

**Appendix 4: Local Plan Part 2 – Summary of Main  
Issues raised by Consultees and  
Proposed Responses**

## **Local Plan Part 2 – Summary of Main Issues raised by Consultees and Proposed Responses**

In preparing the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2, the Issues and Options consultation was undertaken during February and March 2016, Further Options consultation during February and March 2017 and the Preferred Housing Sites consultation during October 2017 and November 2017.

The 'Local Plan Part 2: Summary of Consultation, April 2018', which provides a summary of the representations received during these consultations can be viewed at: [www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy/localplan/localplanpart2landandplanningpolicies/](http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy/localplan/localplanpart2landandplanningpolicies/)

This appendix, as set out in the following table, highlights the main issues raised by consultees to these three consultations and proposes a response by the Borough Council to each issue.

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
<b>Housing Distribution and Allocations</b>		
<b>Housing Development adjacent to the Main Urban Area</b>	It is important to maintain the separation between the Main Urban Area and outlying settlements.	No additional allocations are identified within Local Plan 2 on the edge of the Main Urban Area as this would comprise extensions to existing strategic allocations which have not delivered housing as expected in the Core Strategy (and resulted in the need to allocate additional sites). Expanding strategic allocations would not lead to more homes being built over the next few years than is already due to be delivered. Any extra homes would be built further into the future at the very end of the development of these sites, thereby having no impact at all on the immediate housing shortfall situation. There are further limitations on the edge of Nottingham due to flood zones, accessibility, and merging (which is contrary to Green Belt policy).
	Development should be focused within and on the edge of the Main Urban Area as these are most sustainable locations and comply with Core Strategy policy 3. This was supported by landowners (promoting their sites on the edge of the MUA) and residents of outlying settlements where development is proposed.	See response above.
	No further land should be allocated at Sharphill.	Local Plan 2 does not allocate any additional land at Sharphill.
<b>Land north of Nottingham Knight Roundabout.</b>	Land should be allocated as a housing site in Local Plan 2	Site cannot be accessed off the A60 or A52. The land is not allocated for housing in Local Plan 2.

<b>Local Plan Matter</b>	<b>Main Issue</b>	<b>Summary of Borough Council Response</b>
<b>Land west of Edwalton Strategic Urban Extension</b>	Land should be allocated as a housing site in Local Plan 2 as it would provide retirement accommodation and meet this housing need.	This would comprise an extension to an existing strategic allocation, which although now delivering homes has been delayed. The allocation of this land and its development would reduce the distance between Nottingham with Ruddington and increase the perception of merging. The removal of this area of land from the Green Belt for the purposes of development was previously considered during preparation of the Core Strategy and rejected at that stage. The land is not allocated for housing in Local Plan 2.
<b>Land south of Gamston/Tollerton Strategic Urban Extension</b>	Land should be allocated for 500 homes in Local Plan 2.	This would comprise an extension to an existing strategic allocation which has not delivered housing as expected in the Core Strategy (and resulted in the need to allocate additional sites). Enlarging this allocation would not contribute to meeting the housing needs within the plan period. It would also further reduce the distance between the urban edge of Nottingham (formed by the strategic allocation) and Tollerton. The removal of this areas of land from the Green Belt for the purposes of development was previously considered during preparation of the Core Strategy and rejected at that stage. The land is not allocated for housing in Local Plan 2.
<b>Land north of Gamston/Tollerton Strategic Urban Extension</b>	Land should be allocated for 2,000 to 2,500 homes in Local Plan 2.	This would comprise an extension to an existing strategic allocation which has not delivered housing as expected in the Core Strategy (and resulted in the need to allocate additional sites). Enlarging this allocation would not contribute to meeting the housing needs within the plan period. It would also merge Nottingham with Bassingfield. The removal of this areas of land from the Green Belt for the purposes of development was

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
		previously considered during preparation of the Core Strategy and rejected at that stage. The land is not allocated for housing in Local Plan 2.
<b>Willowbrook Farm, A52</b>	Site warrants a positive planning approach to avoid further dereliction. Provides opportunity for 7-8 dwellings.	Site is isolated within the Green Belt, where removal of individual parcels of land would not comply with Green Belt purposes. The site is also within Flood Zone 2 and 3.
<b>Housing Sites within the Main Urban Area</b>	Sites at Abbey Road, former Central College, Wilford Lane, and Lady Bay Bridge should be allocated.	<p>As three of these sites have planning permission and are located within the Main Urban Area they do not require allocating for development.</p> <p>The site at Abbey Lane is not allocated as its development would comply with existing planning policies and no further policy guidance is required. Site allocation would need to be supported by a site specific flood risk assessment which is not available at present.</p>
	Abbey Road site is within flood zones 2 and 3 and therefore requires a sequential test.	See above. A flood risk sequential test must inform any subsequent planning application decision.
	More brownfield sites should be allocated.	Brownfield sites within the Main Urban Area are policy compliant in principle and do not require allocating. Deliverable brownfield sites are identified within the brownfield register and where included as part of the Borough's housing delivery when determining the amount of greenfield land that would also need to be allocated.
<b>Housing Development at Bingham</b>		
<b>Bingham</b>	No further greenfield sites should be allocated on	Bingham is constrained by the A52 and A46 to the west and

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
	<p>the edge of Bingham.</p> <p>School capacity is an issue due to delays in the delivery of the new school within the strategic allocation.</p> <p>However good transport links and less flooding issues were highlighted as positives which could enable more housing.</p>	<p>south, whilst land to the north is already allocated for housing development within the Core Strategy. Expanding the site would not lead to any more homes being built on it over the next few years than are already due to be delivered. Any extra homes would be built further into the future at the very end of the site's development, thereby having no impact at all on the more immediate housing supply shortfall. Consequently, Local Plan 2 does not identify additional allocations on the edge of Bingham.</p>
<b>Housing Development at Cotgrave</b>		
<b>Cotgrave</b>	<p>No further greenfield sites should be allocated on the edge of Cotgrave as infrastructure, services and facilities are at capacity (especially the schools and medical centre).</p> <p>The regeneration of the town centre has been scaled back and is not sufficient to meet the needs of existing and additional residents.</p>	<p>Cotgrave is a Key Settlement within the Core Strategy with a range of services and facilities. It is considered that Cotgrave's educational and medical facilities, and local highway network could, with financial contributions towards their improvements, accommodate around 370 homes.</p>
	<p>Loss of Green Belt countryside.</p>	<p>Green Belt Review has informed site selection and the allocations within Local Plan 2 are all considered low or low/medium Green Belt importance. The need to deliver the Core Strategy's housing target and the absence of more sustainable alternatives (either brownfield or greenfield beyond the Green Belt) are exceptional circumstances for the release of Green Belt on the edge of Cotgrave.</p>

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
<b>COT01 (Land rear of Mill Lane/The Old Park)</b>	<p>Sustainably located, close to the centre of the village. However possible archaeological remains, surface water run-off, overlooking of neighbours, rotation slip of colliery waste, and proximity to the Canal (flood zone 3, heritage, recreational and ecological asset) and Country Park (recreational and ecological asset) are issues.</p> <p>Site could deliver more than 170 homes.</p>	<p>COT01 is allocated within Policy 2.1 of Local Plan 2 for 180 new homes. Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria.</p> <p>Due to likely archaeological remains sufficient open spaces free of development are likely to be required.</p>
<b>COT02 (Land at Main Road)</b>	<p>Within walking distance of the town centre, however site extends ribbon development into open countryside on Main Road.</p>	<p>Selected allocations are more sustainable. COT02 has not been allocated within Local Plan 2.</p>
<b>COT03 (Land rear west of Main Road)</b>	<p>Sustainably located close to the centre of the village. However development would affect the setting of the historic core of the village which contains listed and local interest buildings.</p>	<p>Selected allocations are more sustainable. COT03 has not been allocated within Local Plan 2</p>
<b>COT04 (Land of Woodgate Lane)</b>	<p>Site is only accessible by an unadopted private road, and therefore its delivery is uncertain. It extends into the open countryside.</p>	<p>Selected allocations are more sustainable. COT04 has not been allocated within Local Plan 2</p>
<b>COT05 (Bakers Hollow)</b>	<p>Site is well contained by development.</p>	<p>COT05 has not been allocated as it is not as well located as those either side of Hollygate Lane.</p>
<b>COT06 (The Brickyard)</b>	<p>Site is further from the centre of the village than other potential allocations. Brick Kilns and shooting range are locally important heritage assets.</p>	<p>Selected allocations are more sustainable. COT06 has not been allocated within Local Plan 2</p>
<b>COT07 (Land</b>	<p>Site extends into the Green Belt countryside.</p>	<p>COT07 is not as well contained as allocations off Hollygate</p>

