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MATTER 2 – SECURING A SUSTAINABLE PATTERN OF DEVELOPMENT

Issue 2: Is the strategic approach to Green Belt, Strategic Gaps and Green Wedges soundly based? [Policies LP1 and LP16]

2.10 Is the continuation of the principle of strategic gaps and green wedges from the 2013 Core Strategy (found sound against the NPPF 2012) justified as part of an appropriate strategy? Do the designations inhibit a sustainable pattern of development and/or a deliverable supply of land for development?

2.11 Does the 2016 Arup report (Document EV17) provide a robust and consistent basis/methodology on which to determine the delineation of the strategic gaps and green wedges?

We refer the Inspectors to our representations on Policy LP1 Spatial Strategy and Policy LP16 Green Infrastructure, in that these policies give effect to Strategic Gap 2 ‘Ringwood and Hollingwood’. This Statement does not seek to repeat the concerns raised therein, including CST’s concerns as to deficiencies in the application of the Arup report to the delineation of the boundary of the proposed Strategic Gap between Ringwood and Hollingwood.

In the context of proposed allocation H5 Pondhouse Farm, Troughbrook Road, Hollingwood, the extent of SG2 would inhibit ‘a sustainable pattern of development’ and a supply of land for development that would otherwise be more deliverable. Specifically, the boundary of SG2 as proposed would inhibit residential development on land to the immediate south of proposed allocation H5 Pondhouse Farm.

We refer the Inspectors to our representation on Policy LP4 Flexibility in Delivery of Housing. That sets out why land to the immediate south of proposed allocation H5 Pondhouse Farm should be incorporated as part of that allocation and not included as part of SG2.
As referenced within our representation on Policy LP4, officers of the Borough Council concluded in their consideration of planning application CHE/17/00390/OUT (Pondhouse Farm) that residential development that included land to the south of proposed allocation H5 Pondhouse Farm would constitute sustainable development. The position set out by the emerging Local Plan is at odds with that professional opinion.

Inclusion of land to the south of proposed allocation H5 Pondhouse Farm within the proposed Strategic Gap between Ringwood and Hollingwood, and therefore its exclusion from the proposed allocation, is based on erroneous conclusions as to the contribution that this modest area of paddock makes to the function of the proposed Strategic Gap. The paddock should not be included with the proposed Strategic Gap. Development of the paddock for residential purposes would not prejudice the function of the proposed Strategic Gap. It would however enhance allocation H5, providing additional flexibility in the delivery of housing, a sustainable pattern of development and a deliverable supply of land for development.

2.12 The Green Infrastructure Topic Paper refers at paragraph 3.11 to the Strategic Gap between Brimington and Tapton (SG1) and states that it does not reflect the available evidence (summarised at Figure 3, p44 of the 2016 Arup Report). Is this the only example where the submitted Plan does not follow the advice in the 2016 Arup Report? What is the particular justification for the demarcation of the submitted Strategic Gap between Brimington and Tapton and is it sound?

We again refer the Inspectors to our representations on Policy LP16 Green Infrastructure, which identifies that the boundary of the proposed Strategic Gap 2 between Ringwood and Hollingwood differs from that recommended within the Arup report. Whilst the Council in preparing the Local Plan is not strictly bound by the evidence before it, the flexibility by which the Council has interpreted the Arup report is suggestive of inconsistencies in its application. It is within this context that, as set out in the above referenced representations, the purposes of including land within the proposed Strategic Gap between Ringwood and Hollingwood can be achieved without the inclusion of the modest area of paddock that is located to the immediate south of Pondhouse Farm (proposed allocation H5). The proposed boundary of the Strategic Gap SG2 should be amended accordingly.
We also bring the Inspectors’ attention to appeal decision ref. APP/A1015/W/19/3223162, Land to the north west of Northmoor View, Brimington, Chesterfield, Derbyshire, decision date 5th August 2019. The process by which the boundary of the Brimington and Tapton Strategic Gap had been determined by the Council, and the evidence upon which that decision was made, was considered by the Inspector in that appeal. In his decision, notably at paragraphs 20 and 21, the Inspector is critical of the Council’s decision making process. In that case, land that was not recommended by the Arup report for inclusion within a Strategic Gap has been included within a Strategic Gap by the emerging Local Plan. The boundary of a different Strategic Gap – SG2 between Ringwood and Hollingwood – within the emerging Local Plan also differs from that recommended by the Arup report. CST’s position in respect of SG2 is that the evidence presented to the Council by CST through its representations on the Local Plan makes clear that adjustments to the boundary of SG2 should be made so as to support the objectives and policies of the Local Plan, notably that land to the immediate south of proposed allocation H5 Pondhouse Farm should be incorporated as part of that allocation and not included as part of SG2.

2.13 Figure 7 of the 2016 Arup Report (page 56) shows the proposed Ringwood and Hollingwood Strategic Gap (SG2). Is it sound to include the Wildgoose Homes site (LAA site 259) within this designation on the Policies Map?

In the context of the concerns set out above, it is also unsound to include the modest area of paddock that is located to the immediate south of Pondhouse Farm (proposed allocation H5) within the proposed Ringwood and Hollingwood Strategic Gap (SG2).