

15th September, 2014

To:

Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government
Kris Hopkins MP
Department for Communities and Local Government
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

localplan@nottinghamcity.gov.uk [i.e. N.C.C.'s
Planning] Policy and Research team

Planning Policy team
[Broxtowe B.C.] Council Offices
Foster Avenue
Beeston
Notts.
NG9 1AB

Nottm. Green Belt Assessment Framework Draft for Consultation July 2014
, Objections on:

- Nottm.-council - N.C.C.* ,and Broxtowe Borough Council, keep planning policy consultation mailing lists - when it suits them I'm on both of those - N.C.C. ,& Broxtowe B.C., would also be particularly cognizant of Green Belt representations; so why did they not inform/consult me directly concerning this 'consultation' - it is a faulty process when you do not consult with members of the public. At the present time Government Ministers are considering whether or not to devolve power 'locally' - these LPAs [Local Planning Authority] are causing much opposition with their un-consulted &/or undemocratic [local residents at Clifton are not allowed to speak at a sham 'area committee' , nor at the Planning Committee] &/or distorted planning - & yet again they fail to consult properly - reasons not to hand them* increased powers.

- Re proposed figure 1: assessment criteria
 - 'To assist safeguarding the countryside from encroachment': the meaning of safeguarding gets distorted [away from protect] in current planning parlance,
 - if a 'location contains inappropriate development' that might be through a LPA with detrimental planning bent,
 - 'urban fringe' is unhelpful phrasing, instead you could say interior Green Belt or interior countryside because these areas could be under the influence of such land;
 - 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns²' - you aren't including Mature Landscape Area designation, or recognizing undesigned heritage assets,
 - '...harm that may be caused...' is unhelpful phrasing.

- Re proposed figure 2: assessment matrix
- 'Check the unrestricted sprawl of settlements'★ 'the site' may have other value e.g. in terms of outlook openness, or a 'washed over' situation,
- 'Prevent neighbouring settlements from merging into one another' 'historical' perceivance or perception on the gap between settlements could have relevance or weight,
- 'Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment' and/or 'Preserve the setting and special character of historic settlements' ★ to ★★★ there's obligation, a duty, to properly uphold 'the rural' and this would include not exacerbating past poor /urbanizing -planning , even e.g. at outer-suburb , copy and paste the highlighted points aforementioned here ● , and apply objections to 2.5 important south of Nottm. .

For the sake of example, Clifton is a separate, Green Belt settlement and its eastern and south-eastern Green Belt flank therein land use, is clearly bounded by Farnborough Road and Summerwood Lane.

Signed, Mr. J. Potter .

