessments, including for example landscape appraisals, biodiversity and flooding risk assessments.</p> <p>All purposes carry equal importance, neither are weighted. However should an area of land perform a vital purpose e.g. preventing merging or the setting of historic features then it is considered fundamentally constrained by the Green Belt designation.</p> <p>The use of traffic lights highlights those sites which perform better or worse against green belt purposes.</p> <p>The individual scoring allows a more detailed analysis. The quantitative scores inform the final conclusions and allow a fair comparison of sites around each settlement and across the borough. The methodology broadly follows the same process undertaken to inform the selection of strategic sites. This was subject to examination.</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		quantitative scores should be ignored in favour of a qualitative analysis.		
Beyer, A	1	TOL1 has been assessed as having a Green Belt score of 21, indicating high importance to the Green Belt. Indeed, this is the highest score of all land considered in the January 2016 and February 2017 Green Belt Reviews. I agree with this assessment other than that the score for "Preserve setting and special character of historic settlement" should be 5, not 4, with justification provided in the original representation.	Score remains 4 against the forth purpose (preserving special character) See response to Ball S	Justification amended. See response to Ball S
Beyer, A	1	TOL2 has been assessed as having a Green Belt score of 18. Out of all sites considered in the January 2016 and February 2017 Green Belt Reviews, only TOL1 has a higher Green Belt score. I agree that this land is important to the Green Belt. However, the score for "Prevent merging of settlements" should be 5,	Disagree that TOL2 should score maximum of 5 against the second purpose (merging). Whilst it would result in a significant reduction it would not completely merge, visually or perceptively merge Tollerton with the strategic allocation.	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		not 4, since the site is very close to the new strategic allocations.		
Beyer, A	1	It is important to protect the setting of the Decoy from development on TOL3. This has not been taken into account in the scoring of “Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment”, suggesting that this score should be increased from 3 to 4 for TOL3.	Decoy forms the southern boundary of the Tollerton Hall locally designated Park and Garden and part of the Hall’s listed building curtilage.TOL3 would not adversely affect the setting of Decoy . There is also farm located between the Decoy and TOL3.	Not amended
Beyer, A	1	The gap between TOL3 and the historic core of Tollerton, including St Peter’s Church (with current foundations dating back to the 12th century), the Old Rectory (approx. 1700) and Tollerton Hall and the lake, is important to preserve the setting and character of that historic core. Therefore it is important to prevent development that causes the older and newer parts of Tollerton to merge. The score for “Preserve setting and special character of historic settlement” should be	Disagree that the score for TOL3 against the forth purpose should be increased from 1 to 5. There is clear and considerable separation between TOL3 and the historic core of the village. This separation includes Hall Farm. Existing development opposite on Tollerton Lane already impacts the setting of old Tollerton.	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		increased from 1 to 5		
Beyer, A	1	The current boundary of TOL4 prevents urban sprawl due to the topography of the site. Therefore the score for "Check unrestricted sprawl of settlements" should be 4, not 3.	Disagree - The site is enclosed by development on two sides and would, if the land were not elevated and prominent, warrant a lower score against this objective.	Not amended
Beyer, A	1	Paragraph 85 of the NPPF states that when defining boundaries, local planning authorities should "define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent". TOL1 has weak hedgerows to the southern and eastern boundaries. Only half of the eastern boundary is robust. TOL2 has weak hedgerows to the north and east. TOL3 has no physical feature for its external southeast boundary and has a weak post and wire fence for its northern boundary. TOL4 has weak hedgerow as its external boundary to the north-east.	The weak boundaries of all the sites in Tollerton are reflected in their respective scores.	Not amended
Parker Strategic Land Limited	1	Reiterate and expands on views expressed in 2016 for Green Belt	See response to consultee's comments on COT11 and COT10	COT11 assessment has been amended (see

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		Review sites COT11 and COT10 (Further Options sites COT8 and COT7).	2016 Green Belt Review.	response to January 2016 Review)
Cliffe Investments Ltd	1	KEY1 (Further Options site KEY1) Willow Brook - a review has been undertaken using the Council's template, which scores the site as 9 (low). It would have a more limited impact in terms of the merging of settlements than the wider site (KEY6) assessed by the Council in its Green Belt Review Part 2. Development would not affect existing open areas of land to the south of the Primary School which play a more important function in maintaining separation between Keyworth and Stanton on the Wolds.	Representation refers to KEY6 in the Green Belt Review. Disagree with reduction in score against the second purpose (merging). Land forms an important buffer between Keyworth and Stanton on the Wolds.	Not amended
East of Gamston Group	1	New site - land at Homestead Farm, Tollerton - a review has been undertaken using the Council's template, which scores the site as 11 (low/medium). Development in this location would have a low-medium	This additional site was previously assessed within Part 1 of the Green Belt Review. Expansion of the strategic allocations is not being considered and therefore a further assessment will not be undertaken.	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		impact on the Green Belt and represents a more appropriate option when compared to alternatives adjoining Tollerton village.		
Space Foods Limited	1	We fully support the findings of the Green Belt Review, and in particular the assessment of the green belt importance of sites within Ruddington. The results of the Green Belt Review Part 2 (b), including both the draft document produced in January 2016 and the current consultation document, demonstrates that the land off Asher Lane [Ref: RUD7] is the best performing site in Ruddington in the assessment, and is the only site in Ruddington that is considered of Low Green Belt importance.	Support is noted and welcomed	Not amended
Murray OBO client	1	Land off North Road, Ruddington has been submitted as a location for residential development.	Land off North Road has been assessed and it is concluded that the site is of low-medium Green Belt importance.	Yes - site RUD14 assessment added. The land is considered fundamentally constrained due to the

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
				merging which would occur.
Aspbury Planning	1	<p>The Green Belt Review should take the opportunity to re-assess the value of the Green Belt designation at land at Hillside, Gotham Road (former Hardstraff Group site) and inset it from the Green Belt, for the reasons set out in detail in the submission. Assessment of the site using the matrix and guidance set out in the Green Belt review scores the site as a 6 (low). The site is a well-established employment site which is predominantly brownfield land. It is no longer a valuable Green Belt site as it does not meet any of the purposes as outlined in paragraph 80 of the NPPF. It is large enough to be inset from the Green Belt. This would encourage the regeneration of the brownfield site and reduce unnecessary complexities caused by the site's current position within the</p>	<p>The Green Belt Review Part 2b focusses upon sites that may be allocated for development through Part 2 of the Local Plan. Given the isolated location, the removal of the employment site at Hillside, Gotham Road is unlikely to occur. In accordance with the NPPF inseting applies only to towns and villages, not employment or residential housing sites. Therefore this site will not be assessed. The development of this site would be considered in accordance with the NPPF and any additional policies that may be included within the Local Plan.</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		Green Belt.		
