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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Planning Design Practice Ltd are Chartered Planning Consultants providing planning advice and submitting proposals to Local Authorities in the East and West Midlands, and with over 40 years combined experience in the team; the company has an excellent record and operates in a fair and open way.

1.2 This document has been prepared by Planning Design as a representation to the Chesterfield Borough Council Sites and Boundaries Issues and Options consultation. The most relevant consultation questions that the document seeks to address are:

Q35. Are the boundaries of the identified Green Wedges and Strategic Gaps appropriately drawn?

and

Q5. Are there any further housing sites that are not on the list that should be considered suitable? (Please provide justification)

1.3 We seek to demonstrate that the site is available and suitable for housing and can contribute to the housing needs of the Borough and also support the Green infrastructure requirements of the Core Strategy.

1.4 The sites benefits from access to all main services, and the site is well located in relation to the village and local services and the landowner controls the means of access.

1.5 Development will not adversely impact on the amenities of neighbours or the appearance and wider character of the settlement and surrounding area.
2 SITE DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION

2.1 The site lies in Inkersall in the Chesterfield Borough about 4km north-east of Chesterfield, and 6.5km north-west of Bolsover. The 4.18 Ha site in question is situated parallel to Bevan Drive in the Chesterfield Borough, immediately to the west of Inkersall and South West of Brimington.

![Figure 1 – Site Location Plan](image)

2.2 The site is not designated for any purpose and is identified as open countryside on the existing local plan proposals map.

2.3 The site is Greenfield with hedgerows to the north and east, woodlands to the south and west and a stream (Trough Brook) running along the western edge. The site slopes from east to west down towards Ringwood Lake and the Trough Brook.

2.4 Staveley Footpath 58 runs north to south along the lower western part of the site as shown in figure 2. The site was, until it was recently secured, used as a cut through to the footpath by members of the public.
2.5 The existing trees and woodland create a natural buffer between the site and the green infrastructure of Ringwood Park and Lake, Trough Brook and a Wildlife Area all to the west (Fig 3).

2.6 The maps show a smaller lake to the south of Ringwood Lake and occupying the western part of the site to the west of Staveley Footpath 58. This smaller lake is now silted up due to non management and has been for a while.
Figure 4 - View looking west from entrance to site opposite Atlee Road. The natural buffer of trees and woodland is visible between the site and Ringwood Park in the background.

Figure 5- View looking west from northern part of the site looking south.
3 RESIDENTIAL SITE ALLOCATIONS

3.1 Chesterfield Borough Council, in line with the Core Strategy will have to deliver a minimum of 7,600 dwellings over the period 2011 – 2031. Core Strategy Policy CS1 (Spatial Strategy) states that:

“Locations for major new housing development will be in line with the strategy of ‘Concentration and Regeneration’, with growth in the following areas:

- Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor
- Chesterfield Waterside development
- Around existing town and district centres
- Close to the local service centres
- Around Regeneration Priority Areas”

3.2 The Sites and Boundaries Issues and Options consultation document explains that a number of sites have already been put forward to the council as part of the ongoing Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). Some of the sites were not considered to be either suitable or available for development as a result of the assessment. The sites currently being considered are identified in figure 6.

Figure 6 – Sites currently being considered (site off Bevan drive indicated by red asterisk).
3.3 The sites being considered so far as having potential for development are those within or next to a settlement or area named in the Core strategy Policy CS1 and which do not have any of the following constraints:

- Heritage assets (including Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings)
- Local Wildlife Sites
- Access to the site and local road network capacity
- Levels of access to key services and facilities
- Protected trees
- Protected species
- Ancient woodlands
- Local Nature Reserves
- Agricultural land quality
- Biodiversity
- Open space with statutory protection
- Protected employment land
- Highways access
- Ground conditions/topography
- Flood risk
- Pollution or contamination
- Land stability
- Access to utility infrastructure

3.4 The Council has acknowledged that in many cases, such constraints can be overcome, in which case, sites have been assessed as “may be suitable”.
4  SHLAA ASSESSMENT OF THE SITE

4.1  The land off Bevan Drive has been a site in the SHLAA since 2010 under the reference 2010/243 and has been assessed as being able to deliver 113 dwellings at years 6-10 at a density of 30 dwellings per acre.

