

With reference to a further written statement the easiest way for me to comply is to list what I think are the relevant documents for the hearing and attach as appendices to this representation.

1. Document addressed to the Nottingham City Council Development Policy and Research Team dated 9th March 2016 ref. Local Plan (Part 2) Preferred Options Consultation Response - LAPP version 2016 – Comments (8 pages). Note the addendum, (pages 6,7 & 8) contains general comments made in relation to the 2013 LAPP. (appendix B) Development Departments marked up version of reference 1) i.e. paragraph numbering. Note this document covers pages 1 to 5 of my 8 page submission.
2. Letter dated 27 Nov 2013. Nottingham City's New Local Plan Preferred Option Consultation - Options DS88 & DS89. Note paragraph 5 lists the amount of open space in the area. (Appendix A)

My contention that it is unreasonable as the planning department is acting as both judge and jury with respect to the allocation of omission statements without the rigor of further questioning.

I wish to add information relating to the status of allotments:

Allotment - Dictionary Definition. - Ref Policy EN4

An allotment is defined as an area of land **rented** for the purpose of growing food.

The New Aspley Gardens are all **freehold** and therefore do not fall under the above category.

They may or may not be used for the above purpose; it's entirely at the owner's discretion.

A rented allotment would have the terms of tenancy written into the rental agreement. For example what the land may or may not be used for and the tenants responsibilities.

In our case every owner (200 plus ?) would have to agree to a similar document, it's clearly not a practical proposition. It's akin to having a row of individually owned houses and expecting everyone to agree to have same garden layout or house colour or both.

The administration of the sites DS88 & DS89 on a coherent basis, similar to an allotment site, is obviously unrealistic and hence not a feasible proposition.

It is pointless the planning department classifying sites DS88 & DS89 as allotment land for planning purposes, as clearly policy EN4 is not relevant in this case.