Owners of land east of Loughborough Road	1	<p>Whilst the overall score and impact is considered fair, the assessment that the site is ‘fundamentally constrained’ because of the impact on Easthorpe House does not recognise the opportunity that a sensitively designed scheme could present to preserve view corridors. The site is large, and future careful master planning could seek to ensure that the character and setting of the listed building is preserved. A balanced view must be taken, which sets the benefits of the development of this sustainably located site, which scores generally low-medium in relation to the impact on the Green Belt, against any impact on the listed building. Land to the east of Loughborough Road (RUD12) is considered a sustainable, deliverable site and would therefore be an appropriate location for a housing allocation</p>	<p>Agreement that overall Green Belt score is fair is welcomed. However the assessment cannot consider measures which may avoid, reduce or mitigate effects on the setting of Easthorpe House. The review can only assess the land in its current form. The Green Belt Review will inform site selection through the Local Plan taking into account and balancing the benefits of the location, such as its sustainable location, against any harm, such as impact on the GB and heritage assets.</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		within Ruddington.		
Ceylon Tea Growers Association	1	TOL3 (land east of Tollerton Lane) - Secondly, whilst we agree with the broad thrust of the Green Belt review, we recommend that the site's score be lowered from 12 to 5 to take into account proposed mitigation measures and remove the Green Belt designation given its weak function.	Assessment cannot consider mitigation measures as the review focusses on the performance of the land in its current form against Green Belt purposes. Minimum score is 7 and issue relating to sprawl and encroachment prevent this low score.	Not amended
Bridge S	1	Willowbrook Farm on the A52 to the east of Gamston roundabout is suitable to be removed from the Green Belt. A review has been undertaken using the Council's template, which scores the site as 9 (low).	Willowbrook Farm is an isolated site within the Green Belt. The Council notes the Green Belt assessment undertaken by the consultee, however, given the sites location the site is unlikely to be inset from the Green Belt and allocated through LAPP (insetting applies to settlements not individual sites). Therefore it will not be included within the Review.	Not amended
Slater, Mrs E	1	I disagree that the COT12 site on the western edge of Cotgrave should be reviewed and possibly removed from the Green Belt for providing land for potential housing developments. The	Disagree - reduction from 700m to 500m is considered moderate and therefore against the criteria scores 3. Furthermore the reduction in distance would be experienced primarily by	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>Green Belt site score for site COT12 should be increased to put it in the Medium-High range of importance as a Green Belt site, for the following reasons:</p> <p>Preventing merging of settlements – score should be increased from 3 to 4 due to distance between Cotgrave and Clipston would be greatly reduced from 700m to only 500m.</p> <p>Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment – for the reasons set out the score should be increased from 3 to 4.</p> <p>Therefore, if the scores for each of the two assessments were increased from 3 to 4 then this would increase the overall score to 16, putting site into the Medium to High range of importance as Green Belt land.</p>	<p>walkers on the footpath, not by the majority of residents who would, if travelling between the settlements, travel indirectly by car or bicycle. Disagree that the score for safeguarding countryside should increase from 3 to 4. A score of 3 reflects an absence of inappropriate development but overriding urban fringe character.</p>	
Historic England	1	Gotham – GOT2 – This is scored as	Known finds have not been identified	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>1 for the historic settlement section and the text reads ‘There are no heritage assets within the site or within locations that would be affected by the removal of this area of land from the Green Belt’ but there is the potential for non-designated heritage assets at the site since there has been a find in the vicinity. Detailed site assessment in respect of the historic environment would assist in informing the Review.</p>	<p>through the heritage assessment nor have impacts on other heritage assets.</p>	
Historic England	1	<p>Gotham – GOT3 – This is scored as 1 for the historic settlement section but it is not clear how the historic environment, heritage assets or setting have been assessed in order to reach that conclusion.</p>	<p>The assessment of a site’s importance to the historic setting of a settlement involves the map based identification of designated and non-designated assets (listed and locally identified structures and conservation areas) and a site visit to determine whether their setting and the setting of the historic character of the village will be adversely affected. Furthermore, no known assets have been identified through heritage assessment.</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Historic England	1	Gotham – GOT4 – This is scored as 2 which has no definition in the methodology scoring criteria. The explanatory historic settlement text sets out that the land forms part of the setting for the historic core of Gotham as viewed on the approach from Leake Road but there is no evidence to demonstrate how this has been assessed to confirm why the score is 2 and not higher, and if higher what mitigation measures might be appropriate in order to reduce the score.	The centre of Gotham is not designated a Conservation Area consequently the assessment of sites that affect its setting result in a lower score. For example developments that affect conservation areas have consistently scored higher (see scores for East Bridgford). The review does not consider mitigation as the assessment focuses on the performance of the land in its current form. Footnote below assessment criteria explains sites scored 2 or 4.	Not amended
Historic England	1	Gotham – GOT5 and GOT6 – The historic environment information scores 1 for each of these sites. However, there is a high survival of field patterns which form part of the historic landscape character and setting for Gotham and the loss of these would have an adverse impact on the historic environment. It is not clear how these have been assessed	Agreed - the presence of ridge and furrow has now been recognised in the assessment as its presence may form part of the historic setting of towns and villages. The reappraisal of the site has resulted in a higher score against the fourth purpose. This includes GOT7. Historic field patterns are also identified through the landscape appraisal which will inform site	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		as part of the Review or SHLAA to inform the process. Detailed site assessment in respect of the historic environment would assist in informing the Review.	selection.	
Historic England	1	Gotham – GOT7 – The historic settlement information scores 1 for this site, but the explanatory text states that ‘apart from ridge and furrow, there are no heritage assets within the site’. This highlights again the inconsistency in approach to the historic environment and the Green Belt Review since the Review methodology does not provide for non-designated heritage assets, yet the text for this site acknowledges the non-designated ridge and furrow as a heritage asset. It is our view that the loss would have an adverse effect on the historic environment but there is no information within the Review to assess the significance of the potential loss. As such, it is not clear	The review does include the assessment of the Green Belt importance to the preservation of a settlements historic setting. Agreed - the presence of ridge and furrow has been taken into account and resulted a higher score against the forth purpose. This includes GOT7. The review considers the importance of the Green Belt to the preservation of ridge and furrow as significant. Removal of Green Belt designation would result in development that would destroy these features and there the historical agricultural setting of the village.	See response to Jackson, Mr and Mrs.