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
<b>behind Firdale(2))</b>	However the landowner suggests that it could provide land for a new school.	Lane and development would extend along Colston Gate into open countryside. Landscape and visual impacts increased due to sloping topography. Consequently it has not been allocated within Local Plan 2
<b>COT08 (Land behind Firdale)</b>	Site extends into the Green Belt countryside.	COT08 is not as well contained as allocations off Hollygate Lane and has not been allocated within Local Plan 2
<b>COT09 (Land South of Hollygate Lane (1))</b>	<p>Although the site is well contained by development and close to the village centre, the junctions of Hollygate Lane and Colston Gate, and Hollygate Park and Stragglethorpe Road are congested. Accidents have also been recorded at the Stragglethorpe Road junction.</p> <p>Archaeological remains may be present.</p>	COT09 has been allocated within Policy 2.2 of Local Plan 2. Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria. Allocation with neighbouring sites offers opportunity to improve the local highway network and increase safety through the creation of a link road between Hollygate Lane and Colston Gate.
<b>COT10 (Land South of Hollygate Lane (2))</b>	<p>Although the site is well contained by development and close to the village centre, the junctions of Hollygate Lane and Colston Gate, and Hollygate Park and Stragglethorpe Road are congested. Accidents have also been recorded at latter junction.</p> <p>Archaeological remains may be present.</p>	COT10 has been allocated within Policy 2.2 of Local Plan 2. Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria. The allocation of this land with COT09 and CO911a offers opportunity to improve the local highway network and increase safety through the creation of a link road between Hollygate Lane and Colston Gate.
<b>COT11a (Land South of Hollygate Lane (3))</b>	Similar to COT09 and COT10 however surface water flooding, proximity to the Canal and the site's extensions further into the Green Belt Countryside are the main issues.	COT11a has been allocated within Policy 2.2 of the Local Plan 2. Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria. Land adjacent to the Canal has not been allocated as it extends into the Green Belt Countryside and it would impact on the setting of the Canal which provides



Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
		recreational, biodiversity and heritage benefits.
<b>COT11b (Land South of Hollygate Lane (3a))</b>	Site extends into the Green Belt countryside and would affect the rural setting of the canal a heritage and nature conservation asset.	Selected allocations are more sustainable. COT11b has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>COT12 (Land South of Plumtree Lane)</b>	Distance from the village, congestion on Plumtree Road and the open aspect of the land are highlighted as issues.	Selected allocations are more sustainable. COT12 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>COT13 (Land South of Gozen Lodge)</b>	No consultation responses (site submitted at Further Issues and Options and not selected as preferred option)	Selected allocations are more sustainable. COT13 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2
<b>COT14 (Land East of Hollygate Lane)</b>	No consultation responses (site submitted at Further Issues and Options and not selected as preferred option)	Selected allocations are more sustainable. COT14 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2
<b>Housing Development at East Leake</b>		
<b>East Leake</b>	No further greenfield sites should be allocated on the edge of East Leake due to infrastructure constraints (schools, medical centre, roads, drainage and sewage) and its unsustainable location compared to settlements closer to Nottingham (whose need is being met with Local Plan 2).	East Leake has nine sites with planning permission and these total more than 1000 homes. This is 600 dwellings more than the Local Plan minimum target. Therefore Local Plan 2 does not identify additional allocations on the edge of East Leake apart from one site (allocated within Policy 3 of Local Plan 2) which has outline planning permission for 235 homes.
	Conversely, East Leake's designation as a Key Settlement with a minimum target which is unconstrained by Green Belt should facilitate more development.	Whilst the target is a minimum, the exceedance of the target by more than 100% and the unsustainable distribution of development resulting from development jumping the Green Belt mean no further allocations (beyond those with planning permission outside the settlement) are allocated. Further

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
		<p>allocations would put at risk the Local Plan's focus to locate development within or adjacent to the main urban area of Nottingham. There are also concerns over East Leake's capacity to support and assimilate additional housing at this time and the affect that any further development would have on the character of the village.</p>
<b>Housing Development at Keyworth</b>		
<b>Keyworth</b>	<p>As identified within the Core Strategy, allocations should deliver no more than 450 homes. Village is constrained by inadequate road infrastructure and the capacity of local services and facilities.</p>	<p>Core Strategy sets a minimum target of 450. In order to address the slower than expected delivery of the strategic allocations and meet the Boroughs housing target for the plan period, Local Plan 2 has identified sites that will deliver around 600 homes.</p>
	<p>As Keyworth is a Key Settlement with a range of services and facilities (school capacity should not be a constraint as pupils could attend schools elsewhere) and bus services. Therefore Local Plan 2 should allocate sites for more than 450 homes. It should have similar growth to Bingham and East Leake which have/will increase by 30%.</p>	<p>Keyworth is a Key Settlement within the Core Strategy with a range of services and facilities. It is expected that Local Plan 2 will allocate a reasonable level of new housing development at this Key Settlement. It is considered that Keyworth's educational and medical facilities, and local highway network could, with financial contributions towards their improvements where necessary, accommodate around 600 homes. NHS England advises that the medical centre could accommodate this number of new residents.</p> <p>It is also judged that, given the existing size of the town which has around 3,000 dwellings, 600 new homes should be able to be assimilated as part of Keyworth without unduly affecting the town's character or local amenity.</p>

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
	The preferred Neighbourhood Plan housing sites should be allocated within Local Plan 2.	The housing allocations promoted within the Neighbourhood Plan (plus an addition site adjacent to Hillside Farm off Bunny Lane (KEY13)) have been allocated within Local Plan 2.
<b>KEY01 (Land East of Willow Brook)</b>	Increased merging of Stanton on the Wolds and Keyworth, congestion during school drop off and pick up and surface water flooding were identified as the main issues.	Selected allocations are more sustainable. KEY01 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>KEY02 (Land off Selby Land and Willow Brook)</b>	Increased merging of Stanton on the Wolds and Keyworth was the main issue highlighted.	Selected allocations are more sustainable. KEY02 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>KEY03 (Land south of Selby Lane)</b>	Increased merging of Stanton on the Wolds and Keyworth was highlighted as the main concern.	Selected allocations are more sustainable. KEY02 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2 due to landscape and Green Belt concerns.
<b>KEY04a (Land off Nicker Hill (1))</b>	<p>Main issues regarding this site comprised the site's distance from the village centre, loss of Green Belt countryside, poor public transport services, and impacts on the landscape and neighbouring local wildlife site.</p> <p>Nearby residential occupation should not restrict the activities of the British Geological Survey.</p>	<p>KEY04a has been allocated within Policy 4.1 of Local Plan 2. Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria. Site is within walking distance of Wold's Drive shopping area and the village centre.</p> <p>Mitigation includes a landscape buffer to reduce disturbance of residents by the British Geological Site's activities.</p>
<b>KEY04b (Land of Nicker Hill (2))</b>	Main issues regarding this site comprised the site's distance from the village centre and loss of Green Belt countryside.	Selected allocations are more sustainable. KEY04b has not been allocated in Local Plan 2 due to landscape and Green Belt concerns.
<b>KEY05 (Hill Top)</b>	Main issues regarding this site comprised the site's	Site is allocated for employment within Local Plan 2. It is

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
<b>Farm (1))</b>	<p>distance from the village centre, visual intrusion and suitability of Platt Lane for additional traffic.</p> <p>Site is identified as a possible employment allocation within the draft neighbourhood plan.</p>	agreed that its location makes it less suitable for housing development than sites selected for housing allocation.
<b>KEY06 (Hill Top Farm (2))</b>	Main issues regarding this site comprised the site's distance from the village centre, visual intrusion and suitability of Platt Lane for additional traffic.	Selected allocations are more sustainable. KEY06 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2 due to landscape and Green Belt concerns.
<b>KEY07 (Shelton Farm)</b>	Main issues regarding this site comprised the site's distance from the village centre, visual intrusion and suitability of Platt Lane for additional traffic.	Selected allocations are more sustainable. KEY07 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2 due to landscape and Green Belt concerns.
<b>KEY08 (Platt Lane and Station Road)</b>	Main issues regarding this site comprised the proximity of the site to neighbouring sports pitches and prevention of this facilities expansion, its distance from the centre of the village, increased congestion and access onto Station Road and Platt Lane, loss of Green Belt countryside/agricultural land and landscape and visual impacts.	KEY08 has been allocated within Policy 4.2 of Local Plan 2. Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria.
<b>KEY09 (North Of Debdale Lane)</b>	Access along Debdale Lane is too narrow.	Selected allocations are more sustainable and there is no requirement to allocate KEY09. KEY09 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>KEY10 (South of Debdale Lane)</b>	Loss of Green Belt, the elevation of the site and impacts on landscape, increased congestion on	KEY10 has been allocated within Policy 4.3 of Local Plan 2. Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within site

