

## Appendix 1

Summary of Green Belt Review documents supplied  
by the JSAs and data review

## Green Belt Review documents supplied by JSAs

### ***West of England JSA***

- First Detailed Proposals (November 2005)
- First Detailed Proposals (August 2005)
- Green Belt Review Committee Paper (October 2005)
- Your Area: Your Vision (November 2004)
- Extracts from South Gloucestershire Local Plan Inspectors Report (date unknown)
- Mapinfo files containing environmental consideration and locational/ Infrastructure considerations by area within the Green Belt
- Sustainability Appraisal of Sub Regional Spatial Strategy Development Options (Appendix B )

### ***Cheltenham and Gloucester JSA***

- Cheltenham and Gloucester First Detailed Proposals (September 2005)
- Detailed Strategy Document Supporting the First Detailed proposals from Cheltenham and Gloucestershire County Council for the Cheltenham and Gloucester Joint Study Area (September 2005)
- Technical Background Paper: Strategic re-assessment Review of Green Belt (2005)
- Shaping the Future of Cheltenham and Gloucester to 2026 (January 2005)
- Cheltenham and Gloucestershire Joint Study Area Report to Cabinet (Gloucestershire County Council) (7 September 2005)
- Technical Background Paper: Constraints Officer Working Group
- Green Belt Background Paper Gloucester Structure Plan 2<sup>nd</sup> Review: Draft Consultation (May 1996)
- Landscape structure map (hand drawn by officers)
- Initial Working Draft Strategic Environmental Appraisal of the Cheltenham and Gloucester Joint Study Area (April 2005)

- Green Belt Background Paper Gloucester Structure Plan 2<sup>nd</sup> Review Draft for Consultation (May 1996)
- Photograph plates of key views of and within Green Belt

### ***South East Dorset JSA***

- South East Dorset Strategy (November 2005)
- First Detailed Proposals (November 2005)
- Strategic Review of Green Belt (2005)
- Technical Report: Development Options Report (25 November 2005) (Draft)
- Technical Report: Testing of Growth Options
- Western Sector Feasibility Study, Dorset (Volumes 1 – 3) (Atkins, January 2005)
- First Detailed Proposals Strategy Document (September 2005)
- Areas of Great Landscape Value, East Dorset District Council (June 1997)
- Extracts from Replacement Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Deposit Structure Plan (July 2004)

### Summary of scope of key documents supplied

Green Belt area	Document	Coverage	Comments
West of England	Sub-regional spatial options – notes for members workshop 10 Sept 04	Assesses strategic locations for development against the following nine criteria: 1. regeneration 2. economic growth 3. communities 4. development (potential to meet varied needs) 5. access to jobs and facilities 6. existing centres (ability to support) 7. environment 8. efficient land use 9. need to travel	The work carried out for this document and the GB review need to be conjoined to develop a fuller assessment.
	Environmental and physical constraints map	SSSI, SAC, SPA, RAMSAR & NNR; historic parks and gardens; conservations areas; common land; UK BAP habitats; Ancient woodland; slopes >10 degrees; AONB; surveyed ALC grades 1,2 or 3a; provisional ALC grades 1 or 2; SNCI/wildlife site; SAM; Flood risk zone 1 or 2.	
	West of England joint study area first detailed proposals, August 2005	Sets out subjects that will be included within the RSS and which require further assessment as part of the process of developing the RSS, and in order to identify suitable sites for development. These are: regenerating and reinforcing the role of the main urban areas; roles and development of smaller towns; role and strength of the greenbelt; role and development of rural areas; economic development; new homes; sites for gypsies and travellers; social and cultural provision; education; health; transport; environmental resource use and management.	The report at paragraph 2.4 notes that all information required to test the implications of the levels of growth and spatial strategy proposed. Results from the Strategic Transport Study are awaited and further work on the strategic review of the green belt and strategic sustainability appraisal is also to be carried out.
	West of England partnership; planning, transport and environment group. Agenda item 10 of 14 October 2005 'Review of Green Belt'	Assesses extent to which Green Belt contributes to essential GB objectives (PPG2); consider whether good reasons exist to justify removal of areas from GB to meet long term development requirements; and assess whether additional areas could meet GB requirements. Identifies five broad GB areas that could possibly be released and briefly describes the impact of development in these areas. Appendix 3 assesses defined areas within the GB and their contribution to PPG2 criteria. <b>There is not a detailed landscape character assessment of the GB nor is there an analysis of the function or strength of purpose of areas within the GB.</b> The document sets out the parameters of the review but there is no indication that the more detailed approach to review should be taken.	
	Bath and North East Somerset landscape character assessments have been undertaken but were not supplied in time to be taken into consideration for this report		

