

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

Crown Estate
423587 agent
Carter Jonas
891530

3 March 2016

Dear Sir/Madam,

REPRESENTATIONS TO RUSHCLIFFE LOCAL PLAN PART 2: ISSUES AND OPTIONS AND DRAFT GREEN BELT REVIEW: ON BEHALF OF THE CROWN ESTATE

These representations have been prepared on behalf of The Crown Estate, in response to Rushcliffe's Local Plan Part 2: Issues and Options and Draft Green Belt Review consultation documents.

Please find below responses to Question 19 of the Local Plan Part 2: Issues and Options document and Question 2 of the Draft Green Belt Review document.

RUSHCLIFFE LOCAL PLAN PART 2: LAND AND PLANNING POLICIES DOCUMENT - ISSUES AND OPTIONS

Question 19: Do you support the Green Belt inset boundaries recommended by the draft Rushcliffe Green Belt Review (Part 2b) for:

Shelford	Yes	✓
----------	-----	---

Comments:

The Crown Estate supports the proposed Green Belt inset boundaries for Shelford as shown in Figure B7 of the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies – Issues and Options consultation document (page 95). The majority of Shelford's built form is located within the inset boundaries (now outside the Green Belt), with physical features being utilised as defensible boundaries. This complies with paragraph 85 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which sets out criteria for those Local Planning Authorities defining/amending Green Belt boundaries.

The establishment of a Green Belt inset boundary for Shelford presents a more flexible planning policy framework to provide affordable and market housing for local residents up to 2028. Infill development provides an opportunity to meet local housing need which assists with incremental growth and village vitality, and therefore in turn supports 'a prosperous rural economy' - a key principle of Chapter 3 of the NPPF.

RUSHCLIFFE DRAFT GREEN BELT REVIEW PART 2 (B)

Question 2: Proposed insets for washed over villages

Do you agree or disagree with the suggested inset boundaries for the settlements currently washed over? If you disagree, state why the boundary is incorrect and where the new boundary should be. Your comment should focus on the contribution the land makes to the openness of the Green Belt, long term permanence and the presence of recognisable defensible boundaries.

Comments:

The Crown Estate supports the proposed Green Belt inset boundaries for Shelford as shown in Figure B7 of the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies – Issues and Options consultation document (page 95). The majority of Shelford’s built form is located within the inset boundaries (now outside the Green Belt), with physical features being utilised as defensible boundaries. This complies with paragraph 85 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which sets out criteria for those Local Planning Authorities defining/amending Green Belt boundaries.

The establishment of a Green Belt inset boundary for Shelford presents a more flexible planning policy framework to provide affordable and market housing for local residents up to 2028. Infill development provides an opportunity to meet local housing need which assists with incremental growth and village vitality, and therefore in turn supports ‘a prosperous rural economy’ - a key principle of Chapter 3 of the NPPF.

We would be grateful if you could upload the above representations to the consultation portal. It would also be helpful if you could keep me informed about all future Local Plan consultations and any other planning policy consultations.

Should you require anything further please do not hesitate to contact me or my colleague Jennifer Islip (/ 020 7518 3273).

Yours sincerely



Alister Henderson
Partner

E: T: 020 7529 1504