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>how these have been assessed as part of the Review or SHLAA to inform the process. Detailed site assessment in respect of the historic environment would assist in informing the Review.</p>		
Wilkins, L	1	<p>GOT7: Preserve setting and special character of historic settlement – this is scored 1 giving a total score of 8. However, this should be scored category 5, giving a total score of 12. The beautiful example of a ridge and furrow field beyond is ignored, which is a great heritage asset to England, not just to Gotham. Heritage England recognises the importance of such fields.</p> <p>Careful archaeological investigation of such fields before any thoughts of development should be considered. The field is surrounded by mature natural hedges and trees. There are regularly bats, grass snakes, herons and green woodpeckers It is a</p>	<p>Agreed - ridge and furrow contribute to the heritage setting of Gotham. Score is increased from 1 to 3 as these non-designated assets would be completely destroyed if the site were removed from the Green Belt and developed without mitigation.</p> <p>Green Belt purposes do not include protection or enhancement of the natural environment. These issues are addressed through the site selection process.</p>	<p>See response to Jackson, Mr and Mrs.</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		wonderful area of countryside that should be preserved.		
Corder, D	1	RUD12: Land North of Flawforth Lane. The score for ' Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment ' is too high. A score of 3 would be more appropriate. The site is bounded on the north eastern side by Silverdale Farm and the associated buildings and one other dwelling. In conjunction with the existing housing immediately to the south of the land this makes the urban edge a very significant feature of the land and means that the land does not have the character of open countryside. The associated dwelling may represent inappropriate development. The score for ' Preserve setting and special character of historic settlement ' is too high. A score of 3 would be more appropriate. Whilst the land forms the setting for Easthorpe House, this	Disagree - as stated in the review, the edge of Ruddington is visible but not prominent. Silverdale Farm is an appropriate development in the Green Belt and not an urbanising feature. Easthorpe House is a prominent 'country house', within extensive grounds that are open. Its visibility does not detract from the open countryside character. The extensive tree belts and hedgerow screen neighbouring development to the south and west, and views east are of open countryside. The presence of cars is temporary and there are no car parking spaces south of the building (between the property and RUD12). The presence of developments that already adversely affect the setting of Easthorpe House (including its setting) and the Conservation Area does not diminish the importance of the Green	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>building already has car parking on three sides of it. Silverdale Farm is close by. The A60 is only around 50m away. The historic setting of the Easthorpe House has already been significantly diminished by these developments.</p>	<p>Belt to the setting of these historic assets. Heritage assessments confirm these adverse effects.</p>	
Dorman, M	1	<p>I agree with the conclusion against TOL 1. I disagree that TOL 2 is being considered as a separate area from TOL1. Identifying them as two separate areas seems arbitrary in the extreme due their size and location. In fact in the other response document the area North of Medina Drive is classed as one area. Can you please clarify this anomaly? As the highest scores of all sites considered it seems strange that these sites were not discounted earlier in evaluation process.</p>	<p>TOL1 and TOL2 are separated (the site is one area in the LAPP consultation document) due to the scale of site when combined, and a judgment was made to assess as two separate parcels of land. Separating the sites allows for a fair comparison with other sites that are smaller. It would also provide a Green Belt assessment of the area directly adjacent to Tollerton, if a smaller allocation were considered. TOL1 and TOL2 (TOL1 in the LAPP) were included in the review in order to establish their Green Belt importance, they could not and will not be screened out prior to or after the review is</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			completed. The decision to progress sites will be taken through the Local Plan process, informed by the Green Belt Review and other evidence.	
Tollerton PC	1	<p>TOL 1 Land South of Little Lane Agree fundamentally constrained and key to green buffer and defensible green belt between Tollerton and Strategic Allocation Site We view the preserve character score as too low, this should be 5 to reflect historic mill and local conservation designation in the Tollerton Character, Heritage and Conservation Strategy</p> <p>TOL 2 Land West of Tollerton Lane Is of high importance to the green belt and also key to green buffer and defensible green belt between Tollerton and Strategic Allocation Site. Prevent merging of settlements should therefore be scored 5.</p> <p>TOL3 – Land East of Tollerton Lane</p>	<p>TOL1: Whilst adjacent to the historic core, the ‘old village’ is not designated a Conservation Area and as indicated by the Heritage Assessment the setting of the listed buildings are unlikely to be affected as the majority, including the Hall, Church and Bassingfield House, are on the eastern side of Tollerton Lane. There are a number of local buildings of interest west of Tollerton Lane and their agricultural setting would be affected.</p> <p>The evidence supporting the presence of a Mill within TOL1 (or TOL2) is noted, however, the authority can identify no further evidence of a mill being located within TOL1 (or TOL2). Given the conclusion that impacts on the listed buildings are less significant, the assessment of TOL1’s</p>	<p>Additional text added <i>“<u>Although the listed buildings are separated from TOL1 by Tollerton Lane and screened by trees, collectively ‘old Tollerton’ represents a traditional linear settlement and TOL1 preserves the setting and historic rural character of this area.</u>”</i></p> <p>Score remains 4. Reference to TOL1 amended to new referencing system.</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>Current boundary of site is clear, permanent and key to preventing urban sprawl. The proposed change would not form an appropriate replacement. Views across this site extend from the village centre along Burnside Grove. Development of this site would give the perception in the reduction of distance between Tollerton, Normanton and Plumtree. Prevent merging should have a score of 2. Rushcliffe SHLAA site concludes this site is only suitable for local need – no evidence of this has been provided and at this time the parish council concludes that none has been established.</p> <p>This green belt review has been instigated in response to strategic need and therefore this site should not be considered. The site lies in a designated neighbourhood plan area – this is appropriate process to determine</p>	<p>performance against the forth purpose has been amended. However due to the impact on the setting of 'old Tollerton' as a whole the Green Belt still performs an important function against this purpose.</p> <p>TOL2 - Disagree that TOL2's score against merging should be 5. The removal of TOL2 alone would result in a significant reduction in distance between Tollerton and the strategic allocation. It would not result in the complete or near complete merging of these areas (as TOL1 (which score 5) would achieve).</p> <p>TOL3 - Disagree that TOL3, if removed, would result in more than a limited reduction in the distance between Tollerton, Plumtree and Normanton. Site does not extend beyond the existing properties on Tollerton Lane. Regarding Neighbourhood Plans as the appropriate planning document to determine need and allocate sites,</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>local need and allocation of sites for local need. Site is setting for properties contained on a local list set out in the Tollerton Character, Heritage and Conservation Strategy and should score a 2. The site also provides the setting for the Decoy and grounds of Tollerton Hall which has not been considered.</p> <p>TOL 4 – Land North of Burnside Grove The topography of the site means that the current boundary prevents sprawl and should be scored a 4</p>	<p>neighbourhood plans cannot, under current planning legislation remove land from the Green Belt. This can only occur through the Local Plan. They can however inform Local Plans.</p> <p>TOL4 – Disagree with increase against sprawl to 5. Whilst the current boundary prevents sprawl, the objective of the review is to identify Green Belt sites and therefore alterative/new boundaries. The topography of the land is considered and results in a higher scorer against the first purpose, as would otherwise be the case.</p>	
