

Examination of the New Castle Point Local Plan

Inspector: Philip Lewis BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

Programme Officer: Andrea Copsey

Examination Office, PO Box 12607, Clacton-on-Sea, CO15 9GN

copseyandrea@gmail.com 07842 643988

Agenda

Hearing Day 2. Wednesday 12 May 2021 – 0930 - 1300

Matter 3 The Green Belt

Issue: Is the Green Belt Assessment consistent with national planning policy for Green Belts, is it based upon appropriate criteria and is it adequate and robust? Are the Green Belt policies clear, justified and consistent with national policy and will they be effective?

- Q.18 Was the Green Belt Assessment undertaken on the basis of a clear methodology consistent with national planning policy for protecting Green Belts?
- Q.19 In terms of paragraph 138 of the Framework, have the proposed alterations to the Green Belt boundaries taken account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development and are they consistent with the Local Plan strategy?
- Q.20 Have all realistic alternatives to releasing land from the Green Belt been considered, such as development outside of the Green Belt, further development in the urban area or increasing development densities, and would the most efficient use of land proposed for release from the Green Belt be made?
- Q.21 Is the site selection methodology for sites to be released from the Green Belt robust?
- Q.22 In overall terms, having regard to the principles established in Calverton, (Calverton PC v Nottingham CC [2015] EWHC 1078 (Admin)) what are the exceptional circumstances for the proposed alterations of the boundaries of the Green Belt to accommodate the

level development proposed which cannot be accommodated outside of the Green Belt?

- Q.23 Are the special circumstances demonstrated for altering the Green Belt boundary as set out in the document Proposed Changes to the Green Belt in the Pre-Submission Local Plan (GB-006) and GB-007 Green Belt Review Part 2 addendum 2021.

NB. The specific Green Belt boundary alterations arising from the proposed allocations will be considered separately in later Hearing sessions.

Strategic Policy GB1 Green Belt Strategy

- Q.24 Does the Policy serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of national policy for Green Belts as expressed in the Framework?
- Q.25 Is the Policy clearly written and unambiguous, so that it is evident how a decision maker should react to a development proposal?
- Q.26 Is the Policy consistent with national policy for Green Belts as expressed in the Framework?

Strategic Policy GB2 New Development in the Green Belt

- Q.27 Does the Policy serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of national policy for Green Belts as expressed in the Framework?
- Q.28 Is the Policy clearly written and unambiguous, so that it is evident how a decision maker should react to a development proposal? Is the Policy consistent with national policy for Green Belts as expressed in the Framework?
- ~~Q.29 What is the clear justification for restricting national permitted development rights as is intended by part 3 of the Policy?~~
- Q.30 Is the Policy consistent with the findings of the HRA?

Strategic Policy GB3 Extensions and alterations to, and Replacement of Buildings in the Green Belt

- Q.31 Does the Policy serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of national policy for Green Belts as expressed in the Framework and other policies of the proposed Plan, such as the design policies?
- Q.32 Is the Policy consistent with national policy for Green Belts as expressed in the Framework?
- Q.33 What is the clear justification for restricting national permitted development rights as is intended by part 3 of the Policy?

Local Policy GB4 limited Infill – Special Policy Areas

- Q.34 What is the justification for the definition of the Special Policy Areas, is this consistent with national policy for Green Belts and would the Policy be effective?
- Q.35 Is it intended that the Policy would render the erection of buildings in these areas as not being inappropriate development in the Green Belt? If so, upon what basis?
- Q.36 Given the boundaries of the Special Policy Areas defined on the Policies Map and the nature of the land so defined, what is envisaged in respect of 'limited infill'?
- Q.37 What is the clear justification for restricting national permitted development rights as is intended by part 3 of the Policy?

Local Policy GB5 Change of Use of Buildings and Land in the Green Belt

- Q.38 Is the Policy consistent with national policy for Green Belts as expressed in the Framework?
- Q.39 What is meant by criterion 1.d of the Policy?
- Q.40 What is the clear justification for restricting national permitted development rights as is intended by part 2 of the Policy?

Local Policy GB6 Ancillary Buildings and Structures in the Green Belt

- Q.41 Is the Policy consistent with national policy for Green Belts as expressed in the Framework, particularly in regard to inappropriate development?
- Q.42 What is the justification for part 2 of the Policy and is this clearly written and unambiguous, so that it is evident how a decision maker should react to a development proposal?

Strategic Policy GB7 Positive Uses in the Green Belt

- Q.43 Is the Policy consistent with national policy for Green Belts as expressed in the Framework?
- Q.44 Is the Policy consistent with the findings of the HRA?

Strategic Policy GB8 Enclosure and Boundary Treatment in the Green Belt

- Q.45 Is the Policy consistent with national policy for Green Belts as expressed in the Framework?
- Q.46 What is meant by 'semi-openness' in part 3 of the Policy and is this consistent with national policy?

Participants

Canvey Green Belt Campaign, Mr G Bracci & Mr S Sawkins

HO20 – Mr J Driscoll

Home Builders Federation, Mr M Behrendt

Ms S Ainsley

Rainier Developments Ltd, Strutt & Parker, Mr S Hollingworth

McLaren, Icen, Mr J Bompas

Gladman, Mr P Bamford

This Land, CODE, Mr M Carpenter

JD Armitage & CALA Homes, JB Planning Mr P Cronk

Inner London Group, Mr L Fenttiman, Plainview, Mr J Dorey