

# Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy – Examination in Public

Matter 8 –Economic Development/ Employment

Statement on behalf of  
Meyrick Estate Management Ltd (360382)

Prepared by Jackson Planning (521508)

August 2013

## **Matter 8 –Economic Development and Employment**

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 4 and 5 raised by the Inspector under **Matter 8** in relation to Christchurch only and highlights why the plan as proposed remains unsound and how modifications to the plan can make it sound.

### **Question 4. Is the restrictive approach to business development outside major villages justified and appropriate (PC3)?**

2. The NPPF has taken a more positive approach to economic development in all circumstances and in particular at paragraph 28 of the NPPF which supports both the expansion of existing businesses and agricultural diversification. Furthermore there is no justification for this highly restrictive approach as it is not justified and is inconsistent with saved policy ENV18 (reproduced below).

### **Question 5. Should the CS make provision for residential re use of redundant/ disused buildings in the countryside?**

3. Saved policy ENV 18 relates to the reuse of buildings in the Green Belt for employment use. Within Christchurch all the remaining undeveloped land within the Borough is within the Green Belt. So this in effect is a 'countryside' policy.

**ENV 18 Proposals for the re-use of buildings and their curtilage in the green belt for employment, tourism and recreation will only be permitted provided that the following criteria are satisfied:**

**1) it does not have a materially greater impact than the present use on the openness of the green belt and the purpose of including land in it.**

**2) the building is suitable for the proposed use without major rebuilding and would not require significant alteration which would damage its fabric and character, or detract from the local characteristics and landscape quality of the area.**

**3) any extensions to buildings and associated uses of land surrounding the building should not conflict with the purposes of including land in the green belt.**

**4) the form, bulk and general design are in keeping with their surroundings.**

**5) the use would not result in a loss of amenity or spoil the enjoyment of other users of the countryside by noise, Traffic generation or other disturbance.**

4. Policy ENV 19 which allowed use of redundant buildings in the countryside to have a residential use if it could not achieve an employment use under policy ENV18 above has not been saved and does not form part of the development plan therefore there is no policy consideration for residential reuse of redundant buildings in the countryside as supported by paragraph 55 of the NPPF .

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

5. Policy PC3 of the plan should be modified to ensure it is consistent with national policy to allow the appropriate development of business use in the countryside in accordance with the NPPF, in addition it should allow conversion to residential use where employment uses are not possible.