Strategic Green Belt Review – Appendices to Final Report

Green Belt area	Document	Coverage	Comments
	South Gloucestershire landscape character assessment, draft June 2002	Divides the district into landscape character areas. Each character area is assessed looking at : key characteristics; location; physical influences; land cover; settlement and infrastructure; landscape character; the changing landscape; and landscape character area boundary.	Assessment covers areas in the northern part of the West of England GB. Ideally this type of assessment should be carried out for all areas within the GB.
Cheltenham and Gloucester	Initial working draft strategic sustainability appraisal of the Cheltenham and Gloucester JSA. June 2005	The document is a Sustainability Appraisal of the development options within the C&G JSA. Identifies absolute constraints.	The work carried out for this document and the GB review need to be conjoined to develop a fuller assessment.  A study of landscape character being carried out. This work needs to be fed into the GB review.  5.2 states that further work has been carried out to determine environmental constraints – this work needs to be fed into the GB review.  The SA appraises options for development at a strategic level. More detailed assessments are required to fully evaluate GB.
	Cheltenham and Gloucester joint study area paper September 2005	This document sets out the boundaries of the C&G JSA, sets out the core purposes of the JSA strategy, core strategy and policies for the JSA.	Green Belt review is required to develop a coherent spatial strategy for the JSA.
	Green Belt background paper, Gloucestershire structure plan 2 <sup>nd</sup> review May 1996	This is a discussion paper and does not contain analysis.	
	C&G JSA background paper: strategic reassessment of the Green Belt. (no date)	Document contains the results of two pieces of work: 1) purpose and meaning of the GB in C&G context examined; and 2) results of a field assessment of the setting of each GB settlement.  Stage one is a discussion of the PPG2 criteria and is not an analysis of those criteria.  Stage two scores different parts of the GB in meeting the PPG2 criteria	The document does not contain the results of the field trip and there is no discussion about the stage two work – setting of settlements.
	Technical background paper on behalf of SWRA (January 2005)	It appears that this working paper explains the methodology used in producing the above background paper.  Sets out the key identified constraints.  Defines broad landscape areas within the GB.	A full landscape character assessment is currently being undertaken and will be available shortly.
	Cheltenham and Gloucester JSA working group on the Green Belt, September 2004 (draft interim report)	This is a discussion paper looking at the PPG2 criteria only.	Green Belt review work was stopped after the local elections.

