

# PURBECK DISTRICT COUNCIL

## CORE STRATEGY

### EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC

Hearing Statement by Andrew Charles Robinson BSc FRICS FAAV of Symonds & Sampson LLP, 5 West Street, Wimborne, Dorset in relation to Matter 14: Central Purbeck (Policy CEN)

#### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This statement is submitted by Andrew Robinson of Symonds & Sampson, 5 West Street, Wimborne, Dorset on behalf of John Baggs (Farmers) Limited in relation to Matter 14: Central Purbeck (Policy CEN) of the examination in public into the Purbeck District Core Strategy Examination in public. Symonds & Sampson are agents on behalf of John Baggs (Farmers) Limited.
- 1.2 This statement is specifically intended to respond to the Inspector's questions and set out Symonds & Sampson's case on matters of soundness,

#### 2. RESPONSE TO INSPECTOR'S QUESTIONS

- 2.1 Matter 14: Central Purbeck (Policy CEN)

##### **Issue 14.2: Is the Council's approach towards the modification of the Green Belt boundary in Central Purbeck and adequately justified?**

- 2.2 PPG2 has been cancelled as of 27<sup>th</sup> March, 2012 following the publication of the NPPF.

Paragraphs 79 – 92 of the NPPF now provide National Planning Policy guidance on Green Belts. The five purposes of Green belt are retained by the NPPF. Once established Green Belt boundaries "should only be altered in exceptional circumstances". If LPA's are considering amendments to boundaries, they must have regard to their intended permanence in the longer term: beyond the plan period: in this case beyond 2027.

- 2.3 This statement is intended to deal with the soundness of Purbeck District Council's approach to Factory Field off Causeway Close (Paragraph 7.8.1 and 7.8.2 of the Purbeck District Green Belt Review January 2012) within its review.
- 2.4 Paragraph 7.8.1 - Having made clear that the site is quite contained and that gap between Wareham Town and North Wareham should be retained, it then states development towards the north of the site would ensure that the "gap" will not be diminished and would not result in demonstrable harm.
- 2.5 Paragraph 7.8.2 - This paragraph then appears to conclude that an amendment of the Green Belt should not be considered due to the sprawl, merging,

countryside encroachment and historic setting issues that would result from development.

The text of Paragraph 7.8.2, however, states in relation to sprawl, merging countryside encroachment and historic setting that provided development does not extend beyond the line created by Wall View Road to the west and Causeway Close to the east, the effect of the sprawling, merging, countryside encroachment and historic setting would either be reduced or minimal.

- 2.6 Paragraph 7.8.2 - This paragraph then goes on to state, with regard to urban regeneration, that there is little derelict or other previously developed land in North Wareham to allow regeneration and few opportunities for infilling, Wareham's housing requirement cannot be met by land already within the settlement boundary.
- 2.7 It is my view based on the information set out by Purbeck District Council in paragraphs 7.8.1 and 7.8.2, the new line of the Green Belt should be as shown on the plan attached at Appendix 1 to this statement. The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that Local Planning Authorities should not include land in the Green Belt where is unnecessary to keep it permanently open. Their own comments on the land shown on the plan attached to the statement at Appendix 1 confirm that this land does not need to be kept open.
- 2.8 Over and above this, paragraph 7.8.2 makes it clear that Wareham's housing requirements cannot be met by land already within the settlement boundary and the National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that Local Planning Authorities should satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the Development Plan period. It is clear in this case that Green Belt boundaries may indeed need to be altered by the end of the Development Plan period because housing requirement cannot be met by land already within the settlement boundary.
- 2.9 I, therefore, consider that the Council's approach to the Green Belt boundary in relation to Factory Field off Causeway Lane has not been properly justified and has not heeded Government advice.

The Council's own approach to the site shows that it could indeed be developed without demonstrable harm and, therefore, there has not been full and proper regard of Government policy in Paragraph 85 of the NPPF.

- 2.10 The Core Strategy, therefore fails

Paragraph 1.8.2 of the NPPF because:

- It is not positively prepared because the approach within the Green Belt review has been to highlight negatives, except that there is a solution to the negatives and, having done this, the review then fails to create a change in the Green Belt boundary.

- It is not the most appropriate strategy and, therefore, cannot be justified because development land is clearly needed in this location but the land shown on the plan at Appendix 1 remains within the Green Belt.
- It is not consistent with National Policy, as explained above.

2.11 The Core Strategy could be made sound by excluding the section of land shown on the plan attached to this statement at Appendix 1 from the Green Belt.

2.12 Once the procedure under Paragraph 2.12 above has been adopted, no change of wording will then be needed.

.....

**Andrew C Robinson BSc FRICS FAAV**

Date: .....