

12 September 2013

**Agenda Item:**

**REPORT OF THE CORPORATE DIRECTOR FOR POLICY, PLANNING AND  
CORPORATE SERVICES**

**RUSHCLIFFE BOROUGH COUNCIL CORE STRATEGY FURTHER  
PROPOSALS FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CONSULTATION (JUNE 2013)**

**Purpose of the Report**

1. To seek Committee ratification for comments set out in this report which were sent to Rushcliffe Borough Council (RBC) on 9<sup>th</sup> August 2013 in response to the request for comments on the Rushcliffe Core Strategy Further Proposals for Housing Development (June 2013).

**Information and Advice**

*Background*

2. The Rushcliffe Borough Council Local Plan Part 1 – Core Strategy is at an advanced stage of preparation. It was submitted for examination in October 2012, however the Planning Inspector undertaking the examination identified that the plan does not make sufficient provision for housing development in the period to 2028, nor take account of longer term requirements beyond the 2028 plan period.
3. Subsequently, the examination was suspended until October 2013 in order to allow Rushcliffe Borough Council to carry out additional work and public consultation on how best to meet the shortfall of proposed housing.
4. Rushcliffe Borough Council have discussed the housing issues with the other Greater Nottingham Housing Market Area (HMA) local authorities and a further 3,550 dwellings have been identified to be developed up to the plan period 2028 in line with the most recent projections. This would take the planned housing provision in Rushcliffe to a total of 13,150 homes between 2011-2028.
5. Consultation on the Rushcliffe Core Strategy Further Proposals for Housing Development ran from the 17<sup>th</sup> June to the 9<sup>th</sup> August 2013. A number of specific questions were asked as part of the consultation. A copy of the County's response is contained at Appendix 1.

6. The County Council owns approximately 55 Ha of land immediately to the south of the Grantham Canal which falls within the area of RBCs proposals and will be promoted as part of any proposed scheme in order to maximise the potential benefits to the Council and community at large. It is anticipated the proposed development will include employment land allocation which will be a significant boost to the local economy and in the longer term the proposed employment land will create jobs along with other anticipated community facilities.
7. The Committee should note that the Council owns further land north of the Grantham Canal comprising 194 ha (as shown on plan B). Other land owners also have land which is currently outside RBC's revised core strategy proposals. Following further discussions between NCC Property and the other land owners representations, may well be made for additional land to be included in the review of the RBC's core strategy and this may also include a review of Green Belt boundaries.
8. It should be noted that on the 7<sup>th</sup> August 2013 a report relating to the County Councils property interests in relation to the sites identified below and proposals for the additional land identified above, was taken to the Finance and Property Committee and the Committee resolved to promote the County Councils land interests to Rushcliffe Borough Council.

#### The Proposed Sites

9. The proposals are for major development at:
  - Land at Melton Road, Edwalton
  - Land south of Clifton
  - Land east of Gamston (north of Tollerton)
10. In the case of Melton Road, Edwalton and land to the south of Clifton, both locations are identified in the already submitted draft Core Strategy as major development sites. The Melton Road, Edwalton site also benefits from planning permission for 1,200 new dwellings. It is intended that both sites will accommodate additional housing than previously proposed as follows.

#### *Land at Melton Road, Edwalton*

11. The existing proposal, set out in the original Core Strategy is to remove land from the Green Belt and allocate for future development 2,500 dwellings. The site is bound to the west by the new A453 and to the south of Barton Lane. Under the further proposals for housing development in this consultation an additional 500 dwellings are proposed, through increasing the density of development rather than taking extra land.

#### *Land south of Clifton*

12. The existing proposal, set out in the original Core Strategy, is to remove from the Green Belt and allocate for development land on both sides of Melton Road. The existing proposal has planning permission for 1,200 dwellings. The new proposals would increase dwelling numbers by 550.