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
	<p>Bunny Lane and unsafe access were highlighted as the main issues.</p> <p>Hedgerows and trees should be maintained and connectivity enhanced.</p>	<p>specific policy criteria.</p>
<b>KEY11 (Land south of Debdale Lane (2))</b>	<p>Loss of Green Belt, the elevation of the site and impacts on landscape and unsafe access onto Bunny Lane were highlighted as the main issues.</p>	<p>Selected allocations are more sustainable and there is no requirement to allocate KEY11. KEY11 intrudes unduly into the Green Belt countryside and has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</p>
<b>KEY12 (North of Debdale Lane (2))</b>	<p>Access along Debdale Lane is too narrow and the site is too far from the centre of the village.</p>	<p>Selected allocations are more sustainable. KEY12 intrudes into the Green Belt countryside and has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</p>
<b>KEY13 (Hillside Farm)</b>	<p>Increased congestion, loss of Green belt countryside, unsafe access onto Bunny Lane, odour from the farm and sewage treatment works, and landscape issues were highlighted as a main issue. Site is not identified as a possible housing site in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>Although this site is not identified within the emerging Neighbourhood Plan as a preferred allocation, KEY13 has been allocated within policy 4.4 of Local Plan 2. Main issues of constraint have been ruled out of recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria.</p>
<b>KEY14 (Land South of Bunny Lane)</b>	<p>Containing land adjacent to Wysall Lane, this larger site may impact on the setting of the Conservation Area. Land on the opposite side is adjacent to a Sewage Treatment Works.</p>	<p>Selected allocations are more sustainable and there is no requirement to allocate KEY14. KEY14 intrudes significantly into the Green Belt countryside and has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.</p>
<b>Housing Development at Radcliffe on Trent</b>		
<b>Housing target for Radcliffe on Trent</b>	<p>As identified within the Core Strategy, allocations should deliver no more than 400 homes. This figure</p>	<p>Core Strategy sets a minimum target of 400. In order to address the slower than expected delivery of the strategic</p>

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
	<p>was determined according to the levels of existing infrastructure. Additional housing will require a new primary school and medical centre, improved leisure facilities, waste water treatment, roads and public transport.</p>	<p>allocations and meet the Borough's housing target for the plan period, Local Plan 2 has identified sites on the edge of Radcliffe on Trent that will deliver 920 homes. To generate the pupil numbers required to sustain a new primary school and to also generate sufficient developer contributions to cover the costs of a new school will require the delivery of upwards of 1,000 new homes. The allocation of land south of Shelford Road will provide land for a new primary school and medical centre.</p>
	<p>Radcliffe on Trent is a Key Settlement with a range of services and facilities, including bus and rail services. Therefore Local Plan 2 should allocate sites for more than 450 homes.</p>	<p>See above</p>
<p><b>RAD01 (Land north of Nottingham Road)</b></p>	<p>RAD01 is within flood zone 2 and a limited area is within flood zone 3. National grid pylons also cross the site.</p> <p>Location provides opportunity for a mixed use development.</p> <p>Site is adjacent to and therefore may adversely affect the disused railway line nature corridor and Cotgrave Forest Focus Area (part of the Borough's ecological network).</p>	<p>RAD01 is allocated within Policy 5.1 for mix use development (residential and employment). Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria. Sequential Test establishes that no reasonable site exists for this mixed use development allocation. Flood risk and flood risk mitigation will be addressed within the flood risk assessment that will support any forthcoming application. Site is the most sustainable location at Radcliffe on Trent.</p>
<p><b>RAD02 (Land adjacent to</b></p>	<p>Development of RAD02 will increase congestion on Shelford Road and overlook neighbouring</p>	<p>RAD02 is allocated for development within Policy 5.2 of Local Plan 2. Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within</p>

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
<b>Grooms Cottage)</b>	properties.	site specific policy criteria.
<b>RAD03 (Land off Shelford Road)</b>	The main concerns highlighted during consultation focused on loss of Green Belt countryside, unsafe access, and congestion and safety on Shelford Road (requires direct access onto A52).	<p>Advice from the Highways Authority and evidence within the submitted planning application for the site indicates that access can be achieved. Congestion issues are not considered significant enough to prevent the allocation of this site. RAD03 is therefore allocated for development within Policy 5.3 of Local Plan 2. Constraints, including highways issues, have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria.</p> <p>Land for a new primary school, medical centre and potential crossing over the railway line is safeguarded within RAD03.</p>
<b>RAD04 (Land of Grantham Road (North of railway line))</b>	The main concerns highlighted during consultation focused on: access, congestion and safety on Shelford Road (alternative direct access onto A52 was considered a priority); its scale and the significant loss of Green Belt countryside; landscape and visual impacts and impact on services and facilities.	Selected allocations are more sustainable and there is no housing requirement to allocate such a large area of land. RAD04 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>RAD05a (Land north of Grantham Road (south of railway line) (1a))</b>	Whilst the site has the potential to access the A52 directly, the loss of Green Belt and agricultural land, and impact on the landscape and visual amenity were highlighted as main issues.	<p>RAD05a (and RAD05b) is allocated for housing within Policy 5.4 of Local Plan 2 (renamed RAD05). These areas were previously combined within RAD05, but were separated and RAD05a was preferred on its own as it did not extend beyond the Harlequin area of the village on the A52.</p> <p>Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria. Access would be achieved more</p>

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
		acceptably via the existing entrance to the St James Business Park.
<b>RAD05b (Land north of Grantham Road (south of railway line) (1b))</b>	Whilst the site has the potential to access the A52 directly loss of Green Belt, agricultural land and impact on the landscape and visual amenity were highlighted as main issues.	<p>RAD05b is allocated for development with RAD05a (renamed RAD05) within policy 5.4 of Local Plan 2. These areas were previously combined within RAD05, but were separated and RAD05a was selected as a preferred site as it did not extend beyond the village's existing edge on the A52 (unlike RAD05b which extends further along the A52).</p> <p>Due to the reduction in housing being delivered on RAD01 (as result of the site being reallocated as a mixed use site (employment and housing)) RAD05b has been allocated for housing in Local Plan 2. Constraints, including landscape impacts and access, have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria. Access would be achieved more acceptably via the existing entrance to the St James Business Park.</p>
<b>RAD06 (72 Main Road)</b>	Apart from access onto Main Road, no significant issues were highlighted or identified.	Although small, RAD06 has been allocated within policy 5.5 of Local Plan 2. Access can be achieved for seven units. Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria.
<b>RAD07 (Land north of Grantham Road (South of railway)(2))</b>	The main issues highlighted during consultation focused on: the loss of Green Belt and intrusion into open countryside landscape; increased congestion on the A52; the distance from the centre of the village and experience of pedestrians.	Selected allocations are more sustainable and there is no housing requirement to allocate RAD07. RAD07 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.



Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
<b>RAD08 (Land south Grantham Road)</b>	Loss of allotments, proximity to Dewberry Hill Local Wildlife Site and access onto A52 were highlighted as the main issues that would constrain the site.	Constraints recognised. Selected allocations are more sustainable and there is no housing requirement to allocate RAD08. RAD08 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>RAD09 (Land at Radcliffe on Trent Golf Club (west))</b>	Access and the limited number of new homes were highlighted by consultees as the main concerns.	Selected allocations are more sustainable (having less impact on landscape and biodiversity) and removal of site from the Green Belt in isolation would not comply with Green Belt policy. It is not appropriate or necessary to allocate this site.
<b>RAD10 (Land at Radcliffe on Trent Golf Club (east))</b>	Loss of Green belt and limited benefits in terms of housing numbers were highlighted as main concerns.	Selected allocations are more sustainable (having less impact on landscape) and removal of site from the Green Belt in isolation would not comply with Green Belt purposes. It is not appropriate or necessary to allocate this site.
<b>RAD11 (North of Holme Lane)</b>	The main issues highlighted during consultation focused on loss of Green Belt, flood risk, impact on local recreational assets and conflict with the neighbourhood plan (which identifies the site within a leisure arc), and proximity to railway line.	Selected allocations are more sustainable and there is no housing requirement to allocate RAD11. RAD11 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>RAD12 (Land North of Shelford Road)</b>	The main issues highlighted during consultation focused on increased congestion on Shelford Road, loss of Green Belt, impact on landscape and visual amenity, adverse effects on local wildlife site and possible presence of archaeological remains around Gallows Hill.	Selected allocations are more sustainable and there is no housing requirement to allocate RAD12. RAD12 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>RAD13 (The Paddock, Nottingham Road)</b>	Surface water drainage and noise were identified as the main issues that could constrain RAD13.	RAD13 is allocated for development within Policy 5.6 of Local Plan 2. Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria.