Mordecai	1	<p>The boundaries of RUD6 appear to have been altered from the original assessment. RUD6 now includes The Croft (RUD14) and the Balmore House residential care home. However there has been no additional or revised assessment of RUD6. It is considered that the</p>	<p>RUD6 has been re-assessed (see response to January 2016 Green Belt Review (LAPP Issues and Options). The addition of Croft house and Balmore House have resulted in a reduction in Green Belt importance from 17 (medium high) to 14 (low-medium).</p>	<p>See response to consultee comments on January 2016 review. RUD6 re-assessed.</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>assessment should be updated and it is suggested that, given the presence of development and urban influences in the form of The Croft and Balmore House, this parcel would have a stronger visual relationship with the built up area. As such, this assessment would potentially lead to a lower score being given in terms of Green Belt Purposes which check the unrestricted sprawl of settlements and assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</p>		
Mordecai	1	<p>Draft Green Belt Review 2b proposed removal of Flawforth Avenue and houses fronting Loughborough Road from the Green Belt. FO site RUD14 is visually associated with the residential development fronting Loughborough Road and should be considered for removal from the Green Belt alongside it.</p>	<p>Unlike Flawforth Avenue, RUD14 (Further Options) is a single dwelling within a substantial garden. Consequently the land does contribute to the openness of the Green Belt and its removal from the Green Belt will not take place as a minor amendment. It is however assessed as part of a wider area (RUD6 in the GB Review) as a possible allocation site.</p>	<p>LAPP Further Options site RUD14 assessed as part of an enlarged RUD6.</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Mordecai	1	Support conclusion that RUD11 is fundamentally constrained. This appears to be an appropriate conclusion given the importance of the land in maintaining separation between the main built up areas of Ruddington and West Bridgford.	Support noted	Not amended
Mordecai	1	Support conclusion that site RUD12 is fundamentally constrained. This appears to be an appropriate conclusion given that the land preserves the historic setting of Easthorpe House.	Support noted	Not amended
British Gypsum	1	Green Belt Review boundaries are too tightly drawn around Gotham. This results in inflexibility if preferred allocations do not come forward. Sites to the south of the village under British Gypsum ownership should be reassessed through the GB Review.	The Green Belt boundary around Gotham reflects the physical separation between the built up area and open countryside. Possible allocations have been assessed through the Green Belt Review Further Options consultation. This includes sites under British Gypsum's ownership. Land of west Hill Road has not been assessed as the site is a wildlife site and therefore excluded, as	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			has the employment site which is not adjacent to or close to the village.	
BT Hoyland	1	Land East of Hollygate Lane is submitted as a new site through the Further Options consultation. A GB score assessment for the site is provided as part of the submission.	This site has been assessed and is included within the Green Belt Review. Having visited the site and considered the scores submitted by the consultee it is concluded that the site is of low-medium Green Belt importance (scoring 14).	New site COT14 has been included within the review.
Bradley, J	1	Disagree with the review scoring for CRO6. A revised assessment and score is supplied as part of the submission. Also disagree with the scoring for CRO1 and CRO2 in regards to heritage - in particular the canal, and the value of Hoe Hill Wood, ridge and furrow.	CRO6: The landowner of CRO6 has submitted a revision of the site, increasing the size of the site to the south. This has been reassessed and the comments made by this consultee have been considered as part of the assessment of the larger site. Due to increased sprawl the performance of the land against the first purpose is increased from 3 to 4. Disagree that CRO6 will result in a moderate reduction in the distance between settlements. The Canalside Industrial Estate is an isolated area within the Green Belt. It is not a	Additional text added to assessment of CRO2 against the fourth purpose. <i>“The site contains prominent areas of ridge and furrow. These contribute to the historic agricultural setting of the village.”</i> Score increased from 2 to 3. Site re-referenced to new referencing system in the document

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p>settlement against which merging could occur.</p> <p>Disagree with increase against the 3rd purpose from 2 to 4. Whilst the land does not contain inappropriate development, the edge of Cropwell Bishop is a prominent feature.</p> <p>Disagree with increase against 4th purpose from 3 to 4. Whilst ridge and furrow is not clearly identifiable, the impact on the setting of locally designated buildings results in a score of 3.</p> <p>CRO1 and CRO2: Disagree with proposed increases in score against the 4th purpose (historic setting) for CRO1 and CRO2. The canal is not a designated heritage asset and views from the canal are screened by thick vegetation. Therefore, it is considered that the impacts on its setting are limited.</p> <p>For CRO2, the presence of prominent ridge and furrow however results in a score of 3 against this purpose.</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Drew, R	1	Disagree in respect to CRO5 - In particular with respect to check unrestricted sprawl of settlements , the justification states “there is a tree belt along the boundary of the school which provides a robust northern boundary”. This is incorrect; almost all of the trees were cut down approximately one year ago. This boundary is now a chain link fence with the occasional bush. When comparing to other sites, I believe this score currently given requires review based on the change to the situation.	Agreed – the site’s northern boundary has been weakened by the removal of vegetation along the school playing field. The score against the first purpose is not reduced however, as the boundary is clearly identifiable and, due to the presence of the school, is robust and permanent.	Justification for CRO5’s score against the first purpose amended: <i>“There is a post and wire fence (with dispersed trees) along the boundary of the school playing field which provides a clearly defined northern boundary. Fern Road provides a strong southern boundary.”</i>
Andrew Kordecki	2	Keen to protect Springdale Lane and the historic ridge and furrow fields and its colony of Grass Snakes. Photographs of this species have been taken 30m from the proposed site on Springdale Lane	Presence of ridge and furrow is recognised in the review and score against the forth purpose amended. Ecological issues are considered within the individual site assessments. Green Belt Review considers compliance with Green Belt purposes.	EAS6 score against fourth purpose (preserving historic character) increased from 1 to 3. Justification amended: <i>“The Green Belt designation prevents the loss of ridge and furrow. Ridge and furrow</i>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
				<p><i>contributes to the historic agricultural setting of the village.”</i></p> <p>Total score increased to 17 (medium to high) and conclusion amended: <i>“Whilst the land does not contribute to the setting of any designated assets, the presence of ridge and furrow, which is important to the historical setting of East Bridgford, increases the land’s performance against the fourth Green belt purpose.”</i></p>
Richard Grimes	2	Impact on neighbouring properties at Closes Side Lane which are mainly bungalows with shallow gardens. In appropriate to build two storey homes which would rob residents of their privacy, their views and their sunlight. If developed, build on Closeside Lane East ONLY. Buildings should be low	Representation does not address specific Green Belt purposes. Site specific concerns will be considered through policy or through the determination of planning applications.	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		rise single story homes.		