### *Land east of Gamston (north of Tollerton)*

13. This site was not identified for development in the submitted Rushcliffe Borough Council Core Strategy, however, it was proposed for a major urban extension in February 2010. Rushcliffe Borough Council consider the site could accommodate 2,500 new dwellings during the plan period 2011-2028. The site would also accommodate employment, open space and other infrastructure in order to support a development of this size.

### **Other Options Considered**

14. As the consultation requires representations to be made on the Rushcliffe Core Strategy Further Proposals for Housing Development (June 2013) the only other option was not to make representations.

### **Reason/s for Recommendation/s**

15. The County Council supports the approach taken by Rushcliffe Borough Council to provide an additional 3,550 homes in order to deliver a minimum of 13,150 new homes by 2028.
16. Modification of the Rushcliffe Local Plan (Part 1 - Core Strategy) to reflect the above would help to ensure that alongside the other Nottingham Core Housing Market Area councils, Rushcliffe Borough Council is planning positively in contributing towards meeting the assessed housing need for 49,950 new homes within Greater Nottingham (between 2011 to 2028) in full, this would in addition, contribute to the wider Nottinghamshire area and support economic growth and regeneration of the County.
17. Further transport modelling is required to understand the impact of increasing housing numbers on the above sites.
18. The County Council would welcome close liaison with Rushcliffe Borough Council and Nottingham City Council to ensure that the proposed development assimilates with the existing communities and provides the infrastructure and services required without negatively impacting on the area. Close links to the town centres, schools and other community facilities will be important to ensure developments are sustainable.
19. Potential impacts on ecology and archaeology will need to be assessed at the earliest opportunity.

### **Statutory and Policy Implications**

20. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of finance, the public sector equality duty, human resources, crime and disorder, human rights, the safeguarding of children, sustainability and the environment and those using the service and where such implications are material they are

described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

### **Financial Implications**

21. There are no direct financial implications.

### **Implications for Sustainability and the Environment**

22. The failure to consider the representations of the County Council on strategic planning and transport matters could lead to unsustainable development taking place, possibly without the adequate context of an adopted Local Plan. The education and transport interests of the County Council as service provider could also be compromised by the lack of a suitable Local Plan.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

- 1) That Committee endorse the above comments, which formed an officer response to Rushcliffe Borough Council.

**Jayne Francis-Ward**

**Corporate Director, Policy, Planning and Corporate Services**

**For any enquiries about this report please contact: Nina Wilson (Principal Planning Officer), Planning Policy Team, ext 73793**

### **Constitutional Comments (SHB.08.08.13)**

23. Committee have power to approve the Recommendation.

### **Financial Comments (TMR 08/08/2013)**

24. There are no direct financial implications as a result of this report.

### **Background Papers and Published Documents**

Rushcliffe Core Strategy Further Proposals for Housing Development (June 2013)

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

### **Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected**

Councillor Martin Suthers OBE – Bingham  
Councillor Richard Butler – Cotgrave  
Councillor John Cottee – Keyworth  
Councillor Kay Cutts – Radcliffe on Trent  
Councillor Reg Adair – Ruddington  
Councillor Andrew Brown – Soar Valley

Councillor Steve Calvert – West Bridgford Central and South  
Councillor Liz Plant - West Bridgford Central and South  
Councillor Gordon Wheeler – West Bridgford West

## Appendix 1 – Detailed NCC Comments

### Rushcliffe Local Plan – Part 1: Core Strategy

### Further proposals for housing development Response Form

Your Details		Agent details (where applicable)
Nina Wilson	Name	n/a
Nottinghamshire County Council County Hall West Bridgford Nottingham NG2 7QP	Address	n/a
<a href="mailto:Nina.wilson@nottscc.gov.uk">Nina.wilson@nottscc.gov.uk</a>	E-mail	n/a

