

EX16

## EXAMINATION HEARINGS

### AGENDA

**TUESDAY 12 NOVEMBER 2013 at 10.00 am**

#### **Matter 5 GREEN BELT**

***Issue: Whether the selection of broad locations for development in the Green Belt is justified by the evidence and whether the mechanisms for release are clear and effective.***

- 5.1 Is the statement in policy CS 5 that “inappropriate development will not be permitted in the Green Belt” consistent with national policy (which includes the ‘very special circumstances’ test)?
- 5.2 Is the methodology used to select broad locations robust?  
Does its complexity over-elaborate the assessment process and make it difficult to identify the critical determinants?  
Does the methodology enable proper value judgements about the relative importance of individual criteria to be made?
- 5.3 There is significant (and not always consistent) repetition amongst the treatment of individual criteria within the commentaries of the KLPCS Green Belt Location Appraisal Sheets (appendix 6 of Green Belt Technical Report (TR03)) – are the results of this process always as robust and clear cut as suggested?
- 5.4 Does the methodology ensure that an appropriate balance is achieved between Green Belt policy and the overall spatial strategy of the KLPCS?  
How has the relative priority between release of Green Belt land and development in areas at risk of flooding been determined, and has an appropriate balance been achieved?
- 5.5 Many Green Belt sites involve loss of ‘best and most versatile’ (bmv) agricultural land. In the assessment has sufficient account been taken of the distinction between the different grades of bmv land?
- 5.6 Policy CS 5 refers to specific “broad locations” being removed from the Green Belt, but also says that boundaries will be defined at Site Allocations stage. As detailed boundaries for the broad locations are mostly identified in the evidence base, why are they not delineated and released at KLPCS stage?

- 5.7 How will the phased release of Green Belt sites operate in practice?  
Is the main driver of release the maintenance of a 5 year land supply (clause 3c of policy CS 5), or will urban regeneration objectives (clause 3b of policy CS 5) also have a role and if so, what will this be?  
Is it necessary to include the reference to meeting longer term development needs?
- 5.8 Is there sufficient clarity in the KLPCS over the mechanism for the release of individual Green Belt sites – how will the relative order of release be determined?  
Why are the individual broad locations not identified in policy CS 5?
- 5.9 Is the approach to safeguarded land in policy CS 5, which does not rule out development before 2028, consistent with national policy which requires safeguarded land to be released through the Local Plan process?
- 5.10 KLPCS table 5.2 indicates that the potential supply/capacity of the broad locations proposed for Green Belt release substantially exceeds the potential shortfall to 2028. Given the importance of retaining as much Green Belt land as possible, is this potential over-allocation justified?
- 5.11 Is the approach to major developed sites in the Green Belt in policy CS 5 consistent with national policy, which allows limited infilling and redevelopment of all previously-developed sites?  
Is it appropriate to continue to regard King’s Business Park as a major developed site in the Green Belt?
- 5.12 Is it likely that land for gypsy and traveller provision will need to be found from within the Green Belt and, if so, should the Green Belt policy reflect this?

### **INDIVIDUAL GREEN BELT LOCATIONS (2.00 pm or later)**

- 5.13 **KGBS1 Bank Lane, Kirkby.**  
Is the selection of this site based on robust evidence?
- 5.14 **KGBS2 Eastfield Walk, Kirkby.**  
The assessment seems to categorise this site as broadly neutral primarily because of its small size. Is too much emphasis given to the issue of size when, on the face of it, this appears to be a suitable site on the edge of a main settlement which would have very little impact on the Green Belt (similar to KGBS7)?

Why does the absence of sustainability benefits as a result of small size carry sufficient weight to justify rejection of this site?

**5.15 KGBS4 East of Knowsley Business/Industrial Parks.**

Is all the land in the northern parcel subject to an availability constraint?

Is the assessment of economic potential and benefit consistent with that of the site to the north (KGBS3): both sites have similar proximity to the existing employment concentration but the sustainability assessment is very different – why?

**5.16 KGBS5 Pinfold Lane, Knowsley Village.**

Is the rejection of this site based on robust evidence of all the environmental and other impacts?

**5.17 KGBS6 Knowsley Village.**

Has proper weight been given to the impact on the setting of the Historic Park and Garden?

How much of the site is Grade 2 agricultural land?

Is the site of value and importance for wildlife?

Green Belt Technical Report (TR03) says it is “clear” that exceptional circumstances exist – is this really the case?

Should this site be brought forward during the plan period rather than being ‘safeguarded’ land?