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
<b>Housing Development at Ruddington</b>		
<b>Housing target at Ruddington</b>	As identified within the Core Strategy, allocations should deliver no more than 250 homes on the edge of Ruddington. This figure was determined according to the levels of existing services and infrastructure. Additional housing would increase congestion, exceed capacity of local schools and medicals services, sewage treatment works and result in significant loss of Green Belt countryside. Ruddington has provided enough housing already, further development would change the village's identity.	Core Strategy sets a minimum target of 250 new homes. In order to address the slower than expected delivery of the strategic allocations and meet the Borough's housing target for the plan period, Local Plan 2 has identified sites that will deliver 350 homes within allocated sites on the edge of the village. Advice from statutory consultees has indicated that, subject to improvements, the additional residents could be accommodated within the local schools and by the medical services. Sites selected would have the least impact on congestion within the centre of the village as they are located adjacent or close to the A60 or on the northern edge of the village, closer to Nottingham. An additional increase in homes by 350 units would not unacceptably change the character of the settlement, which would remain a large village.
	Local Plan 2 should set the target as a minimum as Ruddington is a sustainable settlement which could accommodate more growth.	See above
<b>RUD01 (Land west of Wilford Road)</b>	The main issues highlighted during consultation focused on flood risk, loss of Green Belt and merging with the main urban area, loss of Sellers Field, increased congestion on Wilford Road, impacts on the rural setting of Ruddington and loss of wildlife.	RUD01 is allocated for development within policy 6.1 of Local Plan 2. Constraints have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria. Sellers Field has been removed from the allocation and will be protected within Open Space/GI policies. Sequential test establishes that no reasonable or more sustainable alternative allocation is available. The site's location within a green corridor requires onsite Green Infrastructure to address flood risk and biodiversity issues.

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
<b>RUD02 (Land West of Wilford Road (north))</b>	The main issues highlighted during consultation focused on loss of Green Belt and merging with the main urban area, increased congestion on Wilford Road, impacts on the rural setting of Ruddington and impacts on local wildlife site and SSSI.	Selected allocations are more sustainable and there is no housing requirement to allocate this large area for development. RUD02 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>RUD03 (Land adjacent to St Peter's Junior School)</b>	The main issues highlighted during consultation focused on the access of the site directly from the A60, its isolated location and presence of ecologically valuable grassland habitat.	Selected allocations are more sustainable and there is no housing requirement to allocate this site for development. RUD02 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>RUD04 (Easthorpe House)</b>	Easthorpe House is a listed building and the development of its grounds would significantly affect its setting.	Selected allocations are less constrained by heritage issues, more sustainable and there is no housing requirement to allocate this site for development. RUD04 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>RUD05 (Land south of Flawforth Lane)</b>	Flooding issues and congestion on Flawforth Lane were highlighted as the main issues of concern.	Site is within Flood Zone 1 and only a small area of the site adjacent to Flawforth Lane is identified as being at medium/low risk of surface water flooding. The site's location east of the A60 would reduce its contribution to congestion within the settlement and no concerns regarding congestion have been raised by the highways authority. RUD05 is allocated for housing within Policy 6.2 of Local Plan 2.
<b>RUD06 (Land at Loughborough Road)</b>	Direct access onto the Loughborough Road and location within Ruddington's Conservation Area were highlighted as the main constraints.	The fundamental change in the character of the site and its location within the Conservation Area where it is identified as a positive open space in the Townscape Appraisal is a significant issue. Selected allocations are less constrained and are more sustainable. There is no need to allocate additional sites. Whilst RUD06 has not been allocated for development, it will

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
		be removed from the Green Belt as RUD13 surrounds the site and it cannot remain an isolated area of Green Belt.
<b>RUD07 (Land north west of Asher Lane)</b>	This site is constrained by access issues and its Green Belt status.	Although the site is not considered important in Green Belt terms, the site is fundamentally constrained by access issues which cannot be resolved. RUD07 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>RUD08 (Land West of Pasture Lane)</b>	The merging of Ruddington with Clifton (within the main urban area) and congestion on Clifton Road were highlighted as the main constraint.	Site is fundamentally constrained due to potential to merge Ruddington and Clifton. This site has not been selected as an allocation within Local Plan 2.
<b>RUD09 (Land South of Landmere Lane)</b>	The main issues highlighted regarding RUD09 were the site's isolated and unsustainable location and the limited contribution it would make to the housing target.	Selected allocations are less important in Green Belt terms and are more sustainably located. RUD09 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>RUD10 (Land adjacent to Landmere Farm)</b>	The main issues highlighted regarding RUD10 were the site's isolated and unsustainable location and the limited contribution it would make to the housing target.	Selected allocations are less important in Green Belt terms and are more sustainably located. RUD10 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>RUD11 (Old Loughborough Road)</b>	The loss of prominent Green Belt land which separates Ruddington and Nottingham, landscape and visual intrusion, its isolated location, impact on local historic assets (Old North Road and Brick Kiln) and loss of wildlife were highlighted as constraints on the site.	Selected allocations are less important in Green Belt terms (RUD11 is isolated within the Green Belt and fundamentally constrained) and are more sustainably located. RUD11 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2. Self and custom build housing provision should be adequately provided for by Policy 13 (Self-build and Custom Housing Provision) of Local Plan 2.
<b>RUD12 (Land to the east side of</b>	The main issue which constrains this site and which was highlighted during consultation is the adverse	Selected allocations are less constrained heritage or other issues. RUD12 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
<b>Loughborough Road)</b>	impact development would have on the setting of Easthorpe House which is visible across the site from Flawforth Lane. The site is also adjacent to Ruddington's Conservation Area.	
<b>RUD13 (Land opposite Mere Way)</b>	The size of the site prompted concerns regarding urban sprawl, loss of Green Belt countryside and impacts on landscape and visual amenity. Congestion on Loughborough Road was also highlighted as a concern.	RUD13 is allocated for development within Policy 6.3 of Local Plan 2. Landscape and visual amenity issues have been recognised and mitigated within site specific policy criteria.
<b>RUD14 (Croft House)</b>	Direct access onto the Loughborough Road and location within Ruddington's Conservation Area were highlighted as the main constraints.	The fundamental change in the character of the site and its location within the Conservation Area where the front of the site is identified as a positive open space in the Townscape Appraisal is a constraint. Selected allocations are less constrained by these and other issues. Whilst RUD14 has not been allocated for development, it will be removed from the Green Belt as RUD05 and RUD13 surround the site and it cannot remain an isolated area of Green Belt.
<b>RUD15 (Land off North Road)</b>	Site proposed for allocation.	Site is fundamentally constrained due to potential to merge Ruddington and Clifton. This site has not been selected as an allocation within Local Plan 2.
<b>RUD16 (Land west of Wayte Court)</b>	Site proposed for allocation.	Selected allocations are less important in Green Belt terms and are more sustainably located. RUD16 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>Housing Development at Aslockton</b>		
<b>Housing</b>	Aslockton has already undergone considerable	Local Plan 2 does not identify any allocations at Aslockton.

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
<b>development at Aslockton</b>	expansion for a small village which has limited services and public transport.	<p>Planning permission has been granted for 75 units on land south of Abbey Lane, within the plan period, and this constitutes the village's contribution to the Borough's housing target. Additional allocations would be unsustainable in this location. Recent appeal dismissals have supported this position.</p> <p>However, in accordance with the Core Strategy, small scale infill development is permitted and a Neighbourhood Plan could allocate small sites on the edge of the village to meet local need.</p>
	Housing allocations on the edge of Aslockton should be identified within Local Plan 2. The village contains a range of facilities and is served by good public transport services, including buses and trains.	See above
<b>Housing Development at Cropwell Bishop</b>		
<b>Housing total for Cropwell Bishop</b>	Main concerns regarding the allocation of land for 160 units relate to infrastructure especially the capacity of the primary school, lack of adequate public transport (especially in regards to lack of service after 6pm), insufficient capacity at the sewage works and local traffic congestion. Losses of Green Belt and agricultural land, and impacts on wildlife and village character were also highlighted.	Cropwell Bishop has capability to sustain around 70 dwellings on greenfield sites adjacent to the village, based on the existing size and status of the settlement, the capacity of local services (as advised by the relevant statutory consultees) and the size of those sites deemed suitable for housing development. There is presently no requirement to allocate more than 70 homes in Cropwell Bishop.
	Cropwell Bishop could accommodate more than 160 homes.	See above.

