

Suggested points for representations to Rushcliffe on Core Strategy

A personally written letter or completed form is likely to be more effective than a standard letter

Important:

You will need to include the following phrase for your letter / representation to be recognised as valid:

“The Core Strategy does not comply with legal requirements and is unsound. Policy 2 is unsound because it is not justified, is not effective and is not consistent with national policy. The housing numbers are too high and there should be no development South of Clifton (Policy 23).”

As well as the points in the standard letter, here are some **suggestions on what you might also say:**

Green Belt South of Clifton

- Policy 3 is unsound because RBC have **not** stipulated the very special circumstances that justify including the development of a Sustainable Urban Extension to the South of Clifton within the Green Belt as required by the National Planning Policy Framework
- The NPPF also requires that greater account is taken of the *“intrinsic character of the landscape”* which is not mentioned in the Core Strategy
- Policy 4 proposes building factories and warehouses (B2 and B8) which would be seen for miles around in this location
- The Core Strategy does not take sufficient account of the environmental value of the land South of Clifton and that large parts are Grade 2 agricultural land
- Make your own comments about what the landscape of Clifton Pastures **means to you** e.g. unspoilt views across the valley, green gateway to Nottingham.

Consultation process

- Refer to Statement of Community Involvement
- Rushcliffe Borough Council has not consulted properly with local residents in this area. NPPF requires *“early and meaningful engagement”*
- Rushcliffe have allocated nearly 30% of proposed housing South of Clifton yet the only consultation was held in January 2012 **after** the draft Core Strategy had been approved by the full Council in December 2011
- Our objections to development South of Clifton have been ignored and summarised in less than 100 words in an Addendum to the Fresh Approach
- At no time during the consultation was the proposal to have a permanent site for Gypsies and Travellers presented to us

Brownfield sites

- The NPPF also states that *“allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value”* and *“encourage the effective use of land that has been previously developed (brownfield land)”*
- In line with the NPPF the Core Strategy should allocate more housing to brownfield sites – increasing the numbers allocated at RAF Newton and other available land at Tollerton Airfield which has been excluded from the Core Strategy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- Rushcliffe should **not** have published their core strategy without waiting for the final version of the NPPF to be published
- The Core Strategy should be withdrawn and amended to take account of the NPPF