

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

Dear Sir

Representation on the Rushcliffe Borough Council Core Strategy, March 2012

The Core Strategy is not legally compliant as it was prepared and published ahead of the final National Planning Policy Framework and does not reflect its contents.

Policy 2

I think that 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 not adequately justified and therefore there should be no development to the South of Clifton (Policy 23).

Policy 3

I believe that Policy 3 is unsound because RBC have **not** stated the “very special circumstances” as required by the NPPF, that justify including the development of a Sustainable Urban Extension to the South of Clifton within the Green Belt.

Policy 4

The proposal in Policy 4 for B2 and B8 is unsound and completely inconsistent with the requirements of the NPPF to recognise “the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside” and would be visually intrusive in the landscape (2.2.7).

Statement of Community Involvement

I think that the consultation undertaken by RBC is not legally compliant with their Statement of Community Involvement in that consultation events were only held in our community **after** the draft Core Strategy had been approved by a meeting of the Full Borough Council on 15th December. There was also no mention of a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site on Clifton Pastures during consultation meetings. Objections to the South of Clifton site have been ignored other than a summary of less than 100 words in 7.2 of an Addendum to the Fresh Approach and have not been reflected in the formulation of Policy 23 of the Core Strategy.

Yours faithfully