### Local housing needs

<b>Question 1</b>			
Do you think that we are right to increase the level of proposed housing by at least 3,550 homes, which in total will mean the delivery of a minimum of 13,150 new homes in Rushcliffe between 2011 and 2028? Please tick yes or no.			
<b>Yes</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>No</b>	
If possible, please give reasons for your answer.			
<p>Nottinghamshire County Council supports the approach taken by Rushcliffe Borough Council to provide an additional 3,550 homes in order to deliver a minimum of 13,150 new homes by 2028.</p> <p>Modification of the Rushcliffe Local Plan (Part 1 - Core Strategy) to reflect the above would help to ensure that alongside the other Nottingham Core Housing Market Area councils, Rushcliffe Borough Council is planning positively in contributing towards meeting the assessed housing need for 49,950 new homes within Greater</p>			

Nottingham (between 2011 to 2028) in full, this would in addition, contribute to the wider Nottinghamshire area and support economic growth and regeneration of the County.

It is considered that it would be beneficial if Rushcliffe could set out timescales for site delivery, in terms of annual build rates, in order to provide a more holistic picture as to when sites are likely to be started and completed.

In terms of transport clearly the evidence base relating to the transport impacts of Rushcliffe's strategy will require review. Following a joint meeting with Rushcliffe, Nottingham City and Nottinghamshire County Councils, it has been agreed that as a minimum, further transport modelling is required to understand the impact of increasing housing numbers on the above sites. As a start traffic consultants (MVA) have been tasked by Rushcliffe Borough Council to prepare an update of Stage 1 of the Greater Nottingham Transport Model (i.e. without mitigation) to provide a benchmark of the potential impacts. Until such time as the findings of the study are known it is not possible for the local highway authority to determine the suitability or otherwise of the proposed new housing allocations.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Proposed development of land south of Clifton

### Question 2

Do you think that the identified shortfall in proposed new housing in Rushcliffe should be met in part by increasing the number planned at land south of Clifton by around 500 homes and that this should be achieved without increasing the amount of land already proposed for development? Please tick yes or no.

Yes	X	No	
-----	---	----	--

If possible, please give reasons for your answer.

Nottinghamshire County Council, from a planning policy perspective, supports growth and development at this location, recognising that a similar spatial strategy of sustainable urban extensions is being applied within the Greater Nottingham area. This would therefore positively contribute to the deliverability of sustainable growth across the wider Greater Nottingham Area as a whole.

It is unclear as to whether the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) will be updated, particularly in respect of education and transport and whether further viability assessments be carried out. The County Council would like to reiterate that, as the education and highway authority, they would welcome early discussions in terms of developer contributions.

An increase in housing density would obviously negate the need for increased landtake. However, as an observation, previous proposals for this area as part of the 'Nottingham Gateway' project involved a larger development area, but also involved proposals for significant (and potentially very valuable) areas of habitat creation, which were a major potential benefit of an enlarged development area. The creation of equivalent areas may not be deliverable on such a scale through development at other locations (e.g. Gamston).

The site has archaeological potential. Works associated with the NET and A453 uncovered significant archaeology, in particular one site of a probable Neolithic Causewayed enclosure which had to be considered for preservation in situ, on the advice of English Heritage. Had preservation in situ been required, it would have meant a significant re-design of the NET route at a very late stage.

In terms of transport, clearly the evidence base relating to the transport impacts of Rushcliffe's strategy will require review. Following a joint meeting with Rushcliffe, Nottingham City and Nottinghamshire County Councils, it has been agreed that as a minimum, further transport modelling is required to understand the impact of increasing housing numbers on the above sites. As a start traffic consultants (MVA) have been tasked by Rushcliffe Borough Council to prepare an update of Stage 1 of the Greater Nottingham Transport Model (i.e. without mitigation) to provide a



benchmark of the potential impacts. Until such time as the findings of the study are known it is not possible for the local highway authority to determine the suitability or otherwise of the proposed new housing allocations.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### **Question 3**

Do you have any views on how development of land south of Clifton should look, in terms of, for example, the mix and layout of different land uses on the site, the types and level of new services and facilities on the site and their location?

