

**CORE STRATEGY
DEVELOPMENT PLAN
DOCUMENT (DPD)**

LDF EXAMINATION

Matter 2 – Green Belt (KS2)

STATEMENT PREPARED BY:

**WOOLF BOND
PLANNING LLP**

REPRESENTATION NUMBER: 507541

On behalf of:

**Bodorgan Properties (Channel Islands)
Ltd., Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd. &
Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land**

AUGUST 2013

1. Our joint clients own and have interests in the proposed mixed use extension at North Christchurch (CN1) and wish to ensure that the planning policy framework aimed at securing release of the land is sound in that it is Positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. To do so it must be sufficiently flexible. Please note this statement relates to Christchurch Borough only.

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

2. The proposed changes to the green belt are necessary to meet defined strategic housing need as highlighted in our response to matter 1. The submitted plan continues to rely upon green belt boundaries as originally designated in the early 1980s. Such boundaries were designed to restrict expansion of, Christchurch and indeed in the late 1990s was extended over land at Roeshot Hill to abut the A35 and further restrict development in that area. This proposal is now being reversed by the plan and is supported by Policy CN1 that proposes the exclusion of the site from the green belt.
3. We offer no comment on other green belt changes other than those stated in response to question 2 below.

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

4. Paragraph 83 of the NPPF requires a full review of Green Belt boundaries at the Local Plan making stage having particular regard to their intended permanence in the long term. In the absence of a comprehensive review of the entire Green Belt designation, the Core Strategy as drafted fails to meet this requirement and cannot be sound in this respect as it is contrary to NPPF paragraph 83.
5. In order to make the plan sound we propose a Green Belt review is undertaken to consider the purpose of Green Belt that was established by the 1980 South East Dorset Structure Plan following recognition that the growth of settlements around the conurbation had resulted in the distinction between town and

country becoming blurred and had spread the influence of urban development into the surrounding countryside.

6. The 1980 Structure Plan set out that Green Belt was established for the following purposes:
 - a. To protect the separate physical identity of individual settlements in the area by maintaining wedges and corridors of open land between them; and
 - b. To maintain an area of open land around the conurbation.
7. This is not now consistent with the long-term development needs of the area and should be subject to comprehensive review so that Green Belt boundaries can be sustained in the long term and endure beyond the life of the plan consistent with NPPF paragraph 83.

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

8. For the reasons set out in response to question 2, we do not consider the Core Strategy provides such detail.

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

9. The Christchurch urban extension boundary is clearly defined on Map 6.1 proposal map and the site subsequently removed from the green belt in Appendix 4. However it is considered that a formal proposals map amendment should also be produced at this Core Strategy stage identifying the site as located within a revised settlement boundary.