

EXAMINATION HEARINGS

AGENDA

WEDNESDAY 21 SEPTEMBER 2.00pm

The questions in italics are some (but not the only) specific matters which arise from the evidence and will assist in focusing the discussion.

MATTER 2. SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

Clarity and sequential approach of Policy CP1

2.10 Is it sufficiently clear that the guiding principles in Part A of policy CP1 should be applied to the allocation of land addressed in Part B? Are there any guiding principles to assist the resolution of the potential conflicts inherent in Part B (ie between the sequential approaches to the allocation of land on the basis of (i) its brownfield/greenfield status and (ii) the assessment of flood risk)?

- *Is the sequential approach of policy CP1 consistent with PPS3*
- *What is the relationship between flood risk and the sequential approach, and does the policy accord with PPS25*

Replacement buildings in the countryside

2.12 Are the approaches to the re-use and the replacement of buildings in the countryside consistent with national policy in PPS4?

- *Should policy CP1 allow for the re-use of suitable buildings in the countryside for housing*

Previously-developed land

2.13 Is the target for the proportion of housing development on previously-developed land in the period to 2017 (policy CP1 Part C) realistic and achievable? How will assessment of the priority which is given to development on previously-developed land be measured after 2017 in the absence of a target?

- *Is the 40% target too high and unachievable given likely market conditions and the reduced availability of previously-developed land*

Green Belt

2.14 Is the approach to possible changes to the Green Belt boundary consistent with national and regional policy?

- *Should the CS recognise the possibility of long term changes to Green Belt boundaries and the identification of safeguarded land*
- *Should the CS identify the general extent of the Green Belt*
- *Why is there no mention of the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify altering Green Belt boundaries, and is there evidence to support such alterations*
- *Should possible changes to Green Belt boundaries be made explicit in the CS instead of emerging through a Site Allocations DPD*
- *What is meant by "localised" reviews, and are localised reviews an appropriate method of altering Green Belt boundaries*

Should guidance be provided on the treatment of major developed sites in the Green Belt?

- *Does the absence of any reference to major developed sites represent a policy vacuum*
- *Is it necessary to include a policy relating to major developed sites to comply with PPG2*

2.15 Does the Core Strategy establish appropriate and robust guiding principles to enable potential localised Green Belt reviews to be undertaken in DPDs? Why does policy CP1 not refer to the possibility of localised Green Belt reviews?

- *In the absence of guiding principles, how would the overall sustainability of any Green Belt reviews proposed through DPDs be assessed*
- *Has the possibility of Green Belt reviews been subject to Sustainability Appraisal*
- *Will the need for a Green Belt review be influenced by the position of a settlement within the settlement hierarchy*
- *Around which settlements might future Green Belt boundary changes be necessary*
- *Should Tadcaster and/or Sherburn be identified as locations where Green Belt review will take place*

2.16 Given the greater potential for out-commuting from Green Belt settlements because of their proximity to surrounding cities, is the possibility of Green Belt reviews consistent with the self containment key objective?