Dr John Rieley	2	<p>The methodology used to grade green belt sites into those of high, medium and low value is without basis in terms of reality and is based upon the opinions of the assessor in the absence of real knowledge of the areas in question. It is unclear what evidence on the various assessment criteria were gathered and what expertise the assessors had in evaluating them.</p> <p>For example, one site in East Bridgford has ancient ridge and furrow in evidence in it a fact not mentioned. Some sites are said to have low or little countryside or wildlife value. This is nonsense as the Rushcliffe assessors have no knowledge of East Bridgford's wildlife that is very diverse and occurs everywhere. For example, to say that sites are only used by smallholders is to denigrate this important group in</p>	<p>In order to assess and compare sites equally the methodology employs a scoring system, based on criteria which focus on Green Belt purposes. It was undertaken by experienced planning officers who understand the purposes of the Green Belt and its importance in Rushcliffe. The assessment included desk based analysis supported by site visits. The presence of ridge and furrow was not previously considered within the assessment of a site's importance against the fourth purpose (preserving historic character) as it is not a designated heritage asset. However, following advice from Historic England this position has changed and sites which include ridge and furrow have been re-assessed (see GOT7).</p> <p>Regarding wildlife, the conservation of wildlife is not a Green Belt purpose and does not influence the review. This is</p>	<p>Sites identified as having best examples of ridge and furrow score a minimum of 3.</p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>the local community who depend on Green Belt fields for their livelihood. In these fields there may be few wild plants of interest but they are a habitat for many bird species that fly and feed above them, hares and badgers that roam across them and bats that feed in the sky above them at dusk.</p>	<p>considered through the site selection process.</p>	
Michael Verner	2	<p>Focus should be made on areas in Rushcliffe with significant BROWN FIELD SITES where new schools can be built and good connection's to roads into the city of Nottingham and to main routes where there are existing transport systems. Major traffic congestion problems are experienced every day, especially in the area of the A6097 from the A46 and from the Lowdham Island. EAST BRIDGFORD where drivers are using the village to try and avoid queues going over Gunthorpe Bridge</p>	<p>The broad distribution of development across the borough is set out in the adopted Core Strategy. Representation does not address specific Green Belt purposes. Infrastructure and traffic issues will be considered at part of the site selection within the Sustainability Appraisal</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
TABU	2	<p>Piecemeal review of the Green Belt continues to cause problems and inconsistencies.</p> <p>In each of the previous reviews (Parts 1 and 2a and Part 2b), the Green Belt has been divided into different sizes and shapes of land – this is not a consistent approach in terms of consideration of the relative importance of different parts of the Green Belt. Those sites that are reviewed more times are more likely to be removed from the Green Belt, especially if they are reviewed differently each time.</p> <p>The frequency of review of the same parcels of land is not consistent with paragraph 83 of the NPPF that states. It is inconsistent with this to alter the Green Belt boundaries within Zone 5 of the Green Belt Review 2013 (which states that Zone 5.1 “should ideally remain as Green Belt”) in December 2014 and then to review and possibly seek to alter them again</p>	<p>The 2013 Green Belt review (Part 1 and 2a) informed the selection urban extensions broadly from the main urban area outwards. The second review (Part 2b) informs the selection of the non-strategic sites within Land and Planning Policies (Local Plan Part 2). As they assess the selection of different sized sites, the assessments do look at land at different scales and shapes.</p> <p>Furthermore both the 2013 Review (Green Belt Review Parts 1 and 2a) and the 2017 Review (Green Belt Review Part 2b) are in effect part of the same green belt review and inform the combined Local Plan. There is no conflict with the requirement to ensure long term permanence beyond the plan period.</p> <p>Tollerton is not being treated differently. Due to its location in close proximity to the urban edge and the opportunities to deliver both a strategic site and non-strategic sites it has</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>in 2017. Residents have been misled regarding process and consultation. Tollerton is being treated differently from other areas in that Zone 5.1 was reviewed in 2013 and it is being reviewed again in 2017 with a new consultation in the light of increased housing requirements. Other sites (e.g. those considered in 2016) are not being subjected to a second consultation in the light of these changes.</p> <p>Sites previously consulted upon as a result of their inclusion in the 2013 Green Belt Review should not be consulted on again unless all previously reviewed sites (from 2013 and 2016 reviews) which still have available housing land are also consulted upon again.</p> <p>Removal of further Green Belt in Tollerton would not be consistent with the Inspector's view that no further Green Belt should be removed north</p>	<p>undergone two assessments within the one Green Belt Review.</p> <p>Regarding the re-assessment of sites assessed in 2016, these remain within the Green Belt Review and do not require a re-assessment. They will be considered prior to publication of the Preferred Options Local Plan Part 2.</p> <p>The merging of land between Tollerton, the main urban area and the strategic allocation (as recognised by the Inspector) has informed the scoring of sites on the edge of Tollerton. TOL1 is fundamentally constrained and TOL2 is deemed to be of medium-high green belt importance.</p> <p>The consideration of densities within TOL3 and weighting of benefits and harm to the Green Belt will occur during site selection prior to publication of the Preferred Options if sites are identified as a preferred option.</p> <p>The elevated location of TOL4 (TOL3 in the LAPP Further Options consultation) has been considered and</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>of Tollerton.</p> <p>The proposed sites in Tollerton should not be removed from the Green Belt: The proximity of TOL1 and TOL2 to the approved strategic allocation North of Tollerton makes these sites non-starters for development due to coalescence with that allocation. The relatively small number of houses that could be sensibly accommodated on TOL3 for loss of a relatively long area of extensive views of important open countryside makes TOL3 unsuitable for development. The open countryside north of Burnside Grove contributes to the rurality of Tollerton and, due to the slope of the land. Any development would be visible over quite a distance to the north. Therefore this part of the Green Belt must be retained to prevent unrestricted and conspicuous sprawl.</p>	<p>has resulted in a higher score against the first purpose, checking unrestricted sprawl.</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
Leech, Amanda	2	Unclear why work on the original 4000 has not started. Unfair. More damaging to the village - traffic and loss of views.	Noted - Representation does not address specific Green Belt purposes.	Not amended
Wilson, C	2	The roads around the village are bad enough now without extra housing. Tollerton Lane is very dangerous during to school rush times as it becomes only one car wide for a long stretch due to all the parents parking on it. Also I have the risk of being hit by another car every day as the access drive to my house is a hill start where you can't see so have to put half your car in the road and pray there is nothing coming. If you supply more houses we will need our own doctors surgery as the one we are within Keyworth can't cope with that many more patients	Noted - Representation does not address specific Green Belt purposes. Traffic issues will be considered at part of site selection and assessed within the Sustainability Appraisal	Not amended
Ray	2	Stop taking the easy approach and ruining the British countryside. All other options should be exhausted before building on greenbelt land.	Comment noted - Representation does not address performance of land against Green Belt purposes.	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>Why do you have to put all of the housing within such a small area, Tollerton, Cotgrave, Sharphill?</p> <p>I agree we should all contribute to the need for extra housing but it should be distributed fairly.</p>		
Hallsworth	2	<p>I have recently had the experience of seeing just how little regard Rushcliffe Borough Council Planning department has for the environment. In a neighbouring property the planners (after visiting the site) allowed a 40 year old pond to be dug up without any ecological surveys. The pond used to be home to newts which are a protected species! They also did not insist on a tree survey prior to giving planning permission which has meant that deep excavations have been made in the root protection area around some lovely mature trees. Before RBC starts destroying more countryside,</p>	<p>Comment noted - Representation does not address performance of land against Green Belt purposes. Impacts on ecology and possible mitigation will be assessed through the plan making process and through the sustainability appraisal process.</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		they should demonstrate that they are able to understand their environmental obligations and look after the environment a little bit better in areas that already have housing.		
