

EXAMINATION OF THE NOTTINGHAM CITY LAND AND PLANNING POLICIES

DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT (LOCAL PLAN 2 )

SUBMISSION OF TOM HUGGON

NOTTINGHAM CITY OPEN AND GREEN SPACES CHAMPION

3490

1.All my submissions are essentially set out in my representations at the two earlier stages of the consultation process which have been put together and accurately annotated by the planning department as attached.As these form of the formal documentation I do not wish to set them out again.

2.As the City Council has not altered the plan to accommodate my main principles I wish to have them considered at this Examination.

3.There has been some movement which can be summarised concisely.

4.Of the 193.18 hectares of green space originally allocated 59.39 are not being carried forward leaving 142.59 hectares.At an earlier stage this was reduced to 106.27 hectares but has now gone up again.This is still a significant loss .The largest are PA11, PA17, PA38 and PA59.

5.The major brownfield areas Eastside,Waterside and Southern Area which hardly featured in the first allocation have now largely been allocated .This adds weight to my argument that they should be developed before any green space now that they are possible.

6.Particularly as there has been much recent activity at both Waterside and City Link/Island (the major part of Eastside)sitesThe City Council are shareholders in the Waterside site (Blueprint) and so have direct input into its progress.

7.Whilst the City Council have not acceptedintothe plan my point about phasing of green sites in accordance with their individual importance they have conducted detailed surveys of each incorporating the findings in the development principles for each site.This is fine as far as it goes..It does not alter my point that phasing should be done in accordance with the comparative importance of each site in order of its contribution to the network rather than being part of a planning brief which does not take account of the importance of a site in the hierarchy.

As the City Council owns most of the sites so far as these are concerned it could release them in such order:and has a duty to do so under s40 of NERC Act.

8.So far as the four major sites referred to in para 4 are concerned I pray in aid of my general thesis all the comments made by them in their individual allocation notes as proof

of my thesis. Stanton Tip is a particularly ironic site as it was reclaimed at great public expense from a disused coalmine as a green public open space which it now is.

9. My best evidence is the sites themselves seen on inspection ie. the three major brownfield areas (which should best be seen all at one time for their collective importance) and the four sites mentioned in para 4 above.

10. Finally on the question of whether the allocation process was correct it is my submission that it started from the wrong place. Had the major brownfield sites been included comprehensively in the first area of search together with the smaller brownfield sites there would have been a different approach to the allocation of green sites the importance of which would have been ascertained by survey etc before allocation: and phasing would have been logical and obvious.

Tom Huggon