4.2  As identified in the site characteristics information contained in the SHLAA, the site is classified as poor quality agricultural land and lies within Flood Zone 1 as defined by the Environment Agency Flood Maps. The site is not designated as an Area of Open Space, Green Belt, Local Wildlife Site, Ancient woodland, Local Nature Reserve, or Site of Specific Scientific Interest (SSSI) and has no Protected Trees. The site is not in a Conservation Area and is not part of a Historic Park and Gardens or the curtilage of a Listed Building. The topography of the site (sloping from east to west) is suitable for development and it is accessible from Bevan Drive and has easy access to Services and Utilities. The site is within a Coal Authority Referral Area and there are no concerns regarding contamination or hazardous substances or nearby pylons.

4.3  The SHLAA concludes that the site is available and deliverable and that it is suitable but for a single policy constraint as the site is currently identified as open countryside on the Local Plan Proposals Map. The Environment Agency also suggests a 3 metre easement between any development and the watercourse that runs through the western part of the site.

4.4  The only policy constraint affecting the site is that it currently lies in open countryside. However as part of the Core Strategy, the Borough Council is creating Strategic Gaps and Green Wedges throughout the Borough.
5 RINGWOOD AND HOLINGWOOD STRATEGIC GAP

5.1 Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy states:

“The broad locations of Strategic Gaps and Green Wedges are identified on the Key Diagram and will be defined in detail in the Sites and Boundaries DPD. The boundaries will be based on an assessment of the character of the proposed Green Wedge or Strategic Gap and its contribution to: the setting and identity of the borough and its urban areas; landscape character, habitat and biodiversity; access to countryside and recreation; the ability to connect areas of green infrastructure; and the impact that development would have on the function of the Green Wedge or Strategic Gap.”

5.2 Policy CS8 (Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity) of the Core Strategy states:

“Chesterfield Borough’s green infrastructure network will be recognised at all levels of the planning and development process with the aim of protecting and enhancing the network. Development proposals will be expected to demonstrate that they will not adversely affect, or result in the loss of, features of recognised importance.

Development proposals are required to meet the following criteria where appropriate, and should:

a. not harm the character or function of the Green Belt, Green Wedges and Strategic Gaps, and Local Green Spaces
b. enhance connectivity between, and public access to, green infrastructure
c. increase the opportunities for cycling, walking and horse riding
d. enhance the multi-functionality of the borough’s formal and informal parks and open spaces
e. conserve or enhance the local distinctiveness and character of the landscape
f. enhance the borough’s biodiversity and where possible link habitats
g. Protect existing ancient and non-ancient woodland and increase tree cover in suitable locations in the borough
h. in cases where loss of a green infrastructure asset is unavoidable, include provision of alternative green infrastructure, on site where possible, to ensure a net gain in quantity, quality or function”

5.3 We previously submitted the attached document “Strategic Gap Assessment - Land off Bevan Drive, Inkersall” which outlined why excluding the site from the Ringwood and Hollingwood Strategic Gap would not affect the ability of the Strategic Gap to meet the needs identified in
the Council’s Draft Green Wedge & Strategic Gap Indicative Assessment. Our Strategic Gap Assessment also demonstrated how development of the site could facilitate meeting those needs in terms of providing real access and recreational benefits to urban dwellers.

5.4 As part of the current Sites and Boundaries Issues and Options consultation, the Borough Council have defined the boundary of the Ringwood and Hollingwood Strategic Gap (SBSG02) as shown in figure 7 below.

![Figure 7 – Proposed Boundary of Ringwood and Hollingwood Strategic Gap (site off Bevan drive indicated in red).](image)

5.5 We fully support the proposed boundary of Ringwood and hollingwood Strategic Gap for the reasons outlined in the attached “Strategic Gap Assessment - Land off Bevan Drive, Inkersall” document.
5.6 The principles contained in that document, of maintaining a buffer zone on the western parts of the site and creating pedestrian links through the site from Inkersall to features with high amenity value, such as wildlife areas, attractive parkland, lakes and official footpaths are also demonstrated in the indicative site layout below (fig. 8).
6 RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ON THE SITE

6.1 The site off Bevan Drive would provide an opportunity for new development to contribute to the housing requirement of the Borough. The site could deliver up to 113 and incorporate all of the features indicated in the indicative site plan shown in figure 8.