Burnett, P	2	<p>I consider that no site proposed for development should extend up to any Green Belt boundaries, e.g. RUD 8 extended up to Clifton, & RUD2 extended up to Wilford.</p> <p>There is a nesting pair of Buzzards in the woods on the south-east boundary of this site, so wildlife would need protection.</p> <p>This is an important area for people to enjoy outdoors activities including walking, running, restful meal times, horse riding, exercising dogs, foraging, and appreciating wild life.</p>	<p>Sites that increase the likelihood of merging Ruddington with the main urban area have been assessed as fundamentally constrained by the Green Belt designation. This constraint will be given considerable weight when assessing the suitability of land for housing on the edge of Ruddington. Ecological and recreational/leisure issues will be assessed through the Sustainability Appraisal.</p>	Not amended
	2	It is completely inappropriate to consider Green Belt development in Ruddington. There are countless other sites in the Borough that should be considered before considering	The release of Green Belt land on the edge of Ruddington is established by Core Strategy policy 3 and policy 4, which was adopted in 2014 and which underwent independent examination.	<p>Additional text added to explain the lower score of 2 against fourth purpose for RUD13.</p> <p><i>"Views from the A60</i></p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>destroying the Green Belt. There is no reason to extend the boundaries of the village at the expense of the Green Belt. The village itself does not have sufficient infrastructure to support such unchecked growth. The primary purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent the sprawl of urban areas and this kind of development completely flies in the face of such policy. The inclusion of these sites is opportunistic on the part of the landowners, as they would not have expected to be given such an opportunity to develop their sites for financial gain at the expense of conservation of the Green Belt. Furthermore the locations at RUD6, RUD12 and RUD13 are within or adjacent to the Village Conservation Area, so should not be considered on that basis alone. The site at RUD13 would be a completely unchecked development</p>	<p>The level of infrastructure was examined at this time and informed the level of housing proposed for Ruddington. Further assessments of infrastructure capacity and mitigation will support the development of Local Plan Part 2.</p> <p>The prevention of sprawl is a Green Belt purpose, and whilst any loss of Green Belt for development would result in sprawl, the location of a site, its visibility and presence of defensible boundaries are factors which determine the extent and/or perception of sprawl. This informs the Green Belt Review, which itself informs the Local Plan that ultimately determines whether exceptional circumstances exist to remove land from the Green Belt.</p> <p>The impact on Ruddington's conservation area has informed the performance of RUD6, RUD12 and RUD13 against the forth Green Belt purpose (preserving the setting and</p>	<p><i>within conservation area, as identified in the Townscape Appraisal, do not extend across the site due to an established hedgerow".</i></p>

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>beyond the edge of the village. Furthermore at peak traffic times Loughborough Road is already grid locked as it is often with traffic jams back to Bradmore and even Bunny, so further development in this area will exacerbate the problem and is not in keeping with a semi-rural area.</p>	<p>special character of historic settlement). RUD6 and RUD12 contain land within the Conservation Area and are therefore removal would directly affect this designated area. Views of RUD13 are restricted and amended text for RUD13's score against the forth purpose is now included. The weak external boundary has resulted in a higher score against the first Green Belt purpose (check unrestricted sprawl). Traffic and congestion are not Green Belt issues, these will be considered through site selection within the Sustainability Appraisal (informed through advice from Nottinghamshire County Council).</p>	
McKenzie-Small	2	<p>It was disappointing not to be consulted in this or the earlier round. Our garden directly adjoins the northern of the two fields, making us one of its five neighbours. I would call into question a process that hasn't</p>	<p>There are no legal requirements to consult neighbours of potential development sites. However the Council has sought to engage all residents through exhibitions and leaflet drops within settlements where</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		involved all of the stakeholders.	development is proposed. In Ruddington, this occurred last year on the original allocations proposed. There was no second exhibition or leaflet drop regarding the additional allocations such as RUD11. As a rule residents are made aware of the Local Plan process and developments that may affect them, this is evidenced through the consultee's representation. The consultee is on our Local Plan database and will be consulted when further consultation is undertaken throughout the development of the plan.	