Strategic Green Belt Review – Appendices to Final Report

Green Belt area	Document	Coverage	Comments
	Shaping the future of Cheltenham and Gloucester to 2026, January 2005	Public consultation document. Sets out potential development options for the JSA but does not contain any analysis.  Does identify main physical constraints to development. (technical work is contained in background papers)	
	C&G JSA Report to cabinet, 07 <sup>th</sup> September 05	Progress report detailing “advice” to be sent to SWRA regarding policy for the RSS. The report is concerned with housing growth and does not contain technical assessment work. County Council advice is based on no change to the Green Belt in the period to 2026. Green Belt review work was stopped after the local elections.	
	C&G JSA detailed strategy document for first detailed proposals (September 2005)	Document covers the issues of constraints to development, transport and the Green Belt. The County Council does not support development within the Green Belt in the period to 2026. No assessment of the GB is provided.	The analysis work carried out for this document needs to be undertaken in the context of a Green Belt review as this would provide a more robust position on which the county council can defend its stance.
	Untitled map (no date)	Indicates critical landscape wedges, important local ridge lines, AONB, flood plain, waste sites and 250m buffer from waste sites.	
South East Dorset	South East Dorset Strategy, November 2005. SED 02: the strategy	Document sets out a broad development strategy for SE Dorset and provides an overview analysis of the strategic issues facing the SE Dorset sub-region. It is based on a series of technical reports including one assessing development options/Green Belt	The Green Belt review is an integral part of developing the strategy and a comprehensive Green Belt review will result in a more robust strategy.
	South East Dorset sub-regional study: final first detailed proposals, September 2005	Predecessor of the above document setting out components for the sub-regional strategy.	
	South East Dorset sub-regional study: final first detailed proposals, technical report: development options. Draft November 2005	This document looks at urban potential, urban extensions and contains a review of the Green Belt.  The urban extensions search identifies absolute constraints and partial constraints (termed discretionary constraints). These constraints have been mapped.  Table four of the paper lists the criteria for rigorous testing. This testing process conforms with the process used in the Cambridge study.	Looking at the SE Dorset assessment and the South Gloucestershire landscape character assessment it would be useful to have a proforma to standardise recording of data and its presentation simply to speed up the process of comparison and analysis.  The assessment looks at predetermined sites and thus does not identify transport corridors
	Western sector feasibility study – vol 1 (no date) Chapter 1 – Introduction	Study assesses the potential for a major growth area to the west of Poole. The study is to inform the SE Dorset sub-regional strategy.	
	Western sector feasibility study volume 3: shadow appropriate assessment (no date)	This document is a ‘shadow’ assessment of the impact of the proposed western extension on neighbouring internationally designated sites – Dorset Heaths Special Area of Conservation (cSAC), Dorset Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) and wetland of international importance (Ramsar site) and Poole Harbour SPA and Ramsar site.  The site is located within the Green Belt.	The study identifies ecological areas which are considered to be constraints to development but the analysis is more detailed than is required for the Green Belt assessment process.
	South East Dorset sub-regional study: testing of growth options technical report (no date)	Document provides an overview of the growth strategies for the sub-region and an assessment matrix of each option when assessed against a number of sustainability criteria. Document does not provide detailed assessment.	

Error! Unknown document property name.

The following table compares data used in and available to the Green Belt review processes in each JSA against that which was collected and used to undertake the Cambridge Sub region Study Green Belt review.

Green Belt Area	West of England	Cheltenham & Gloucester	South East Dorset
<b>Assessment</b>			
<b>Constraints to development</b>			
Playing fields	Sub-regional spatial options – notes for members workshop 10 Sept 04		<b>Yes</b> in the November 05 technical report on development options. Partial or discretionary constraints have also been identified.
Historic parks and formal public open space	Sub-regional spatial options – notes for members workshop 10 Sept 04 Environmental and physical constraints map	Initial working draft strategic sustainability appraisal of the Cheltenham and Gloucester JSA. June 2005  Technical background paper on behalf of SWRA (April 2005)	South East Dorset Strategy, November 2005. SED 02: the strategy  South East Dorset sub-regional study: final first detailed proposals, technical report: development options. Draft November 2005  Western sector feasibility study volume 3: shadow appropriate assessment (no date) (only in the area relevant to the study)
SSSIs	Sub-regional spatial options – notes for members workshop 10 Sept 04 Environmental and physical constraints map	Initial working draft strategic sustainability appraisal of the Cheltenham and Gloucester JSA. June 2005  Technical background paper on behalf of SWRA (April 2005)	South East Dorset Strategy, November 2005. SED 02: the strategy  South East Dorset sub-regional study: final first detailed proposals, technical report: development options. Draft November 2005  Western sector feasibility study volume 3: shadow appropriate assessment (no date) (only in the area relevant to the study)
Grade 1 flood plain (0.1-1% annual probability)	Sub-regional spatial options – notes for members workshop 10 Sept 04 Environmental and physical constraints map	Initial working draft strategic sustainability appraisal of the Cheltenham and Gloucester JSA. June 2005  Technical background paper on behalf of SWRA (April 2005)	South East Dorset Strategy, November 2005. SED 02: the strategy  South East Dorset sub-regional study: final first detailed proposals, technical report: development options. Draft November 2005  Western sector feasibility study volume 3: shadow appropriate assessment (no date) (only in the area relevant to the study)
Grade 1 ground water protection zone		Initial working draft strategic sustainability appraisal of the Cheltenham and Gloucester JSA. June 2005  Technical background paper on behalf of SWRA (April 2005)	South East Dorset Strategy, November 2005. SED 02: the strategy  South East Dorset sub-regional study: final first detailed proposals, technical report: development options. Draft November 2005  Western sector feasibility study volume 3: shadow appropriate assessment (no date) (only in the area relevant to the study)
SAMs	Sub-regional spatial options – notes for members workshop 10 Sept 04 Environmental and physical constraints map	Initial working draft strategic sustainability appraisal of the Cheltenham and Gloucester JSA. June 2005  Technical background paper on behalf of SWRA (April 2005)	South East Dorset Strategy, November 2005. SED 02: the strategy  South East Dorset sub-regional study: final first detailed proposals, technical report: development options. Draft November 2005  Western sector feasibility study volume 3: shadow appropriate assessment (no date) (only in the area relevant to the study)
Ancient woodland	Sub-regional spatial options – notes for members workshop 10 Sept 04 Environmental and physical constraints map	Initial working draft strategic sustainability appraisal of the Cheltenham and Gloucester JSA. June 2005  Technical background paper on behalf of SWRA (April 2005)	South East Dorset Strategy, November 2005. SED 02: the strategy  South East Dorset sub-regional study: final first detailed proposals, technical report: development options. Draft November 2005  Western sector feasibility study volume 3: shadow appropriate assessment (no date) (only in the area relevant to the study)
Sites with known mineral reserve	Sub-regional spatial options – notes for members workshop 10 Sept 04		
RAMSAR sites	Sub-regional spatial options – notes for members workshop 10 Sept 04 Environmental and physical constraints map	Initial working draft strategic sustainability appraisal of the Cheltenham and Gloucester JSA. June 2005  Technical background paper on behalf of SWRA (April 2005)	South East Dorset Strategy, November 2005. SED 02: the strategy  South East Dorset sub-regional study: final first detailed proposals, technical report: development options. Draft November 2005  Western sector feasibility study volume 3: shadow appropriate assessment (no date) (only in the area relevant to the study)
Grade 1 agricultural land Cemeteries	Sub-regional spatial options – notes for members workshop 10 Sept 04	Initial working draft strategic sustainability appraisal of the Cheltenham and Gloucester JSA. June 2005  Technical background paper on behalf of SWRA (April 2005)	South East Dorset Strategy, November 2005. SED 02: the strategy  South East Dorset sub-regional study: final first detailed proposals, technical report: development options. Draft November 2005  Western sector feasibility study volume 3: shadow appropriate assessment (no date) (only in the area relevant to the study)

