

LAPP.M3 Rep 188, Mr J Potter 04, text of emails referred to in Document 01 from Mr Potter, attachment listed as document 05

From: Potter Mr.J
Sent: 03 April 2017 09:00
To: Cllr J Urquhart; Cllr C Gibson; Cllr S Young; Cllr J Cook
Cc: Councillor A Rule; david.bishop@nottinghamcity.gov.uk; paul.seddon@nottinghamcity.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@nottinghamcity.gov.uk; [planning enforcement officer]@nottinghamcity.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@nottinghamcity.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@nottinghamcity.gov.uk; ldf@nottinghamcity.gov.uk; [REDACTED]@nottinghamcity.gov.uk; feedback@pins.gsi.gov.uk
Subject: Planning Feedback

3rd April 2017

Portfolio Holder Councillor Urquhart,

Good morning; having received your email,

From: Cllr J Urquhart
Sent: 27 March 2017 12:41
To: Potter Mr.J
Subject: Re: 16.02648.PFUL3

, this reply to that is because:

senior figures in your development management department, including - but probably not limited to - those constant-fixtures at your Planning Committee, ought not to have allowed my comments to be mis-summarized in the first place. The herewith attached 16-02648-PFUL3.docx denotes (in green) the issues raised that all the way through the process have been avoided or were left (somewhat) unanswered.

In my initial comments these did not read "if the building waste would be reused on site", did any of the other 16/02648/PFUL3 letters of objection use that phrasing or raise that particular matter?

['Losing' demolition waste on site could also be getting onto the subject of unnecessary land degradation vs soil quality, a material planning issue.]

Certainly I raised - and this planning department (somewhat) avoided - or vaguely deferred it to conditions - the material planning issues [noise/vibration/dust/air quality] involved in carting demolition waste off it being processed elsewhere, in spite of the known opposition of other local south Nottinghamshire communities.

Mrs Urquhart re the Waste Core Strategy you are at its Foreword - & also above that planning document there is the NPPW - it's been broached with senior planning policy personnel, how it's yet to be seen in any planning application this council - for example - deals with in terms of the material planning issues of the large percentage of demolition (& construction) waste generated - actually unsustainable, not upholding the uppermost part of The Waste Hierarchy triangle i.e. [waste] prevention or to produce less [waste], & also wastefully wiping away built continuity or a sense of place within built environment - be assessed or appraised against the aforementioned waste policies.

The Planning Inspectorate at Bristol are yet to undertake Examination

of your part 2 proposals, at this Clifton though - re this council - there are some different planning factors, it would seem pre-empting (dragging out/...circumventing) that process, leaving least possible for the Examination to actually examine isn't a fair process.

It is of discredit, that *some* (- however not all -) of your planning staff, to them it's a game, *some* to the point of time-wasting *un*professional mis-summarization; that becomes this council's loss, them and therein a culture of not *really* wanting to listen to the detail local residents can provide, who may actually have some positive ideas for this particular area, Clifton.

Here is some summarized feedback about your planning department & set-up: Contrary to the idea of local-ism, is that this council does not allow members of the public to speak on local (planning) matters, at its minuted 'area' committee, and that it also does not allow members of the public to address its Planning Committee.

This council's planning applications online not displaying an area or ward - & on some not even a (partial) postcode - at the first page possible for those looking through weekly / monthly lists, it appears as if this council's planning applications webpages try to be off-putting in general.

Over at Queens Drive park'n'ride, what is a bus depot constructed on the flood plain sans planning application(s) is of question.

[REDACTED] the Green Belt, is it considered that, amongst others, development management have been and are cumulatively looking the other way [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Were there similar council planning operatives around in the 1980s who thought it was adequate to tip nr. Burrows Farm countryside proximate to heritage Clifton Wood (, & who were they)?

'Sincerely,
Mr J Potter .

From: Potter Mr.J

Sent: 21 March 2017 18:53

To: Cllr J Urquhart; development.management@nottinghamcity.gov.uk; ldf@nottinghamcity.gov.uk

Cc: [REDACTED];

Councillor A Rule; npcu@communities.gsi.gov.uk

Subject: Proposal 16/02648/PFUL3 , Objections e-mail with attached letter.

(Attachment: 16.02648.PFUL3)

21/03/2017

It is questioned how open minded councillors on the planning committee are?
- besides the Clifton South ward councillors who've appeared to push, or peddle, this proposal - when this council, in your planning committee report at 7.16, not-impartially owns the triangular land in question; at the beginning of the report it notes that 16/02648/PFUL3 "would be a significant departure" from Plan, it is questioned then why isn't it indicated in the aforementioned report whether this proposal would be looked into by the National Planning Casework Unit?

Herewith - on the attached 16.02648.PFUL3.docx - examples of development management's, it's considered deliberate, mis-summarization of my representation comments sent, and the avoidance of accountability re planning matters raised, are provided, colour denoted; it's been telephone mentioned within the last week to PA [REDACTED], and PA [REDACTED], that this development management department may be on course for (a) written complaint(s) about their (continued) mis-summarization, and/or mis-presentation at its planning committee, and/or avoidance of accountability on planning matters, including [- policy hierarchy minimization of -] waste planning matters; they are, at the present time, still able to correct themselves through their planning committee update sheet(s).

Mr J. Potter .

(For the information of NPCU, further to informal phonecall w/ [REDACTED] PM 21.03.17)

From: Potter Mr.J

Sent: 16 March 2017 1:17 PM

To: Cllr C Arnold; Cllr R Healy; Cllr C Gibson; Cllr S Young; Cllr J Cook; development.management@nottinghamcity.gov.uk; [REDACTED] Paul Seddon; [REDACTED]; ldf@nottinghamcity.gov.uk

Cc: Councillor A Rule

Subject: Proposal 16/02648/PFUL3 , Objections e-mail and letter

16th March 2017

To:
the Vice-Chair' of Planning Committee;
Executive Assistant R Healy;
Cllrs,

(16.02648PFUL3.docx is attached) for your consideration; the Green Lane 'triangle' location would be the place [in Clifton] where the Council could shape it to much increase its residential component i.e. instead of a proposed density of up to 300 units next to Clifton Wood;

Council-planning could have alternatively shaped the drive-thru application(s) to instead have had some residential dwellings facing onto Dalehead Road, rather than two not necessary fast-food outlets; Council-planning could have alternatively shaped the former Clifton Bridge Cafe location to (instead) have had a road-stop restaurant, with residential to the back of, there; Council-planning could have alternatively shaped detached houses in Clifton: Baird House and Four Winds [Clifton Lane], and The House [107 Southchurch Drive nr. Clifton Leisure Centre], to have instead continued being residential dwellings; reused instead of (lack-of-policy) wastefully not-resisting the aforementioned from being demolished; this Council's-planning would appear to continuously squander acceptable planning and place shaping opportunities.

Mis-summarization of my comments letter, attached, and also this planning departments' avoidance of accountability on important, planning matters raised therein
- as re planning's committee report - is herewith another point of objection.

Mr J. Potter .