Newton Nottingham LLP	2	There are grounds to release the additional land (adjacent to the Newton Strategic Site), required for the allotments and public open space, from the Green Belt if necessary. To demonstrate this point, we have undertaken an appraisal of the site's green belt function using the same methodology as employed by the	Expansion of existing strategic allocations is not proposed within the LAPP. Area proposed for development is within the existing inset boundary. Further alteration to the Green Belt boundary would not be required in most cases as in general terms, recreational open space and	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>Council. Check unrestricted sprawl of settlements The land outside the existing Green Belt will have two boundaries adjoining the existing permitted area of development at RAF Newton and will, in effect, be a visually well-connected 'rounding off' that settlement. Using the Council's assessment matrix, the site should score '1'.</p> <p>Prevent merging of settlements. The proposed area will not extend the built area westwards beyond its existing most westerly point, nor would it extend Newton northwards beyond the existing village properties on Shelford Road. The assessment matrix score should be '1'.</p> <p>Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment Given that area is located between the existing properties in Newton on Shelford Road and the permitted development area, we do not believe</p>	<p>allotments would fall under 'provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it'.</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>that the area could be described as materially encroaching onto open countryside. However, we accept that these areas have not themselves been the subject of inappropriate development already. On this basis, the assessment matrix score should be '3' at most.</p> <p>Preserve setting and special character of the historic environment. The land does not contain nor form the setting of a designated or non-designated heritage asset. Its score should therefore be '1'</p> <p>Assist in urban regeneration. The councils default score of 3 is appropriate in this case too, although the land in question will form part of the regeneration of the Newton site which is an existing major developed site that has been removed from the green belt. Overall, the additional land at Newton scores 9.</p>		
Horner, S	2	The document implies that Gotham	Consultation on Local Plan Part 2	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		will be inset. Not clear what the inset will be or whether Gotham will be inset or washed over.	Issues and Options included consultation on the supporting Green Belt Review January 2016. This review identified the draft inset boundary for Gotham. The decision to inset Gotham is endorsed within Policy 4 of the adopted Core Strategy which has been subject to independent examination.	
Horner, S	2	The Green Belt in Rushcliffe provides planners with a dilemma. Concentrate development on a few centres or spread the development and include small villages. In the spirit of the Green Belt to my mind the former is preferable to the latter	Advice regarding the strategic distribution is welcomed. Both concentrating development and distributing development across the borough pose Green Belt issues. Locating more development in settlements closer to the main urban area, such as Ruddington, risk merging. Other settlements contain historic assets which contribute to the historic setting. The selection of sites, informed by the Green Belt Review will be made according to the overall strategy that takes account of a wide range of factors, including infrastructure and services (including	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			transport), landscape, and ecology.	
Beyer, A	2	<p>The Green Belt Review (February 2017) reviews sites TOL1, TOL2 and TOL4 which are all contained in Zone 5.1 which was reviewed in the Green Belt Review (2013). This zone is also within the area reviewed in the Green Belt Review (2006). In each case, the Green Belt has been divided into different sizes and shapes of land – this is not a consistent approach in terms of consideration of the relative importance of different parts of the Green Belt.</p> <p>The frequency of review of the same parcels of land is not consistent with paragraph 83 of the NPPF. It is inconsistent with this to alter the Green Belt boundaries within Zone 5 of the Green Belt Review 2013 in December 2014 and then to review and possibly seek to alter them again in 2017. The 2013 Green Belt Review stated that Zone 5.1 “should ideally</p>	<p>The 2013 Green Belt Review informed the selection on strategic sites which extend the main urban area through Part 1 of the Local Plan (Core Strategy). The second review assesses non-strategic (smaller) sites on the edge of inset villages where additional housing may be suitable. They are two distinct assessments examining the performance of Green Belt at two different scales. As the latter seeks to identify smaller sites at individual field level their approaches, whilst similar (assessing five green belt purposes), are different. As Tollerton has been identified as a settlement where a limited amount of development could be accommodated it has been assessed twice.</p>	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		remain as Green Belt". It would be perverse to remove land within that zone from the Green Belt so soon after deciding to retain it as Green Belt.		
Beyer, A	2	Removal of further Green Belt in Tollerton would not be consistent with the Core Strategy Inspector's view that further land should be allocated south of the strategic allocation.	The Inspector's Core Strategy Report referred further expansion of the strategic site, not the identification of sites on the edge of Tollerton itself. Notwithstanding this, the merging of Tollerton and strategic allocation (main urban area) has informed the review and resulted in TOI1 being fundamentally constrained.	Not amended
Butler, M	2	Assume this consultation only refers to additional sites and not those that we have already commented on in March 2016. If this refers to all the sites, original and new then reiterate my comments submitted at the time about Hillside Farm, Keyworth.	See response to consultee's comments on 2016 Green Belt Review.	Not amended
Slater, Mrs E	2	The importance of the land for farming purposes should be taken into account when assessing land as	The importance of the land for farming purposes and recreational benefits are not considered within the Green Belt	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		Green Belt land. The use of Green Belt land as an amenity for people to walk in along the public footpaths and for horse riding should also be assessed. A number of reasons why the land is not suitable for development are then set out, which have been taken into account when summarising Further Options consultation representations.	review as these are not Green Belt purposes (as set out in the NPPF). These issues will be considered alongside the Green Belt Review through site selection and further consultation on Local Plan Part 2 through the sustainability appraisal process.	
Historic England	2	Of the Methodology which has been applied to the 2014 and current review the parameters of the review for the historic environment relate to highly valued assets only so does not account for the requirements of NPPF para.139 in relation to non-designated assets, particularly archaeology. We feel that this limit to high value assets misses valuable historic landscape setting information, such as areas where there is high survival of field patterns, including ridge and furrow, which can have	The presence of ridge and furrow has been re-assessed and sites where the Green Belt protects these features have been re-scored as 3 against the forth purpose. Ridge and furrow provide historical context for rural settlements. Removal of Green Belt and subsequent development would result in the complete loss of these features. Regarding non-designated heritage assets and archaeology, these have been assessed within the heritage assessment of possible allocations. This will inform site	Ridge and furrow is included within the review and score of 3 is applied where well preserved features would be lost through development.

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		links to the historic core of the settlement. It is recommended that the Council considers if/how this could be addressed in the Green Belt Review. If it is concluded that the Council has considered the historic environment appropriately in respect of the Green Belt Review, but that more detailed assessment information elsewhere in the process would inform site selection overall, then it would be worth making that clear in the Additional Sites report.	selection alongside the Green Belt Review. Methodology applied to the 2014 GB Review was not questioned by an independent inspector.	
