

# **EXAMINATION OF WHBC LOCAL PLAN 2013 -2032**

Regulation 19

## **Little Heath Action Group**

Comments on EX223 Green Belt Boundaries General Approach

29<sup>th</sup> January 2021

## HS25 (LHe1)

EX223 seems to imply that HS25 has available land around its perimeter to allow for planting outside of the proposed site. Aside from Hawkshead road to the south (which already forms a strong boundary), ownership of the land does not extend over the intended Green Belt Boundary.

In addition, we would argue that new proposed boundary is irregular and would jut-out into the countryside and would be difficult to defend.

Should the new Green Belt Boundary be re-drawn as a straight-line continuation from the rear of the back gardens of the dwellings to the east this would give two advantages. Firstly, it would allow for proper planting to the north of the site (where the boundary would be weakest) and create a far stronger straight line defensible boundary.

## Introduction

The introduction to EX223 seems to slightly miss the intended guidance of the NPPF 2012. Whilst WHBC have acknowledged “recognisable and likely to be permanent” they seem to have omitted the significant emphasis of the below points.

*#83 “Authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they could be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.*

*#85 “satisfy themselves that Green Belt Boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period” and “define boundaries clearly, using physical features that a readily recognisable and likely to be permanent”.*

When read together these points create a far stronger requirement with respect to the permanence of new Green Belt boundaries.

Permanence should not be considered as a vague desire; due diligence should be applied and rigorously tested to ensure, in most possible circumstances, the boundaries will exist beyond the plan period.