

# Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy – Examination in Public

Matter 2 –Green Belt

Statement on behalf of  
Meyrick Environmental Management Ltd (360382)

Prepared by Jackson Planning (521508)

August 2013

**Matter 2 –Green Belt**

1. This statement is made on behalf of Meyrick Estate Management Ltd (MEM) (Rep 360382) in response to the matters and issues to augment evidence provided in the statements and technical reports made at pre submission and proposed modification stage. This statement considers the questions raised by the Inspector under **Matter 2** and highlights why the plan as proposed remains unsound and how modifications to the plan can make it sound.

**Question 1 -Is the proposal to make limited changes to the GB justified?**

2. The plan makes limited changes to the GB that are not underpinned by any comprehensive or local review of the GB boundaries in order to understand the full capacity of the GB to accept further development in support of the CS vision and meet the full objectively assessed housing needs of both councils. The proposed changes are therefore not fully justified.

**Question 2 - Have the GB boundaries been assessed to consider their capability to endure beyond the plan period, as advised in NPPF para 83?**

3. The Councils have not carried out the necessary Green Belt review of the boundaries to consider their capability to endure beyond the plan period (refer also to statement for 360382 under Matter 4) which means that the plan cannot be found sound as it is a requirement under the NPPF paragraph 83. This is particularly the case with the allocation of site CN2.
4. The boundary to the south for the inset to the Green Belt for the village of Burton has largely followed the existing built extent of the village. But is not distinct and does not relate to any recognisable physical features on the ground. The frontage ribbon development along the Salisbury Road from Burton Farm south to the railway is excluded from the inset. From the site CN2 and beyond to the south, development is visible on three sides including the Salisbury Road frontage, the rear of Sandy Plot, Condor Close and Medlar Close. The GB boundary is simply a vague open field boundary and clearly does not have a degree of permanence as the very proposal for CN2 is seeking to extend the current inset boundary

in a similar fashion to its current arbitrary nature rather than extend it to a recognisable physical defensible feature.

**Question 3 -Does the CS set out a precise timescale and clear process for the GB boundary changes?**

5. The trigger for release from the Green Belt should be on the basis of an acceptable strategic site allocation being confirmed. In the case of site CN2 at Burton it is necessary to allocate the appropriate development that will support the village and the objectively identified housing need. Until site CN2 is formally allocated the GB boundary is uncertain as it is not clear where the defensible long term GB boundary will need to be located.

**Question 4 - Are the GB boundaries for every development proposal clearly defined on proposals maps?**

6. In relation to site CN2 at Burton as currently proposed the GB boundary is not at all clear as the change to the CN2 site area would leave a small isolated pocket of green belt around the properties 56-60 Salisbury Road. This is almost entirely isolated from any other part of the retained GB in this part of the village and GB designation should not be used in this isolated way as it is clear that this is strictly part of the inset to the GB as a result of development to the south.

**Why does the plan as drafted in relation to GB fail the tests of soundness?**

7. The plan fails the following 'Soundness Tests'
  - Lack of full or localised Green Belt Review is not consistent with NPPF paragraph 83
  - Lack of defined boundary for the Green Belt using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent as required by NPPF paragraph 85
  - The proposed GB boundary at site CN2 Burton is not effective as it has left a small isolated GB area that should become part of the village inset to GB.
  - The proposed GB changes are not justified by evidence

**How the plan can be made sound?**

8. A review of the GB is necessary to be consistent with the NPPF to ensure that it is consistent with the Local Plan strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development, and possibly identifying safeguarded land.
  
9. GB boundaries will also need to be drawn up to endure beyond the plan period using recognisable permanent physical features.