

Lilian Greenwood MP



HOUSE OF COMMONS

LONDON SW1A 0AA

### **Matter 3 – Minerals Provision Policies**

I know that additional representations have already been made by Nottingham City Council in relation to the proposed site and heritage assets. Currently, the proposals will impact on designated assets of the “highest significance” including grade I listed Clifton Hall and its grade II registered park and garden. Further, that the City Council considers that the proposal will be detrimental during the operational phase and even after remediation has been completed these “significant strong concerns” are so substantive “as to make the allocation of the Mill Hill site unjustified and unsound”. To date, Nottingham City Council does not feel that this aspect has been “adequately considered in proposing to allocate the site for mineral extraction”.

As I understand it, the Regulation 19 submission from Barton in Fabis, CVRA, Larkhill Village Residents and others specifically demonstrates that there is a lack of detailed analysis of housing developments and required aggregate provision and demonstrates that the inclusion of Shelford would achieve a better geographical spread than that realised by the current MLPPV.

I also remain concerned over the amount of time the applicant has had to provide an acceptable planning proposal. You will be aware that the Mill Hill site was first proposed in 2015 as part of the earlier draft Minerals Local Plan. Further, that correspondence between the County Council and the applicant suggests that there “remain fundamental issues with the application” (Barton in Fabis Parish Council et al response to Question 34).