![Indicative Site Layout](image)

Figure 8 – Indicative Site Layout

6.2 As demonstrated in the indicative site layout, and in the attached document “Strategic Gap Assessment - Land off Bevan Drive, Inkersall,” development of the site will assist the Ringwood and Hollingwood Strategic Gap in achieving its purpose.
6.3 Additional planting can supplement the existing woodland on the west of the site, maintaining and enhancing a natural buffer between the built up area of Inkersall and the green infrastructure of Ringwood Park and Lake, Trough Brook and Wildlife Area. Additional planting could also be placed throughout the site as well as along the boundary between the site and Bevan Drive.

6.4 A sensitively designed scheme such as that shown in the indicative site layout can enhance the character of the existing settlement and would be compatible with existing neighbouring land uses. The nearest new dwellings to Bevan Drive could be positioned far enough into the site that the topography of the land, sloping east to west, will ensure that they are significantly below the level of existing properties along Bevan Drive. As a result, the existing properties along Bevan Drive would still enjoy expansive views across the wider landscape.

6.5 The site is classified in the SHLAA as poor quality agricultural land so there will be no loss of the most versatile agricultural land as a result of developing the site. The site is not currently used for agriculture.

6.6 Until the site was recently secured, members of the public used the site as a cut through to the public footpath (Staveley FP58) at the bottom of the site and the amenity features to the west of the site.

6.7 As part of a housing development on the site, new public footpaths can be designated to create links from Bevan Drive through to the public footpath (Staveley FP58) at the bottom of the site and the amenity features to the west of the site. These pedestrian links are obviously needed and could link up Inkersall with the high quality Green Infrastructure to the west.

6.8 As part of any development on the site, the landowner and developer have indicated their desire to restore the small lake that has been silted up. This will enhance the green infrastructure and form part of the attractive pedestrian routes that will be created to link Bevan drive with the existing Green Infrastructure to the west of the site.

6.9 The site is entirely within flood zone 1 so there is no risk of flooding to the development. The site can also be developed in a way that there is no increased risk of flooding to surrounding land uses as a result of the development.
6.10 The site is available for development having been put forward by the landowner, and a developer is on board and ready to develop the site as soon as possible.

6.11 Assuming the proposed boundary of the Ringwood and Hollingwood Strategic Gap goes forward as part of the Local Development Framework, there are no identified or unresolved constraints to the delivery of the site either in Policy of Physical terms.

6.12 Being on the edge of Inkersall, the development of the site for housing would integrate well with the existing pattern of development and would allow the natural expansion of Inkersall to the west.

6.13 A satisfactory access could be created from Bevan Drive with the required visibility splays.
7 CONCLUSION

7.1 It has been demonstrated above that the site can be developed in a way that assists the Ringwood and Hollingwood Strategic Gap in achieving its purpose. We therefore fully support the proposed boundary of the Ringwood and Hollingwood Strategic Gap.

7.2 With the exclusion of the site from the Ringwood and Hollingwood Strategic Gap there are no constraints to the development of the site for housing.

7.3 The landowner and developer are ready and willing to see the site developed for housing and it has been demonstrated that this can be done in a way that meets the Site Assessment Criteria identified in the Sites and boundaries Issues and Options consultation document.

7.4 As well as contributing to the housing needs of the district, the site can be developed in a way that is beneficial to the entire community of Inkersall. New and existing residents could take advantage of childrens’ play facilities, public open space and new pedestrian links through to areas of high amenity value and green infrastructure to the west of the site. The restoration of the former lake that has been silted up would also add value to the amenity of the site and surrounding Green Infrastructure to the benefit of the local community.

7.5 The site at Bevan Drive, Inkersall should therefore be considered suitable for housing development to help meet the housing needs of the Borough.
“Assessment of the Proposed Ringwood and Hollingwood Strategic Gap”

With Reference to SHLAA site 2010/243 – Land off Bevan Drive, Inkersall Green (Northedge)

By Paul Nellist
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1. **Introduction**

1.1 In October 2011, Chesterfield Borough Council published the *Draft Green Wedge & Strategic Gap Indicative Assessment* as part of its *Core strategy Evidence Base*. The Core Strategy will identify broad and indicative areas for policy making, and as such indicative areas only are shown by this document. More specific boundaries will be identified by the Site Allocations DPD.