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
<b>CBI01a (Land south of Nottingham Road)</b>	During consultation periods the following issues regarding this allocation were highlighted: Impact on the setting of the village and locally important buildings, loss of ridge and furrow	Selected allocations are less constrained by heritage or landscape issues. CBI01 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>CBI01b (Land south of Nottingham Road (1))</b>	Not consulted upon - Site was submitted during further issues and options, but was not selected within the subsequent preferred housing site documents.	See above.
<b>CBI02 (Land north of Memorial Hall (1))</b>	The main issues of concern regarding this site are the loss of Green Belt countryside, inadequate access of Hoe View Road via Mercia Avenue and impacts on the Canal and neighbouring wildlife site.	Selected allocations are less important in Green Belt terms and less constrained by access concerns, or biodiversity and heritage issues (due to proximity to Canal). There is no requirement to allocate more than 70 homes in Cropwell Bishop and CBI02 has not been allocated within Local Plan 2.
<b>CBI03 (Land north of Memorial Hall (2))</b>	The main issues of concern regarding this site are the loss of Green Belt and intrusion into open countryside, inadequate access of Hoe View Road via Mercia Avenue and impacts on the Canal and direct loss of a local wildlife site.	Selected allocations are less important in Green Belt terms and less constrained by biodiversity and landscape issues. There is no requirement to allocate more than 70 homes in Cropwell Bishop and CBI03 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>CBI04 (Land north of Fern Road (2))</b>	The main issues of concern regarding this site are the loss of priority habitats (hedgerows and trees), impact on historic core of the village, access and loss of ridge and furrow.	Selected allocations are less constrained by heritage and landscape issues. CBI04 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>CBI05 (Land east of Church Street)</b>	Access to the site of Church Street, intrusion into the countryside, effects on rights of way, proximity to the sewage treatment works, overlooking of properties,	CBI05 is allocated by Policy 7 of Local Plan 2 for around 70. The constraints have been recognised and mitigation measures are identified within the policy criteria for the

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
	potential archaeological remains, and surface water flooding are highlighted as issues.	development of the allocation.
<b>CBI06 (Land north of Fern Road (3))</b>	The site's distance from the village is considered unsustainable. Intrusion into the open countryside and loss of agricultural land are also main issues.	Selected allocations are in more sustainable locations where development would have less impact on the landscape and not intrude significantly into the Green Belt. CBI06 is not allocated as housing site in Local Plan 2.
<b>CBI07 (Land north of Fern Road (1))</b>	Although not consulted upon as a single allocation, it previously comprised the eastern half of the CBI05 prior to CBI05's reduction in size and selection as a preferred housing allocation. The main issues of concerns regarding the larger site are the significant intrusion into the open countryside and landscape impacts as a result of the rising topography.	Selected allocations are less constrained by landscape issues. There is no requirement to allocate such a large area for housing. CBI06 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>Housing Development at East Bridgford</b>		
<b>Housing total for East Bridgford</b>	Opposition to the identification of East Bridgford as a location for limited housing development highlighted the loss of Green Belt, inadequate services and infrastructure (notably school capacity, medical services, public transport and roads), changes in the character and community of the village, and the unsustainability of locating housing on the edge of the village.	East Bridgford has scope to sustain around 125 dwellings on greenfield sites adjacent to the village, based on the existing size and status of the settlement, the capacity of local services and the size of those sites deemed suitable for housing development.
	East Bridgford could accommodate more than 125 homes.	See above
<b>EBR01 (Land</b>	The main issues of concerns regarding this site are	Selected allocations are less constrained by heritage issues.



Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
<b>behind Kirk Hill (east))</b>	the loss of land used by the local community for scouting, adverse impacts on the historic core of the village, impact on the setting and entrance to the village, and loss of Green Belt.	There is no requirement to allocate this site for housing. EBR01 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>EBR02 (Land behind Kirk Hill (west))</b>	The main issues of concerns regarding this site are the impact on the historic setting and entrance to the village, loss of Green Belt and intrusion into open countryside, proximity to the A6097 and loss of new woodland.	Selected allocations are less constrained by heritage and setting issues. There is no requirement to allocate this site for housing. EBR02 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>EBR03 (Land north of Kneeton Road (1))</b>	The main issues of concerns regarding this site are: the adverse effects on the setting of East Bridgford Manor, Manor Lodge, and Conservation Area; landscape impacts on the Trent Valley; loss of Green Belt agricultural land; distance from the village centre; congestion on Kneeton Road; and impact on rights of way.	Selected allocations are less important in Green Belt terms and less constrained by heritage and landscape issues. There is no requirement to allocate this site for housing. EBR03 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>EBR04 (Land north of Kneeton Road (2))</b>	The distance of this site from the centre of the village, the significant loss of Green Belt countryside, landscape concerns and congestion on Kneeton Road were highlighted as main issues.	Selected allocations are less important in Green Belt terms and less constrained by landscape issues. There is no requirement to allocate this site for housing. EBR04 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>EBR05 (Land at Lammas Lane)</b>	Access via a single track road and loss of Green Belt countryside are highlighted as the main issues.	Selected allocations are not constrained by access issues. EBR05 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>EBR06 (Closes Side Lane (west))</b>	The main issues of concerns regarding this site are: the narrowness of the roads; overlooking of neighbouring properties; impact on Conservation	EBR06 is more constrained by access issues than the selected sites which can be accessed of Butt Lane and offer an additional connection between Butt Lane and Closes Side

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
	Area; loss of countryside and loss of rural views.	Lane. EBR06 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>EBR07 (Closes Side Lane (east))</b>	The main issues of concerns regarding this site are: the narrowness of the roads; loss of countryside and loss of rural views.	EBR07 is more constrained by access issues than the selected sites which can be accessed of Butt Lane and offer an additional connection between Butt Lane and Closes Side Lane. EBR07 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>EBR08 (Land to the North of Butt Lane)</b>	Main issues raised regarding EBR08 are the site's protrusion into the Green belt and open countryside, effects on the rural approach/setting of the village, and loss of agricultural land.	EBR08 is allocated (with EBR11 and EBR12) as a housing site within policy 8.1 of Local Plan 2. Site specific criteria based policy requires a comprehensive development with sites to the north. They also address constraints and identify mitigation. The allocation sites EBR08, EBR11 and EBR12 together has the advantage of enabling a new access to be created between Closes Side Lane and Butt Lane.
<b>EBR09 (Land south of Springfield Lane)</b>	Main issues raised regarding EBR09 are the site's extension into the open countryside, landscape impacts, its access via an unadopted road and presence of ridge and furrow.	Selected allocations are not constrained by similar access, landscape or heritage issues. EBR09 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>EBR10 (Land south of Butt Lane)</b>	During consultation the main issues raised were: the site's visibility, especially over longer distances to the south and east; proximity to and impact upon a local wildlife site (Springfield Lane Woodland); impact on the setting of the village and right of way.	EBR08 is allocated as a housing site within policy 8.2 of Local Plan 2. Site specific criteria based policy addresses constraints and identify mitigation.
<b>EBR11 (South of Closes Side Lane)</b>	Site submitted during preferred options consultation and therefore no representations have been received on this site.	EBR11 is allocated as a housing site within Policy 8.1 of Local Plan 2. Site specific criteria based policy requires a comprehensive development with sites to the south. They also address constraints and identify mitigation. The allocation sites

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
		EBR08, EBR11 and EBR12 together has the advantage of enabling a new access to be created between Closes Side Lane and Butt Lane.
<b>EBR12 (North of Butt Lane (2))</b>	Site submitted during preferred options consultation and therefore no representations have been received on this site.	EBR12 is allocated as a housing site within Policy 8.1 of Local Plan 2. Site specific criteria based policy requires a comprehensive development with sites to the north and south. They also address constraints and identify mitigation. The allocation sites EBR08, EBR11 and EBR12 together has the advantage of enabling a new access to be created between Closes Side Lane and Butt Lane.
<b>EBR13 (Land off Brickyard Lane)</b>	Land proposed for housing development.	Selected allocations are not constrained by access issues. EBR13 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>Housing Development at Gotham</b>		
<b>Housing total for Gotham</b>	Opposition to the identification of Gotham as a location for limited housing development (100 homes) focused on the loss of greenfield/Green Belt, flood risks, adverse impacts on views from Gotham Hills, inadequate services and infrastructure (notably school capacity, medical services, public transport and roads), and limited local shops.	Gotham has scope to sustain around 70 dwellings on greenfield sites adjacent to the village, based on the existing size and status of the settlement, the capacity of local services and the size of those sites deemed suitable for housing development.
<b>GOT01 (Land to the rear of former British Legion)</b>	Support for the allocation of this site highlighted the development of the former British Legion as a positive and that it could be incorporated into the village.	Whilst the site was supported by more residents than other sites, concerns regarding the loss of locally important priority habitats and the local green corridor prevent its allocation.
	GOT01 supports good quality grassland scrub	See above