Green Belt Area	West of England	Cheltenham & Gloucester	South East Dorset
Assessment			
<b>Setting of the main urban centres</b>	Detail of setting of urban areas in relation to Green Belt areas contained within mapinfo files supplied. Additional work needs to be undertaken respect of historic towns.	C&G JSA background paper: strategic reassessment of the Green Belt. (January 2005) categorises importance of Green Belt locations in regard to historic setting but there is no analysis.	South East Dorset sub-regional study: final first detailed proposals, technical report: development options. Draft November 2005
topography	Detail of topography in respect of entire Green Belt is mapped.		
sense of approach	Detail of setting of urban areas and thus sense of approach in relation to Green Belt areas contained within mapinfo files supplied.		
change on the urban-rural edge			
landmarks	Some detail of key landmarks setting of urban areas in relation to Green Belt areas contained within mapinfo files supplied. Additional work needs to be undertaken in respect of historic towns.		
skylines	Some detail of important skyline supplied in mapinfo files supplied.		
views from the urban centre	Detail of setting of urban areas in relation to Green Belt areas contained within mapinfo files supplied. Additional work needs to be undertaken respect of historic towns.		
<b>Character of settlements within the Green Belt</b>			no
historic characteristics	Acknowledged in West of England joint study area first detailed proposals, August 2005 that Bath is a historic asset but not related to Green Belt review. Additional work needs to be undertaken respect of historic towns.  West of England partnership; planning, transport and environment group. Agenda item 10 14 October 2005 'review of Green Belt'. Appendix three assesses sections of the Green Belt against PPG2 criterion to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns but this is not an analysis of the historic characteristics.		South East Dorset sub-regional study: final first detailed proposals, technical report: development options. Draft November 2005
spatial distribution			
Cultural, social and economic links	West of England joint study area first detailed proposals, August 2005	Cheltenham and Gloucester joint study area paper September 2005	South East Dorset Strategy, November 2005. SED 02: the strategy
<b>Environmental capital</b> local character areas biodiversity	South Gloucestershire have a landscape character assessment dating from 1992. This covers the northern and north-eastern parts of the Green Belt. Not a similar document for the other parts of the Green Belt. Landscape character assessment of bath and North East Somerset has been undertaken.	Too limited extent – para 3.3 of Green Belt review background paper. Cotswold escarpment and the Severn Vale are acknowledged in Sept 04 working group minutes as being important landscape features.  Initial strategic sustainability appraisal of the Cheltenham and Gloucester JSA. June 2005  Technical background paper on behalf of SWRA (January 2005)	South East Dorset sub-regional study: final first detailed proposals, technical report: development options. Draft November 2005. character areas identified but further work on biodiversity required.
<b>Transport corridors and nodes</b>	West of England joint study area first detailed proposals, August 2005  To be considered in more detail once the Greater Bristol Strategic Transport Study is finalised.	September 04 working group minutes acknowledge that this is an area to be looked at.  Cheltenham and Gloucester joint study area paper September 2005 – strategic links and not assessed in relation to housing or Green Belt.  C&G JSA detailed strategy document for first detailed proposals – looks at strategic linkages from an economic perspective.	<b>Yes</b> in the November 05 technical report on development options (assessed from the strategic economic perspective).