1.2 This report sets out to show that whilst the Ringwood and Hollingwood Strategic Gap is both necessary and beneficial to the area, excluding the site will not prevent the Strategic Gap from achieving its purpose.

2. **Site location and context**

2.1 The 4.18 Ha site in question is situated parallel to Bevan Drive in the Chesterfield Borough, immediately to the west of Inkersall and South West of Brimington.

Figure 2.1 – Location of site (source: - Chesterfield Borough Council 2010 SHLAA)
2.2 The Grade II Listed, Ringwood Hall lies approximately 500m to the north west, separated from the site by its gardens and Ringwood Park which are identified on the Local Plan Proposals Map as ‘historic park/garden’ and as a monument on the Derbyshire Historic Environment Record.

2.3 The site is Greenfield with hedgerows to the north and east, woodlands to the south and west and a stream (Trough Brook) running along the western edge. The site slopes from east to west down towards Ringwood Lake and the Trough Brook.

2.4 The land immediately to the west, appearing on the maps as a smaller lake and woodland (now marshy woodland), is under the same ownership as the site.

3. **Location and Justification for the Ringwood and Hollingwood Strategic Gap**

3.1 Chesterfield Borough Council has identified 8 broad areas of the Borough as either Green Wedges or Strategic Gaps.

![Proposed Indicative Green Wedges and Strategic Gaps](image_url)

*Figure 3.1 – Proposed Green Wedges and Strategic Gaps. (Source: - Draft Green Wedge & Strategic Gap Indicative Assessment)*
3.2 The site lies adjacent to/within the broad area identified for the proposed Ringwood and Hollingwood Strategic Gap just east of the centre of the district.

![Map of the Ringwood and Hollingwood Strategic Gap](image.png)

Figure 3.2 - The Ringwood and Hollingwood Strategic Gap (source: - Draft Green Wedge & Strategic Gap Indicative Assessment)

3.1 Although similar to Green Wedges, Strategic Gaps have distinct purposes. Whilst Green Wedges penetrate urban areas, Strategic Gaps maintain the landscape qualities and openness of large open areas. However, both should be areas for biodiversity protection or improvement, and be part of a green infrastructure network. That network is important to link urban open spaces and the countryside, thus providing recreational access for people in urban areas to nearby open land.

3.2 Identifying Strategic Gaps is essential to address the following needs, identified in the *Draft Green Wedge & Strategic Gap Indicative Assessment*. 
• The need to protect the setting and separate identity of settlements, by avoiding their coalescence.

• The need to retain the openness of the land by resisting greenfield growth, and thus conserving the existing character of an area in terms of its current mix of urban and rural development.

• The need to provide real access and recreational benefits to urban dwellers, and the perceived (psychological) as well as real benefits of having open countryside near to where people live.

3.3 In order to determine whether the proposed Strategic Gaps in the Draft Green Wedge & Strategic Gap Indicative Assessment met the above needs, each was assessed in terms of:

- Landscape character type
- Blue Infrastructure (e.g. rivers, open water, wetland, etc)
- Replacement Chesterfield Borough Plan (2006) allocations
- Biodiversity
- Access, routes and public rights of way
- Historic Heritage
- Urban Rural Fringe Issues
- Previously Developed Land
- Public Land Ownership

3.4 Drawn out of the assessment of the ability to meet those needs, the justification for the Ringwood and Hollingwood Strategic Gap is that it:-

• Would prevent the coalescence of Hollingwood and the Western part of Middlecroft.

• Would maintain a strategic gap between Inkersall and Brimington.

• Would act as a buffer between Staveley and the former Staveley Works Corridor.

• Has attractive parkland, lakes and footpaths with high amenity value.

• Has high biodiversity value
• Has a good network of public rights of way

3.5 The specific boundaries of the Ringwood and Hollingwood Strategic Gap will not be identified until the Site Allocations DPD is produced.

3.6 The remainder of the report puts forward a case to explain why we feel that excluding the site from the Ringwood and Hollingwood Strategic Gap will not jeopardise the Gap’s ability to meet the needs identified above. The longer term development of the site could indeed complement the Strategic Gap in meeting those needs.

3.7 The following analysis takes the assessment of the Ringwood and Hollingwood Strategic Gap carried out in the Draft Green Wedge & Strategic Gap Indicative Assessment, and examines the effect excluding the site would have on each criterion.