Land to the south-east of the development area (marked as 'area for surface water balancing') should be designed to maximise its nature conservation value, as should other areas of Green Infrastructure through the site.

The site has the potential to have significant areas of archaeological interest where preservation in situ is required, this would need to be addressed in any development scheme.

A masterplan for the area would be welcomed to facilitate this discussion in more detail.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Proposed development of land at Melton Road, Edwalton

### Question 4

Do you think that the identified shortfall in proposed new housing in Rushcliffe should be met in part by increasing the number planned at land at Melton Road, Edwalton by around 550 homes? Please tick yes or no.

<b>Yes</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>No</b>	
------------	----------	-----------	--

If possible, please give reasons for your answer.

Nottinghamshire County Council, from a planning policy perspective, supports growth and development at this location, recognising that a similar spatial strategy of sustainable urban extensions is being applied within the Greater Nottingham area. This would therefore positively contribute to the deliverability of sustainable growth across the wider Greater Nottingham Area as a whole.

It is unclear as to whether the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) will be updated, particularly in respect of education and transport and whether further viability assessments be carried out. The County Council would like to reiterate that, the education and highway authority, they would welcome early discussions in terms of developer contributions.

It seems sensible to focus increased development in an area where development would already be taking place, although it is not clear why this cannot be achieved by increasing housing density as at land south of Clifton.

In terms of transport, clearly the evidence base relating to the transport impacts of Rushcliffe's strategy will require review. Following a joint meeting with Rushcliffe, Nottingham City and Nottinghamshire County Councils, it has been agreed that as a minimum, further transport modelling is required to understand the impact of increasing housing numbers on the above sites. As a start traffic consultants (MVA) have been tasked by Rushcliffe Borough Council to prepare an update of Stage 1 of the Greater Nottingham Transport Model (i.e. without mitigation) to provide a benchmark of the potential impacts. Until such time as the findings of the study are known it is not possible for the local highway authority to determine the suitability or otherwise of the proposed new housing allocations.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### **Question 5**

Do you have any views on how development of land at Melton Road, Edwalton should look, in terms of, for example, the mix and layout of different land uses on the site, the types and level of new services and facilities on the site and their location?

The proposals require a reduction in the area of land currently proposed for a country park, and the establishment of a new development area to the south-west of Sharphill Wood. Both have the potential to result in increased pressure on the wood (which is a SINCE), and very careful consideration will need to be given to how the development is designed, and the configuration of open space, so that pressure on the wood from an increased population is minimised. It is likely that additional green space provision will be required in association with the new development area to the south-west of Sharphill Wood, along with a landscaping buffer between the development area and the wood.

The site has the potential to have significant areas of archaeological interest where preservation in situ is required, this would need to be addressed in any development scheme.

It is the County Council's understanding that a large retail store is proposed in this area. The potential impact of this proposal on the viability and vitality of the West Bridgford retail area should be assessed.

In terms of transport, clearly the evidence base relating to the transport impacts of Rushcliffe's strategy will require review. Following a joint meeting with Rushcliffe, Nottingham City and Nottinghamshire County Councils, it has been agreed that as a minimum, further transport modelling is required to understand the impact of increasing housing numbers on the above sites. As a start traffic consultants (MVA) have been tasked by Rushcliffe Borough Council to prepare an update of Stage 1 of the Greater Nottingham Transport Model (i.e. without mitigation) to provide a benchmark of the potential impacts. Until such time as the findings of the study are known it is not possible for the local highway authority to determine the suitability or otherwise of the proposed new housing allocations.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### **Question 6**

Do you think other land within (to the north) of the A52 should be removed from the Green Belt and at the present time 'safeguarded' from development? If possible, please give reasons for your answer.

No, this land is unlikely to come forward during the plan period, as the Green Belt Review identifies it as a longer-term development option, so it would not positively contribute to meeting the Plan's overall housing target.