Green Belt Area Assessment	West of England	Cheltenham & Gloucester	South East Dorset
<b>Capacity assessment</b>			South East Dorset Strategy, November 2005. SED 02: the strategy. – Uses Urban housing capacity study and is not an assessment of capacity within the Green Belt.
<b>Comments</b>	Review so far looks at the PPG2 objectives and considers the assessment criteria in this context only. Absolute constraints are mentioned (e.g. floodplain) as are some landscape features, but there needs to be a stronger analysis on how these contribute to the value of areas within the Green Belt and in identifying possible areas for release.	Various strands of work need to be compiled into a single document. Cambridge style landscape assessment should be carried out, the work so far is too superficial .	

Error! Unknown document property name.

---

## Appendix 2: Correspondence from GOSW to SWRA of 14 November 2005

14 November 2005

*Bronwyn Hill  
Regional Director*

**Bryony Houlden  
South West Regional Assembly  
Dennett House  
11 Middle Street  
TAUNTON  
Somerset  
TA12 1SH**

2 Rivergate  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6EH  
GTN: 1361 1701  
Tel: 0117 900 1701  
Fax: 0117 900 1901

Mast House  
Shepherds Wharf  
24 Sutton Road  
Plymouth PL4 0HJ  
GTN: 1390 5063  
Tel: 01752 635063  
Fax: 01752 227647

Email: [Bronwyn.hill@gosw.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Bronwyn.hill@gosw.gsi.gov.uk)

### **Regional Spatial Strategy – Reinforcing the evidence base**

I thought it would be helpful to write to you with some thoughts following the recent Assembly plenary and Peter Brown's letter of 3 November to the 4(4) Authorities. We also undertook, at one of the Assembly's workshop sessions on 21 October, specifically to set out the Government's position in respect of the RSS and the Green Belt.

When Baroness Andrews agreed an extension to the RSS timetable in June she stressed the need for the Assembly to move quickly to plug gaps in the evidence base. Thoss Shearer's letter of 16 August elaborated on this, pointing to the need to ensure that the evidence underpinning the JSA work and 'first detailed proposals' is robust and complete.

Peter Brown's letter helpfully identifies a number of areas in which further work is needed. However, I am concerned that it may not go far enough in filling the gaps in critical areas.

As Peter's letter acknowledges, testing of growth levels has varied across the JSA and 4(4) work. However, it is clear that there is not enough information about the possible implications of planning for higher growth scenarios including those set out in the draft Regional Economic Strategy. The RSS and RES processes will test the realism of the growth scenarios but the former will be frustrated if we do not have complete and robust information about the spatial implications. The work recently commissioned from Roger Tym & Partners will help the Assembly and others to better understand the economic potential of key places but it will need to be taken further to articulate the spatial, transport and other non-economic implications of higher scenarios should they materialise. We hope that it will be possible to arrive at a common regional view about what the levels of growth are likely to be to

inform the draft RSS and its implementation plan. But in any event it is inevitable that the EiP Panel will want to look at the implications of planning for the range of growth scenarios and essential that complete and robust information is available for them to properly consider the issues and arrive at a clear view.

