

green belts and local designations such as green barriers. The major distinction between the two is that green belts have a degree of permanence in that they should be protected for a longer period than the current development plan life span. Green barriers however should be reviewed as part of the developmen¹,kdS- ÎÈÙ³¥-ÛÒ(°ó/=C,æë-üÿ÷ %p â™Ž G *Y-^ a"ë O5

3.0 Evidence

- 3.1 This objection site was originally submitted as a candidate site for a mix of uses, primarily residential but including a retirement village and some employment. The site is in the same ownership as the Northop Road site which is allocated in the Plan and which is also the subject of a Position Statement put before the Examination. At the time of submitting the candidate site the owners were quite reasonably considering the site as a candidate site at the early stage of

responsible authorities, to look beyond the plan period for potential areas where that need can be best met. It would be very short-sighted not to do so.

- 3.5 Whilst this issue relates to green barriers as opposed Green Belts, regard should be had in this instance to paragraph 3.68 of PPW. This states that, *“When considering Green Belt designations a sufficient range of development land which is suitably located in relation to the existing urban edge should be made available, having regard to the longer term need for development land, the effects of development pressures in areas beyond the Green Belt and the need to minimise demand for travel. This may require land to be safeguarded, and boundaries of proposed Green Belts must be carefully defined to achieve this .* This has traditionally been referred to a white land .

4.0 Conclusion

- 4.1 The Plan should adopt the principle of white land and delete the proposed extension to the green barrier.

03 May 2021