4. Analysis of the Ringwood and Hollingwood Strategic Gap Assessment

4.1 Landscape character type

Strategic Gap Assessment: “The Ringwood and Hollingwood Strategic Gap are classified as Estate Farmlands”

Impact of excluding the site: The characteristics of this land classification would not be altered by any future development of the site.

4.2 Blue Infrastructure

Strategic Gap Assessment: “The northern part of the area overlooks the River Rother and Chesterfield Canal.”
Impact of excluding the site: The site is not in the northern part of the area.

Strategic Gap Assessment: “An area surrounding the Chesterfield Canal is in Flood Zones 2 and 3A”

Impact of excluding the site: The site is in Flood Zone 1 and therefore not subject to a high level of flood risk.

Strategic Gap Assessment: “Trough Brook and Ringwood Lake to the south provide significant recreational and biodiversity value.”

Impact of excluding the site: The site is adjacent to both the Trough brook and Ringwood Lake and a sensitive, well managed development on the site can increase both their recreational and biodiversity value, as well as providing a link/access to them.

4.3 Replacement Chesterfield Borough Plan (2006) allocations

Strategic Gap Assessment: “Open countryside and other open land (EVR2)”

Impact of excluding the site: The site is currently covered by this policy.

Strategic Gap Assessment: “River and canal environment (EVR13) - Trough Brook”

Impact of excluding the site: This feature is further north and not near to the site.

Strategic Gap Assessment: “Historic Park and Garden (EVR34) - Ringwood Hall Grounds”

Impact of excluding the site: Due to the level of screening offered by the trees in the foreground, and the site’s relationship to the existing development in Inkersall, it is considered that the future development
of the site would not have a significant effect on the setting of
Ringwood Hall.

**Strategic Gap Assessment:**  “Proposed greenways and strategic walking and
cycling routes (TRS13) - Trans Pennine Trail”

**Impact of excluding the site:** These features are further to the north
and south of the area so will be unaffected by this site.

**Strategic Gap Assessment:**  “3 Wildlife Sites - Brimington Field (ref: CH006),
Ringwood Lake (ref: CH008) and West Wood & Parkers Wood (ref: CH007)”

**Impact of excluding the site:** As mentioned above, sensitive and well
managed development on this site in future could complement and
improve these areas in terms of access, increased biodiversity and
amenity.

**Strategic Gap Assessment:**  “Safeguarded route for Phase 2 of the Markham
Vale connection (north of Middlecroft)”

**Impact of excluding the site:** This feature is further to the north of
the area so will be unaffected by this site.

### 4.4 Biodiversity

**Strategic Gap Assessment:**  “Populations of water voles identified.
Troughbrook Wood is an area of Plantation Ancient Woodland and is now a
designated Local Wildlife Site which contains a number of rare
wetland/wetland plants and species. The area around Ringwood Lake is home
to water vole populations. The area’s three Local Wildlife Sites, Brimington
Field, West Wood & Parkers Wood and Ringwood Lake, contain a rich mix of
woodland (including ancient woodland), wetland species and woodland flora.
Good canal side wetland habitats on Chesterfield Canal.”
Impact of excluding the site: A sensitive and well managed development on this site in future could increase biodiversity and provide access to these features.

4.5 Access, routes and public rights of way

Strategic Gap Assessment: “Strong Public Rights of Way in the area around Ringwood Park as well as an informal network of paths within Troughbrook Wood. Human activity mainly recreational as a result of public rights of way network and established parkland and lake.”

Impact of excluding the site: The site is private land with no public access other than the public right of way which runs parallel to the Trough Brook in a north-south direction. Future development could provide public access from Inkersall, through the site, and form part of the network of access to recreation.

4.6 Historic Heritage

Strategic Gap Assessment: “Ringwood Hall is a Georgian Grade II listed building and the hall’s ground is a locally designated Historic Park and Garden. West Wood contains significant areas of ancient woodland. Chesterfield Canal to the north dates from 1777 and includes Hollingwood Lockhouse (now a restored community hub).”

Impact of excluding the site: Although development on this site could potentially be visible when viewed from Ringwood Hall and its gardens, it is considered that such views would not be significantly altered, given the screening offered by the existing mature trees to the west of the site and the fact that housing is already visible on the brow of the hill to the east of the site. As such, the future development of the site is unlikely to have a significant adverse impact on the setting of the hall.
4.7 Urban Rural Fringe Issues

*Strategic Gap Assessment:* “Chesterfield Road (A619) and Middlecroft form built-up areas (where there are also some derelict farm cottages). Established residential/Industrial areas to the north and west.”