I know that the Assembly is commissioning a study to look at the consistency of the JSA and 4(4) work to review the green belts. I would like to be reassured that this will be taken further to make sure the gaps in the reviews that are already apparent are filled. It will not be necessary for the RSS to repeat the policies and purposes of the green belt which are clearly set out in PPS2. But as Peter says in his letter, RPG10 has since 2001 required strategic authorities to review the green belt in Structure Plans to establish its general extent, and this has not yet been completed. This responsibility has now passed to the RPB in the RSS. The reviews must be completed if the RSS is to set out clear policies on the changes to the general extent of the green belt, displayed diagrammatically as well as in words as part of the key diagram for the urban areas concerned, where these are necessary to accommodate any proposed urban extensions. The RSS cannot remit this work to LDDs or a future review of RSS. It is vital that completion of the green belt reviews takes place hand-in-hand with the work to test the implications of the growth scenarios, so that the possible effects on the green belt are understood and its general extent is established (including possible increases) to ensure that the green belt purposes are robust for the future. It is entirely right for the JSAs and the 4/4 authorities in the three relevant parts of the Region to participate in these reviews, but ultimately if the work they submit is insufficient it will be necessary for the RPB to take the reviews forward in tandem with its emerging thinking about the most appropriate locations and size of urban extensions, and time is running out.

You will also be aware of the difficulties in obtaining reliable supporting evidence and costings for the transport schemes associated with a number of the JSA and 4(4) authority submissions. The Regional Funding Allocations initiative provides the region with an opportunity to plan for investment over the long term but in order to do this we do need reliable costed transport proposals with which the region can prioritise. In the RSS context, if the Regional Transport Strategy is to be fully integrated, robust evidence is required to support the infrastructure needs associated with growth.

These are the main areas where further work appears to be needed, but we are also concerned to ensure that sufficient evidence is available to support the emerging RSS policies for the rural parts of the region. It will be essential to ensure that, for example, emerging proposals in rural areas are supported by robust and realistic evidenced based economic assessments in order to ensure sustainable outcomes.

I have copied this letter to the planning/environment directors of the 4(4) Authorities and to Claire Gibson at the RDA.

**BRONWYN HILL**

## Appendix 3: Best Practice Review

## Methodology used for reviewing the Green Belt in the Cambridge sub-region study

The review of the green belt around Cambridge comprised the following principal components:

1. Identify constraints to development.
2. Identification of primary and secondary green belt purpose.
3. Assessment of areas within the Green Belt for further investigation:
  - o Setting and character
  - o Environmental capacity
  - o Relationship of urban/rural edge
4. Sustainability assessment of individual sites.

The review was carried out in three stages and these are set out below.

### Stage one

Agreement on and mapping of constraints to development. Some of these are absolute constraints, such as SSSIs and grade 1 flood plain, and others are partial constraints, such as, grade 1 agricultural land. These areas were excluded from search areas for new development.

### Stage two

1. Establish the primary purpose of the Green Belt (to preserve the special character of Cambridge and to maintain the quality of its setting) and secondary purpose (to prevent further coalescence of settlements).
2. Setting and special character of the green belt. For the Cambridge study this comprised:
  - o local character areas – vegetation, historic attributes, views;
  - o topography;
  - o views of the city of Cambridge, and
  - o the interface between the city and its surrounding villages and the countryside.
3. Environmental capacity framework assessment of potential development sites. This comprised the following elements:
  - o landscape and setting – relationship between site and surrounding landscape and historic core of Cambridge;
  - o vegetation structure – determined capacity assessing ability of existing vegetation to screen development;
  - o topography – important in considering local and wider impacts;
  - o biodiversity – considered broadly at this stage;
  - o transport – assess ability of site to contribute to sustainable travel patterns and includes walking, cycling and public transport.
4. Relationship of the rural/urban edge.
5. Examination of the degree of physical and visual separation between settlements.

### Stage three

Following from stage two, areas within the Green Belt where it was considered that development could be accommodated, were assessed on a site by site basis against a set of agreed capacity and sustainability criteria.