Historic England	2	Review text should be amended since historic settlement site comments relate to 'heritage assets' as a whole. Heritage assets include designated and non-designated heritage assets whereas the methodology only addresses designated at present. It is not clear how setting has been assessed either.	Disagree - The assessment criteria within the Green Belt Review of Additional Sites outlines the methodology of assessing the Green Belts importance against the fourth purpose. It states: <i>"the degree of harm that may be caused to the setting or special character of the existing built up area settlement, taking into account the visual aspect of designated and non-designated heritage assets"</i>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
			<p><i>(conservation areas, listed buildings, historic parks and gardens, scheduled monuments or important heritage feature).</i>" The matrix refers to designated and non-designated heritage assets. There is no detailed methodology for assessing the effect on setting. Effects will depend on the asset, its importance and character, and the value of the setting to this character.</p>	
Historic England	2	<p>We recommend that the methodology for site assessment contained in Historic England Advice Note (HEAN) 3: The Historic Environment and Site Allocations in Local Plans is used to consider sites in relation to the historic environment. Outcomes from any such site assessment work could be included in the Green Belt Review as well as the LP Part 2 Further Options document moving forward. This would assist with providing clarity as to how the historic</p>	<p>A separate heritage assessment has been carried out on site options prior to a preferred options consultation. This has, in part, informed revisions to the Green Belt review where appropriate.. This assessment has informed the Green Belt Review. Mitigation of effects upon heritage assets will be considered during site selection.</p>	

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		<p>environment has been assessed in order to differentiate between the scores of 3 and 5 – at present it is not clear how adverse impact and significant adverse impact has been determined and it is not clear whether assessment has been consistent across all sites. As well as adding to the evidence base in respect of heritage assets and setting information, such assessment work could identify sites which may have a higher score in relation to Green Belt Review assessment at present but where mitigation measures could apply and result in a situation where all, or part, of a site could actually be considered for bringing forward in the Local Plan Part 2 Additional Sites in relation to the historic environment:</p>		
Historic England	2	Cotgrave – COT12 – The historic settlement information does not account for any unknown	Unknown archaeology cannot inform the Green Belt Review which focuses on the preservation of historic	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		archaeology at present so the score could potentially increase;	character and its setting. These are known and identifiable features. The site selection process will be informed by an assessment of heritage assets this will include possible archaeological features.	
Historic England	2	Cropwell Bishop – CRO5 – The historic settlement information is scored as 1 although it states that the Green Belt forms part of the setting for this part of the village. As such, the score could possibly be higher depending on any historic environment assessment outcome;	There are no identified heritage assets that would be adversely affected. It is agreed that the proximity to the historic core should result in a higher score of against that purpose. Further assessment has identified the presence of prominent ridge and furrow within the south east field adjacent to Fern Road. This has increased the score against the forth purpose to 3.	CRO5 score against preserving historic character is increased from 1 to 3. Additional text added to the justification: <i>“The south eastern field, adjacent to Fern Road, contains prominent ridge and furrow. These contribute to the historic agricultural setting of the village.”</i> Total score increased from 10 to 12. Land is low-medium Green Belt importance.
Historic England	2	East Bridgford – EAS4 – The historic	The heritage assessment does not	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		settlement information is scored as 3 although this could be a significant adverse impact to score 5 depending on any historic environment assessment outcome;	identify any significant individual heritage assets which may be affected.	
Nottinghamshire County Council	2	<u>Proposed insets for washed over villages:</u> In broad agreement with the methodology, however NCC do consider that the former uses of the lands adjacent the boundary should be factored into the assessment , in particular any brownfield sites that would be suitable for future expansion / development (commercial or residential) to allow the villages to grow sustainably. e.g. Newton and linkages to Bingham , Plumtree eastern expansion and linkage to Normanton on the Wold , Gotham and extension to south west (former mine area)	Disagree - The inset boundaries are drawn according to the physical settlement edge and where the open countryside begins (i.e. openness (free from built structures). Whether land is brownfield or greenfield is not the main determinant. The removal of land beyond these identifiable boundaries will occur through the allocations process where sites are being promoted by development or through the SLHAA process.	Not amended
Nottinghamshire County Council	2	<u>Minor Amendments to Existing Boundaries:</u> In broad agreement with the methodology, but similar	These issues were addressed during the previous consultation. Disagree - the removal of land beyond the existing	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		comment to previous where present brownfield opportunities should be exploited to provide expansion potential for the villages. - Cropwell Bishop extension north east from Ethedene, Barlows Close and Shelton Gardens - Keyworth include development to the south east of the BGS campus.	settlement Green Belt boundaries will be informed through the Green Belt assessment of possible housing allocations, not through minor amendments to existing boundaries.	
Nottinghamshire County Council	2	<u>Minor Amendments to Existing Boundaries:</u> There appears a degree of contradiction between rational used to exclude the Health Centre at Cropwell Bishop from the inset area of Cropwell Bishop , whilst including the areas of Keyworth Primary School , and the garden of 12 Nottingham Road and 1 Holme Lane Radcliffe on Trent with their respective inset areas .	The health centre and its grounds in Cropwell Bishop are judged to contribute to the openness. The review therefore recommends that this area should form part of the inset to Cropwell Bishop	Not amended
Nottinghamshire County Council	2	<u>Key Settlement Review:</u> Broad agreement with the methodology. Improvement could be achieved with integration of previous land use to	RAF Newton was removed from the Green Belt following adoption of the Core Strategy in 2014. The site is identified for housing development.	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		support the defensible defined boundaries e.g. RAF Newton	The former runway remains in the Green Belt due to its openness.	
Wilkins, L	2	In Jan 2016 the local plan agreed that no green belt around Gotham would be destroyed and all current green belt/wash would stay. This was only a year ago. The same arguments still stand. There are 5000 empty homes in Nottinghamshire at the moment, which proves that there is plenty of opportunity to house people on land that is not greenbelt. The decision to remove land from greenbelt should not be taken lightly.	The Core Strategy sets out that Gotham will be inset from the Green Belt and the Green Belt Review identifies the proposed boundary. The Issues and Options consultation on Local Plan Part 2 in 2016 sought views on these boundaries. It did not address the removal of additional land beyond the boundaries for housing. The need to consider additional sites on the edge of Gotham has arisen during 2016/17 as it has become clear the borough does not have sufficient housing sites to deliver the Core Strategy housing target.	Not amended
Corder, D	2	The photograph provided with RUD12 is taken with a perspective that gives the impression of Easthorpe House being set at the end of a long run of open field. It does not show the A60 (left hand side of the picture) or the buildings of Silverdale Farm. The	The photographs add context for the conclusions made in the review, it would not be practical to include more than one photograph. The chosen photograph seeks to highlight the main Green Belt issues with each site. In this case the setting of Easthorpe	Not amended

Consultee	Question number	Comment Summary	Rushcliffe BC Response	Amend Green Belt Review
		actual view from this point (taken from Flawforth Lane) does not make the land look so open. I feel the photograph makes the site look less developed and urban fringe in nature than it in fact is.	House is a main concern and the chosen photo for RUD12 illustrates this.	