**Impact of excluding the site:** The site does not affect these issues

4.8 Previously Developed Land

*Strategic Gap Assessment:* “None identified”

**Impact of excluding the site:** The site is Greenfield land.

4.9 Public Land Ownership

*Strategic Gap Assessment:* “The parkland, lake and areas of woodland are owned by Chesterfield Borough Council”.

**Impact of excluding the site:** The site is privately owned.

5. Potential to exclude the site from the Ringwood and Hollingwood Strategic Gap

5.1 The case for excluding the site from the Strategic Gap is two-fold. Firstly, excluding the site would not prevent the Strategic Gap from meeting the three needs identified. Secondly, longer term development of the site could in fact complement and enhance many of the positive functions of the Strategic Gap.

5.2 Excluding the site from the Strategic Gap would not prevent the three needs being met, namely;

*The need to protect the setting and separate identity of settlements, by avoiding their coalescence.*
The need to retain the openness of the land by resisting Greenfield growth, and thus conserving the existing character of an area in terms of its current mix of urban and rural development.

The need to provide real access and recreational benefits to urban dwellers, and the perceived (psychological) as well as real benefits of having open countryside near to where people live.

5.3 Excluding the site from the strategic gap would not prevent the gap from protecting the setting and separate identity of settlements. Without the site, a sufficient separation would still exist between Inkersall and Brimington in order to avoid them coalescing.

5.4 Indeed, Ringwood Lake, the Trough Brook and the trees and woodland lining its banks, and the steep topography of the western part of the site provide an ideal natural barrier to the future westward expansion of Inkersall.

Figure 6.1 – Showing sufficient separation between Inkersall and Brimington even with the site excluded
5.5 If excluded, although the site would still be covered by open countryside policies, it would allow for the long-term natural growth of Inkersall. Given the proximity of the site to Inkersall, its facilities and services (such as the new medical centre under construction), natural expansion would be sustainable on this site. With that in mind, a well designed development scheme could use the western part of the site to provide a further buffer between such expansion and the wildlife areas and open countryside between Inkersall and Brimington.

5.6 If a buffer were created on the western part of the land holding, adjacent to Ringwood Lake and the Trough brook, future development of the remaining part of the site to the east could provide public access from Inkersall to the features with high amenity value, such as wildlife areas, attractive parkland, lakes and official footpaths.

5.7 The smaller lake and adjacent woodland are not included in the site but are under the same ownership. These could be included as part of the buffer
zone and improvements (in terms of amenity and biodiversity value) made to them as part of any future development.

Figure 6.3 – Showing potential long-term natural expansion, buffer zone and potential links/access from Inkersall to amenities

Figure 6.4 - Showing public footpath running along western edge of site, connecting to amenities
5.8 Those areas with high amenity value also have a high biodiversity value which must be at least protected. Sensitive future development on the site, incorporating enhanced protection and better management of the western part of the site could in fact increase biodiversity through the creation of suitable habitat (e.g. wildflower meadow).

5.9 Another specific issue that may arise if and when the natural expansion of Inkersall occurs in the future is the effect on the setting of Ringwood Hall. Existing residential development along Bevan Road is visible from Ringwood Hall, its gardens, and parts of Ringwood Park. That given, future development on this site would not greatly alter the landscape when viewed from those places and therefore not have a significant effect on the setting of Ringwood Hall. The views from the lower parts of the valley in Ringwood Park and the Trough Brook, of Inkersall and the site, are well screened by the natural barriers of trees, woodland and steep topography along the Brook, around the lake and throughout the valley floor.

6. Conclusion

6.1 Excluding the site from the Ringwood and Hollingwood Strategic Gap would not affect the ability of the Strategic Gap to meet the needs identified in the Draft Green Wedge & Strategic Gap Indicative Assessment.

6.2 Furthermore, future development of the site could facilitate meeting those needs in terms of providing real access and recreational benefits to urban dwellers.

6.3 Due to the natural screening and existing development, it is not considered that future development of the site would have a significant adverse effect on the setting of Ringwood Hall and its gardens.