(please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## Proposed development of land east of Gamston (north of Tollerton)

### Question 7

Do you think that the identified shortfall in proposed new housing in Rushcliffe should be met in part by a major mixed use development on land to the east of Gamston (north of Tollerton), which would include the delivery of around 2,500 homes by 2028, and with capacity to provide around a further 1,500 homes post 2028? Please tick yes or no.

Yes	X	No	
-----	---	----	--

If possible, please give reasons for your answer.

Nottinghamshire County Council, from a planning policy perspective, supports growth and development at this location, recognising that a similar spatial strategy of sustainable urban extensions is being applied within the Greater Nottingham area. This would therefore positively contribute to the deliverability of sustainable growth across the wider Greater Nottingham Area as a whole.

The Gamston site appears to be of generally low nature conservation value, although it would be useful if (preliminary) site surveys were available to support this view, and there may nevertheless be impacts on protected and other notable species.

The site has the potential to have significant areas of archaeological interest where preservation in situ is required, this would need to be addressed in any development scheme.

It is unclear as to whether the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) will be updated, particularly in respect of education and transport and whether further viability assessments be carried out. The County Council would like to reiterate that, the education and highway authority, they would welcome early discussions in terms of developer contributions.

In terms of transport clearly the evidence base relating to the transport impacts of Rushcliffe's strategy will require review. Following a joint meeting with Rushcliffe, Nottingham City and Nottinghamshire County Councils, it has been agreed that as a minimum, further transport modelling is required to understand the impact of increasing housing numbers on the above sites. As a start traffic consultants (MVA) have been tasked by Rushcliffe Borough Council to prepare an update of Stage 1 of the Greater Nottingham Transport Model (i.e. without mitigation) to provide a benchmark of the potential impacts. Until such time as the findings of the study are known it is not possible for the local highway authority to determine the suitability or otherwise of the proposed new housing allocations.

### Question 8

Do you have any views on how development of land to the east of Gamston (north of Tollerton) should look, in terms of, for example, the mix and layout of different land uses on the site, the types and level of new services and facilities on the site and their location?

The development should be designed such that its nature conservation value is maximised. This should include enhancements to existing green corridors of the Grantham Canal (which is a SINC) and Polser Brook, and through careful design of surface water attenuation features. There may also be the scope for significant areas of woodland planting.

Consideration should also be given to improved access into the countryside around the development area, including east towards Cotgrave Country Park and north to the Holme Pierrepont area.

The transport and connectivity issues will be most challenging if a significant development is permitted to the east of the A52 (T). It will be essential for the RBC to demonstrate that this site can be suitably linked to West Bridgford town centre and Nottingham City Centre by public transport and that the new community can be integrated with the neighbouring Gamston settlement by sustainable travel opportunities. As part of previous Gamston proposals it has been suggested that the A52(T) would be diverted bypassing the A52 (T) Gamston roundabout. This would provide the opportunity to bring the development inside the A52(T) to minimise the segregation from the existing conurbation and would also help Rushcliffe Borough Council in providing a clear green belt boundary. However, this may affect the position of the allocation to accommodate the suggested modified road scheme. The precise location/extent of the site would then need further consideration.'

<b>Signed:</b>		<b>Date:</b>	
----------------	--	--------------	--

The consultation period runs from Monday 17 June 2013 until **5pm on Friday 9 August 2013**. Responses to all eight questions can be made through the Borough Council's consultation portal (see [www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy](http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy) ), or by completing this form in writing or by e-mail and submitting it to:

Planning Policy  
Rushcliffe Borough Council  
Civic Centre  
Pavilion Road  
West Bridgford  
Nottingham  
NG2 5FE

[localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk](mailto:localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk)

**If submitting your comments in writing, please print your name clearly together with your email and postal address. Please note that we may publish all names, addresses and comments received on our website but we will not publish signatures, personal telephone numbers or email addresses.**