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
	habitat and is part of a well-defined green corridor, linking to Gotham Sandbanks SSSI.	
<b>GOT02 (Land north of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (west))</b>	During consultation the main issues raised were: loss of green space that contributes to the character of the village, loss of ridge and furrow; and impact on wildlife corridor.	The selected allocation is more sustainable and there is no requirement to allocate GOT02. GOT02 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>GOT03 (Land north of Kegworth Road/Home Farm (east))</b>	Increased congestion, especially during school drop off and pick up times, increased surface water flooding, inadequate access from Brick Lane, ridge and furrow and visual impacts were highlighted as main issues that constrain the site.	The selected allocation is more sustainable and there is no requirement to allocate GOT03. GOT03 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>GOT04 (Land South of Pygall Avenue)</b>	The main issues highlighted during consultation are the inadequate access of Hall Drive (which is not wide enough), presence of ridge and furrow (since ploughed over), and loss of Green Belt countryside.	The selected allocation is more sustainable and there is no requirement to allocate GOT04. GOT04 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>GOT05a (Land east of Gypsum Way/The Orchards)</b>	The main issues highlighted during consultation are impacts on the character of the village, intrusion into open countryside, the effects on the listed barn (within the bus depot), risks of surface water flooding and impact on local priority habitats (grassland, shrub and hedgerow) and local wildlife site.	Due to concerns relocating the bus depot it has been removed from the allocation. A reduced GOT05a is proposed as a housing allocation within Policy 9 of Local Plan 2. Site specific criteria based policy addresses constraints and identify mitigation.
<b>GOT05b (Land East of Gypsum Way/The Orchards)</b>	Previously consulted upon within the Further Issues and Options consultation. This was a combined GOT05a and GOT05b site (GOT05). Surface water	The selected allocation is more sustainable and there is no requirement to allocate GOT05b. GOT05b has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
(2))	flooding and impact on the character of Gotham were highlighted and are pertinent concerns.	
<b>GOT06 (East Leake Road)</b>	The main issues highlighted during consultation are the site's intrusion into the wider landscape, its scale and effects on the visual approach to the village.	The selected allocation is more sustainable and there is no requirement to allocate GOT06. GOT06 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>GOT07 (Land east of Hill Road)</b>	Flooding concerns and the presence of pylons were highlighted as main issues.	The selected allocation is more sustainable (nearer to the centre of the village and less landscape impacts) and there is no requirement to allocate GOT07. GOT07 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>GOT08 (Land south of Moor Lane)</b>	Access off a tight bend, traffic on Moor Lane and existence of a covenant preventing the development of the site are highlighted as constraints.	The selected allocation is more sustainable and there is no requirement to allocate GOT08. GOT08 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>Housing Development at Sutton Bonington</b>		
<b>Housing total for Sutton Bonington</b>	Opposition to the identification of Sutton Bonington as a location for limited housing development (100 homes) highlighted the village's unsustainable location, loss of countryside, impact on the character of the village, flood risks, inadequate services and infrastructure (notably school capacity, medical services, public transport and roads), and limited local shops.	Sutton Bonington has scope to sustain around 80 dwellings on the site north of Park Lane, based on the capacity of the site, existing size and status of the settlement, and the capacity of local services. During consultation on Further Options, the local education authority advised that the school could not accommodate further housing. There is not, however, currently evidence to support this position and therefore it is considered appropriate and sustainable for the village to accommodate a limited level of new housing development.
	Sutton Bonington has sufficient services and facilities to accommodate 100+ homes, is in a sustainable location close to Kegworth and	See above

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
	Loughborough. The village is not in the Green Belt.	
<b>SUT01 (Land north of Park Lane)</b>	The main issues highlighted as constraints are the site's location in a mineral safeguarding area, Sutton Bonington's unsustainable location, merging with Normanton on Soar, flood risks, impacts on neighbouring properties, detrimental impacts on the setting of the village, and infrastructure.	See above regarding Sutton Bonington's sustainability. The site's proximity adjacent to residential properties means minerals are unlikely to be extracted from this location. The perception of merging, surface water flooding and impacts on neighbouring properties can be reduced and mitigated through the design and layout of the development and incorporation of green infrastructure. SUT01 is identified as an allocation in Policy 10 of Local Plan 2.
<b>SUT02 (Land south of Pasture Lane)</b>	No consultation responses (site submitted at Further Options). Sutton Bonington was not identified as a settlement for growth in the subsequent preferred options due to concerns regarding primary school capacity. This position has since changed following further examination of future pupil numbers.	Site is within flood zone 3, unlike the selected allocation. There is no requirement to allocate SUT02 within Local Plan 2.
<b>SUT03 (Land south of Landcroft Lane)</b>	No consultation response as site was submitted during the Preferred Options consultation.	Selected allocation is not constrained by accessibility issues (unlike this site which has poor pedestrian access over the railway bridge) and is less sensitive in landscape terms. There is no requirement to allocate SUT03 in addition to SUT01. SUT03 has not been allocated in Local Plan 2.
<b>Housing Development at Tollerton</b>		
<b>Housing total for Tollerton</b>	Opposition to the identification of Tollerton as a location for limited housing development highlighted the contribution Tollerton will make within the Gamston strategic allocation, the loss of	The parish of Tollerton contains the Tollerton/Gamston strategic allocation (up to 4,000 new homes). Whilst delivery is delayed, the parish will provide a critical number of homes during the plan period and beyond. Sites to the north are

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
	greenfield/Green Belt, inadequate services and infrastructure (notably school capacity, absence of medical services, public transport and highways capacity), and limited local shops.	constrained by sensitive areas of Green Belt (which prevent the merging of the village with the strategic allocation) or have access constraints. No sites are proposed on the edge of Tollerton.
	Tollerton is sustainably located close to the edge of Nottingham and is well served by public transport.	See above
<b>TOL01 (Land at Burnside Grove)</b>	Potential Civil War archaeological remains, loss of open countryside, impact on village character, loss of Green Belt, increases in traffic through the village, excessive scale of development and overlooking of existing residents are the main issues highlighted during consultation.	See above
<b>TOL02 (West of Tollerton Lane and North of Medina Drive)</b>	The scale of development and subsequent loss of Green Belt, merging with the Gamston strategic allocation, and landscape impacts are a significant issue. Impacts on Jubilee Wood and rights of way are also a concern.	See above
<b>TOL03 (Land east of Tollerton Lane)</b>	Loss of open countryside and loss of long distance views from within the village, impact on Tollerton Lane (which is congested and dangerous), impact on the right of way, absence of defensible boundaries, and local character are identified as issues.	See above
<b>TOL4 (Jubilee Wood)</b>	This land was submitted during consultation on Further Issues and Options. Tollerton was not	See above

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
	identified as a growth settlement in the Preferred Options. Consequently no representations on this site have been sought.	
<b>Housing Development at Other Villages</b>		
<b>Extension of Former RAF Newton Strategic Urban Extension</b>	An additional 150 units should be delivered within the allocation. This would require parts of the green infrastructure (planned allotments and public open space) to be accommodated beyond the allocation within the Green Belt.	Phase 2 within the Former RAF Newton SUE has not yet commenced and increasing the number of new homes within this allocation (and effectively enlarging it through the relocating of Green Infrastructure beyond its boundary) would not contribute to meeting the housing needs within the plan period. An addition of 150 new units is not therefore necessary or appropriate at present.
<b>Costock</b>	In order to provide a greater mix of housing sites and address the shortfall in housing delivery, a wider distribution of housing sites across the borough should be proposed in Local Plan 2, including allocations at Costock.	Although Costock has a primary school and public house, it does not contain sufficient services and facilities to meet the basic needs of existing residents. Whilst located close to East Leake, concerns regarding services within this Key Settlement have prevented further allocations within this settlement and would prevent the allocation of sites at Costock.
<b>Bunny</b>	Land east of Loughborough Road is more sustainably located than the proposed mixed use regeneration site on the former Bunny Brickworks within Policy 23 of Local Plan 2.	This greenfield Green Belt site does not provide opportunities to deliver the regeneration of brownfield site for mixed use development.
<b>Green Belt</b>		
<b>Existing Green Belt Boundaries</b>	British Geological Survey (BGS) should not be removed from the Green Belt.	The complex of buildings does not contribute to the openness of the Green Belt and the creation of a new boundary around the BGS would create a more robust defensible Green Belt



Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
		boundary. Removal has been assessed and proposed within the Green Belt Review Part 2b.
<b>New inset boundaries</b>	Inset boundaries are too tightly drawn, reducing flexibility.	<p>The Green Belt boundaries were drawn in accordance with the NPPF which requires robust and defensible boundaries that preserve land which is free from development (open).</p> <p>The additional housing and its distribution within allocations across outlying settlements provides flexibility. There is no requirement to draw looser boundaries and facilitate more development.</p>
<b>Safeguarded Land</b>	Safeguarded land should be identified within Local Plan 2 in order to provide flexibility and ensure long term delivery.	In order to increase five-year supply of housing land, land has been identified within the adopted Core Strategy (Local Plan 1) and the emerging Local Plan 2 which exceeds the Borough's housing target up until 2028. The Strategic Allocations will continue to deliver homes within the next plan period. Consequently there are no exceptional circumstances for removing land from the Green Belt for safeguarding.
<b>Employment</b>		
<b>Employment Allocations</b>	Local Plan 2 should allocate employment sites, especially the site identified within the Keyworth Neighbourhood Plan (KEYD) which is off Platt Lane.	<p>The employment allocation identified off Platt Lane within the Neighbourhood Plan has merit and is allocated for employment within the publication draft Local Plan 2.</p> <p>Land for employment is also identified within a mixed use allocations at Radcliffe on Trent (RAD01) and at Bunny (BUN01). These meet local demand (within the adopted Radcliffe on Trent Neighbourhood Plan) and, in the case of</p>

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
		<p>Bunny, regeneration purposes.</p> <p>As sufficient employment land will be delivered within the Strategic Allocations, and the Employment Land Forecasting Study identifies no need for additional employment sites, only these three sites will be allocated for employment development within Local Plan 2.</p>
<b>Existing Employment Allocations</b>	Bunny Brickworks, British Gypsum, Langar Airfield, and Hathern Works (Sutton Bonington) should be retained as employment allocations.	<p>Only Bunny Brickworks remains an allocation (for mixed use development).</p> <p>Existing employment sites will be protected and their future development managed through criterion based policies on employment development, Green Belt and development within the countryside.</p>
<b>Centres of Excellence</b>	Local Plan 2 should include further policies on Centres of Excellence.	Core Strategy Policy 4 is sufficient to manage development within Centre's of Excellence.
<b>Rural Diversification</b>	Although supported, policies should ensure development does not adversely affect the landscape or environmental assets.	Local Plan 2 policy Development in the Countryside provides further guidance on diversification of rural enterprises and criteria which will manage its environmental impacts. Core Strategy policy 16 adequately covers landscape issues (requiring compliance with Nottinghamshire Landscape Character Assessment).
<b>Regeneration</b>		
<b>Regeneration Sites</b>	Although the allocation of Bunny Brickworks and the Former Islamic Institute as regeneration sites is	Although the Former Islamic Institute is covered by an extant planning permission for 95 homes it is also allocated for

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
	supported within the majority of representations, the protection of local character and biodiversity assets is a main issue.	<p>development as it is a brownfield site on the edge of Flintham. This policy will ensure reserved matters applications and/or future changes to the permitted development respects the site's location.</p> <p>Site specific policies will manage the ecological effects of developing Bunny Brickworks. The loss of any priority habitats should be avoided, mitigated, or, as a last resort, off-set.</p>
<b>Local and District Centres and Centres of Neighbourhood Importance</b>		
<b>Local and District Centres</b>	The proposed Local Centre for Radcliffe on Trent should be enlarged to include the railway station.	District Centre has been extended to include the railway station. This reflects the centre boundary as defined in the Radcliffe Neighbourhood Plan.
	Secondary frontage on Shelford Road, Radcliffe on Trent, should extend to New Road	The frontage on Shelford Road from the proposed secondary frontage includes a significant number of non-retail uses. It does not comprise a frontage of retail uses (A1 to A5) and warrant designation as a secondary frontage.
	A regeneration zone should be designated south of Main Road, within Radcliffe on Trent's local centre.	Local Plan 2 does not identify any regeneration zones. Instead, the adopted Neighbourhood Plan forms part of the development plan for Rushcliffe and this identifies the Main Road Regeneration Area within which policy 3 applies.
	The primary shopping area within East Leake's Local Centre should be extended from the Three Horse Shoes to the bottom of Castle Hill.	The Local Centre boundary (rather than primary retail area) has been extended to reflect the village centre boundary within the adopted Neighbourhood Plan.
	28 Main St, 40 Main St, 42 Main St, Main St and small parade leading to Health Centre/Library	The parade of shops leading to the health centre has been designated as primary frontage. 28 Main Street is an isolated

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
	<p>should be identified as primary frontages; and the row of units behind odd numbers on Gotham Road as a secondary frontage.</p>	<p>retail unit and 40 and 42 Main Street are residential units. They are not part of a primary frontage.</p> <p>The units behind the odd numbers on Gotham Road are in business use and do not justify the designation as a secondary frontage.</p>
	<p>The frontages within courtyard off Long Acre should be identified as secondary frontages.</p>	<p>The frontages have been designated secondary frontages.</p>
	<p>Frontages on Wolds Drive, Keyworth should be primary frontages.</p>	<p>The frontages on Wolds Drive do not contain a sufficient percentage of shops to qualify as primary frontages. Its location beyond the Local Centre requires a greater flexibility of uses to serve the local community.</p>
	<p>District and Local Centres have inadequate parking provision.</p>	<p>Local Plan 2 policies require appropriate parking provision as part of all developments within District and Local Centres and Centres of Neighbourhood Importance.</p> <p>“6Cs” parking and/or Highways Authority requirements will continue to be applied.</p>
	<p>Whilst restrictions on non-A1 (shops) should be applied within the primary shopping area, they should not be too restrictive. A3 and A4 uses (cafes and public houses) encourage visitors and provide vitality.</p>	<p>The Retail Study and surveys indicate that Local and District Centres are performing well, with low un-occupancy rates. The emerging policies seek to maintain the current mix of uses, allowing for only 20% of the primary frontage to be non-retail (non-A1 to A5). 60% must be A1 (shops) and this reflects the current mix of units. Depending on the amount of non-retail this allows for up to 40% A2 to A5 uses.</p>

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
	Further allocations for retail should be identified.	The Retail Study concludes that further allocations for retail uses are not required, given existing permissions. However there may be a need to review this position as the strategic allocations are delivered through the plan period.
<b>Centres of Neighbourhood Performance</b>	The junction of Debdale Lane and Nottingham Road at Keyworth should be a Centre of Neighbourhood Importance.	There is merit in this and the area is now identified as a Centre of Neighbourhood Importance within Local Plan 2.
	A5 uses should be restricted to maintain vibrancy.	Emerging policy within Local Plan 2 does not permit A5 uses to exceed 30% of units within the Centres of Neighbourhood Importance.
<b>Retail Impact Assessments</b>	Support was expressed for a 500 metre square floorspace threshold for undertaking Retail Impact Assessments when located outside of a centre.	Welcomed, the 500 metre square threshold is included within the emerging plan.
	Threshold should be based on vitality, viability and effects of development on any town centre strategy. Not just average floor space.	This would result in inconsistent requirements to undertake retail impact assessments. The need to consider other issues is not suggested within the Retail Study.
<b>Design and Landscaping Character</b>		
<b>Design</b>	Local Plan 2 should contain more detailed policies on design to ensure development is sympathetic to the natural and built environment.	Core Strategy policy 10 contains a comprehensive list of design criteria and principles. No further policy is required. Design SPD may be reviewed following adoption of Local Plan 2. This will provide greater detail regarding local characteristics, local landscapes and approaches to design.
<b>Landscape Character</b>	Mature/Local Landscapes should be re-instated. Locally valued landscapes have been identified in	The emerging Local Plan 2 will not contain any further policy guidance on landscape. As with design, this issue is

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
	the Vale of Belvoir, Gotham/Barton ridgelines and River Trent Valley.	adequately addressed within Core Strategy policy 10. National policy no longer encourages the establishment of locally designated protected landscapes. The Nottinghamshire Landscape Character Assessment and Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy provide borough wide landscape guidance; this will continue to inform planning applications.
<b>Historic Environment</b>		
<b>Local Heritage Assets</b>	The Trent Valley and confluence with the Soar and Derwent are particularly sensitive areas.	Limited development is proposed in these locations and all allocations have been assessed within a Heritage Assessment. Where archaeological remains are suspected, mitigation measures have been included within site specific policies.
	Buildings of local importance, ancient woodland, hedgerows, ridge and furrow fields and historic parks and gardens should be protected.	Local Plan 2 protects local heritage assets (including buildings and parks and gardens) and ancient woodland. Local Plan 2 has sought to avoid allocating sites with preserved and easily identifiable ridge and furrow. Ancient (important) hedgerows are protected through other legislation.
	Local historic assets should be listed within Local Plan 2.	A list of locally important assets will not be included within Local Plan 2 as these are likely to change during the plan period. Local Plan 2 contains criteria which determine whether any non-designated asset is locally important and therefore a material consideration when determining planning applications.
<b>Designated Heritage Assets</b>	Policy should require assessments of significance and recognition of setting.	Criteria within Local Plan 2's heritage assets policy requires the establishment of the asset's significance and protects its setting.
	An archaeology policy should supplement the Core	An archaeology policy is included within Local Plan 2.

