



Hearing Statement ² Flintshire Local Development Plan (LDP) 2015-2030 examination

In relation to: Matter 16 ² Green Barrier

for Mrs Stott and Mrs Haworth (Rep ID: 1233028)

Emery Planning project number: 14-065

Project : 14-065
Hearing : Matter 16 ²Green Barrier
Client : Mrs Stott and Mrs
Haworth (Rep ID:
1233028)

Date : 29 April 2021
Author : John Coxon

This report has been prepared for the client by Emery Planning with all reasonable skill, care and diligence.

No part of this document may be reproduced without the prior written approval of Emery Planning.

Emery Planning Partnership Limited
trading as E mery Planning.

Contents:

1. Introduction	1
2. Response to Matter 16	1
3. Conclusions	5

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This hearing statement is prepared by Emery Planning on behalf of Mrs Stott and Mrs Haworth (Rep ID: 1233028) in relation to Matter 16 – Green Barrier. Our responses to the issues and questions on this matter are set out below.

2. Response to Matter 16

Key Issue: Do the policies and proposals on this matter achieve the relevant objectives of the LDP in a sustainable manner consistent with national policy? Are they based on robust and credible evidence?

a) Should the green barriers be renamed green wedges?

- 2.1 Whether the designation is named as a Green Barrier or a green wedge is not important, as the policy outcome is the same. However, we do consider that the proposed designation has been applied far too widely and fails to accord with the guidance set out in PPW11 on green wedges. This is discussed further below in the context of our client's specific interest (the proposed Flint Mountain – Northop Green Barrier).

b) Is the methodology of the green barrier assessment robust and has it been applied consistently?

- 2.2 Our client's specific objection relates to the proposed Green Barrier known as area no. 6: Flint Mountain – Northop.
- 2.3 The relevant tests for the designation of green wedges are set out in PPW11. Paragraph 3.6.4 of states:

2.4 Paragraph 3.6 8 provides:

2.5 Paragraph 3. 70 provides:

2.6 Paragraph 3. 71 provides:

preventing their coalescence with Northop. Development between Northop and Maes Celyn would represent a logical rounding off of the settlement with no impact upon its identity, rather than a merging of settlements as described by the Council.

It is also stated that preventing the coalescence of Northop with Coleg Cambria and the built up area of Maes Celyn is justified as there is continued pressure for development, illustrated by the candidate sites which have been put forward on land adjoining Northop and Maes Celyn. However, the presence of candidate sites cannot be used as justification for a Green Barrier. The tests in national policy are that the Green

BP8). But in any event, there is no reason why heritage and conservation issues cannot be adequately controlled through the application of existing policy protecting heritage assets. Furthermore, no evidence is provided in relation to important views into and out of the area which should be protected. The test set out in PPW11 is not met.

2.9 The tests of PPW11 are not met. We therefore conclude that the proposed Flint Mountain -Northop Green Barrier is not soundly based and should be deleted.

Land to the south of Holywell Road / Coleg Cambria

2.10 Without prejudice to our view that the proposed Flint Mountain -Northop Green Barrier is not soundly based, we consider that our clients land to the south of Holywell Road / Coleg Cambria should be removed from it. This land is shown on the below plan .



Figure 1: Land adjacent to Maes Celyn, Holywell Road, Northop

2.11 The land does not lie directly between Northop and Flint Mountain. Having regard to the tests set out in PPW11, it does not:

- fulfil the purpose of Green Belts as set out at paragraph 3.67 of PPW11;
- prevent the coalescence of settlements;