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
	Strategy	
<b>Climate Change, Flood Risk and Water Use</b>		
<b>Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation</b>	Local Plan 2 should contain a policy on renewable energy to avoid environmentally sensitive sites and land of high grade agricultural land.	<p>Renewable energy policy is included within the Local Plan 2. This contains comprehensive criteria which should direct development to less environmentally sensitive locations. Policy does not prevent use of high grade agricultural land. In accordance with NPPF, loss of agricultural land is a material consideration that forms part of the 'planning balance' when determining planning applications.</p> <p>Local Plan 2's Development within the Countryside policy provides further guidance where renewable energy developments are located beyond settlement limits.</p>
<b>Reducing Carbon Emissions</b>	Local Plan 2 should contain further guidance on the reduction of CO2 during the construction and occupation of development	Government policy has removed the ability of LAs to include local plan policies that address CO2 emissions. This issue is addressed through building regulations.
<b>Water Efficiency Standards</b>	Local Plan 2 should contain lower standard water use of 110 litres per day than the national 125 litres.	Lower water use standards have been justified within the Outline Water Cycle Study and they would not create viability issues for development. Local Plan 2 therefore requires 110 litres per day.
<b>Managing Flood Risk</b>	Sites within flood zones 2 and 3 must be subject to sequential test.	A sequential test of sites has been completed and supports Local Plan 2.
<b>Sustainable Drainage</b>	Local Plan 2 should contain a sustainable drainage policy.	Surface Water Management policy is included within the emerging plan.

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
	Drainage issues should be addressed through policies that deliver natural flood management measures and biodiversity enhancement within multifunctional GI.	Surface water management policy, managing flood risk policy and development affecting watercourses policy addresses these issues within Local Plan 2.
	No further developments should take place within the River Trent Flood Plain.	Development will continue to occur in the main urban area of Nottingham which is within the River Trent floodplain as this contains some of the most sustainable locations in the Borough (the Core Strategy focuses development towards the main urban area). One site is also allocated at Radcliffe which is within flood zone 2 (and limited area in flood zone 3) as this is also one of the most sustainable locations on the edge of a Key Settlement. No other residential or employment development is allocated in the River Trent floodplain.
	Land uses/development within the flood plain should provide flood storage.	Local Plan 2 contains Green Infrastructure policies that promote flood storage measures within areas where this is a primary function of the area.
<b>Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity</b>		
<b>Green Infrastructure</b>	Green Infrastructure policies should identify the variety of types of spaces and their functions.	These are identified within the GI and Open Spaces policy and supporting text.
	The GI network should be mapped within Local Plan 2	The GI network is identified within Local Plan 2, but is not included within the policies map as it would over complicate the map.
	Local Plan 2 should recognise that one function of GI may be more important than another.	Local Plan 2 highlights the functions of each corridor and seeks to ensure these functions are improved where development



Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
		takes place within them.
	RBC should create a GI Strategy to assist delivery/review of LP policy.	GI Strategy may follow adoption, subject to priorities at the time.
<b>Local Green Space</b>	Land at Warner's Paddock, Forest Road and Cogley Lane in Bingham were identified as potential Local Green Spaces.	These have been identified within the Local Green Space policy and policies map.
	Inholms Gardens and Coney Grey Sports Ground in Flintham are possible Local Green Spaces	Inholms Gardens is identified as a Local Green Space.
	Local Plan 2 should recognise all green spaces not just Local Green Space.	Although they are not individually identified within the policies map, Local Plan 2 identifies a list of open space types that are protected.
	Sharphill Wood should be a Local Green Space	Sharphill Wood is not identified as a Local Green Space.
<b>Parks and Open Spaces</b>	Local Plan 2 should not focus on formal parks and open spaces. It should highlight biodiversity benefits/functions of more informal open spaces.	Local Plan 2 identifies a list of open space types that are protected, including individual wildlife sites, priority habitats, flood alleviation areas, woodlands and amenity/semi natural green spaces. Ecological networks of sites and habitats are also identified.
	Open space requirements should not be based solely on the size of development. It should allow for off-site provision and financial contributions.	Local Plan 2 policy does set a threshold above which a contribution will be required for open spaces. The contribution will depend on existing open spaces (quality and quantity) and the increased need for more as a result of the development. A financial contribution for off-site improvements is permitted where this would provide the most effective means of creating usable open space.

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
<b>Biodiversity</b>		
<b>Biodiversity Network</b>	Local Plan 2 should consider biodiversity on a landscape scale and identify the ecological networks within Rushcliffe which connect habitats and nature conservation sites.	These are identified within the plan as Biodiversity Opportunity Areas and policies within the plan seek to preserve and enhance them.
	Local Plan 2 should deliver the Nature Conservation Strategy.	Nature Conservation Strategy and Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Project have informed the identification of ecological networks and emerging policies.
	Local Plan 2 should contain a criteria based policy which protects sites according to their place in the hierarchy. This should include non-designated sites and priority habitats.	Local Plan 2 contains a criteria based policy which protects sites and habitats according to their position in the hierarchy.
<b>Trees</b>	Protection of aged and veteran trees and ancient woodlands should be included within the wider criteria based policy that protects assets.	Local Plan 2 contains a separate policy on trees, reflecting the importance within the Borough of maintaining and increasing tree cover.
<b>Off-setting</b>	Off-setting should only occur in accordance with the NPPF mitigation hierarchy (avoid, mitigate or as a last resort compensate). Policy should not be overly prescriptive.	Local Plan 2 reinforces the mitigation hierarchy within the designated and non-designated sites policy.
<b>Culture, Tourism and Sports Facilities</b>		
<b>Allocations</b>	Allocations for culture, tourism and sport should be included in the plan if they are required to support	A need for specific culture, tourism and sporting facilities has not been identified within the supporting evidence base.

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
	new development.	
<b>Safeguarding Facilities</b>	River Trent, River Soar, Grantham Canal and Great Central Railway should be safeguarded from development for their ecological, recreational, tourism and commercial benefits.	These facilities are safeguarded within Local Plan 2 Tourism and Leisure Policy.
	Grantham Canal/River Trent Canal link along the Polser Brook should be safeguarded.	This route is safeguarded within the Local Plan 2 Tourism and Leisure Policy and identified within policies map.
	West Bridgford Hockey Club seeks the allocation of land to the south of West Bridgford, immediately north of Ruddington to be allocated as a sports facility in Local Plan Part 2.	This proposal should be more appropriate advanced as a planning application. Green Belt policy allows for appropriate facilities for outdoor sport as long as the openness of the Green Belt is preserved.
<b>Contamination and Pollution</b>		
<b>Noise Pollution</b>	Noise pollution from aircraft flying into and from East Midlands Airport was highlighted as an issue, especially within East Leake.	Local Plan 2 cannot directly influence activity of the airport (which is not within the Borough) or the flight path of aircraft (which is often influenced by weather conditions).
<b>Light Pollution</b>	Local Plan 2 should contain a specific policy on light pollution, which is a particular issue within rural areas. This policy should prevent the illumination of habitats that are important for light sensitive species (e.g. feeding corridors for bats).	Local Plan 2 pollution policy addresses light pollution and impacts on wildlife, including bats.
<b>Air Pollution</b>	Local Plan 2 should contain a policy on air pollution.	Air pollution is included within the Local Plan 2 pollution policy.
<b>Transport</b>		
<b>Transport Policy</b>	Further policies on local transport are required to address inadequate rural bus service, rail services	Core Strategy policies 14 and 15 address travel demand and transport infrastructure. These complement the development

Local Plan Matter	Main Issue	Summary of Borough Council Response
	(between Nottingham and Grantham) and rat running.	targets, their distribution (which is delivered partly through Local Plan 2 allocations) and strategic allocations within the Core Strategy. Site specific policies in the Local Plan 2 outline highways improvements which are required to deliver non-strategic allocations. Wider transport issues, including public transport, are addressed within the Nottinghamshire County Council's Transport Plan.
<b>Trent Lane/The Hook River Trent Crossing</b>	An additional River Trent Crossing between Trent Lane and The Hook was highlighted as a main issue.	Any additional River Trent crossing would be progressed through the Local Transport Plan. Local Plan 2 does not propose any development that would prevent the creation of additional crossing within the Lady Bay area.
<b>Parking</b>	6Cs Highway Design Guide should continue to be used.	Local Plan 2 policy requires compliance with Highway Authority standards.
<b>Telecommunications Infrastructure</b>		
<b>Broadband</b>	Local Plan 2 should promote broadband within new developments	There are agreements at a national level to ensure that most new development is provided with necessary broadband infrastructure.
<b>Minerals</b>		
<b>Minerals Safeguarding</b>	Local Plan 2 should contain a policy that safeguards minerals resources.	Minerals safeguarding policy is included within Local Plan 2 and these areas are identified within the policies map.