---

## Nottingham Derby Green Belt Methodology

- Study discussions held with officers from local authorities affected by the Green Belt, matters to be raised are:
    - the history of the Green Belt;
    - purpose of the Green Belt;
    - views on the effect of the Green Belt;
    - the designation and operation of the Green Belt in policy making in the development plan and development control;
    - possible changes to Green Belt boundaries.
  - Meetings or telephone conversations with interest parties in the outcome of the Green Belt, identified by the steering group;
    - parties familiar with environmental issues of the area, i.e. Environment Agency;
    - with knowledge of strategic interest in development activity, i.e. House Building Federation (HBF);
    - from the voluntary sector, i.e. Council for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) and friends of Green Belt.
  - The report format used is as follows:
    - The origins of the Green Belt
      - Philosophical origins of Green Belt;
    - The purpose.
      - As identified in PPG 2, it identifies 5 purposes;
      - To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas;
      - To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another;
      - To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
      - To preserve the setting and character of historic towns;
      - To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
    - Green Belt Objectives
      - These are not objectives of Green Belt policy, but objectives which land in Green Belts might have a positive role in fulfilling.
      -
    - Operation of Green Belt Policy
      - It identifies that there is a unique issue to Green Belt when preparing development plans and how they should deal with them;
-

## Section 2

- National Planning Policy
- Green Belt and Sustainable Development
  - The overarching goal of spatial planning is now to contribute towards greater sustainability by bringing about development that is more sustainable.
- Findings of the study
- The Plan-Led system

## Section 3 examines the Nottingham – Derby Green Belt

- Introduction
- Review
  - Identifies the location of the Green Belt/s;
  - Potential changes to the defined area;
  - How existing Green Belts have been defined historically and why;
  - If any extensions or reductions are proposed;
- Implications of maintaining the Green Belt
  - It identifies consequences of development in the Green Belt
- Green Wedges
  - These are areas of open space to be protected from development or provide wildlife corridors within urban areas. Leicester and Derby identify these where there are no Green Belt designations.

## Section 4 Green Belt and Spatial Planning

- Options for the way forward
    - It identifies three tests for the consideration of options, they are:
      - reflect the proper role of RPG
      - be consistent with the aim of achieving more sustainable development
      - assist with the operational issues raised by having part of the Region subject to Green Belt policy
-

- Influences on the approach
    - The main influences are on the review are:
      - Preparation of RPG
      - Formulation of Spatial Strategy
      - The scale of development to be provided for.
  - Spatial Strategy
  - Scale of development
    - It identifies a sequence of steps in assessing the scale of changes to the Green belt:
      - how much development provision is to be made in the Region, and in the Three Cities Sub Area;
      - what proportion of the Sub Area provision should be in or closely related to each of the cities;
      - how much development can and should take place within the urban areas;
      - what level of development should take place on the edge of or closely related to the urban areas.
  - Proposed Approach
    - The questions to be addressed are therefore:
      - what mechanism should be followed for changing Green Belt boundaries?
      - how should the locations for the boundary changes be identified?
  - Mechanism
    - It identifies the removal of land from the Green Belt the approach or to change the boundaries.
    - The following approach is suggested:
      - in the RPG, establishing the expectation that some of the required development will be accommodated in what is now Green Belt;
      - in the structure plans, preferably informed by joint working of the local authorities in the sub region, identification of the broad areas where Green Belt boundaries will need to be changed;
-

- in local plans, identifying those areas within the areas of search to be allocated for development, and redrawing the boundaries.
- Criteria of development locations
  - The criteria used is:
  - **Opportunity:**
    - the trip lengths generated by movement between new homes and other facilities can be low, because of the pattern of uses
    - there can be good access to public transport;
    - By **impact** locations which minimise the impact on environmental assets. These have included:
      - national or county wide landscape and nature conservation designations
      - agricultural land classification
      - water source protection areas, and areas at risk from flooding.
  - By '**contribution**' the extent to which adding to the development in a location can improve the overall pattern of development.
- Identifying locations
  - These locations were tested for their impact and contribution, through a process which is both convergent and iterative. The development envisaged could be achieved by either:
    - a series of small scale peripheral expansions located according to the criteria of opportunity and impact
    - a few larger schemes located according to the opportunity and impact criteria, but creating a contribution by involving employment as well as housing and providing for other facilities to be included.
- Adding to the Green Belt
  - No areas proposed as can be controlled through other planning policies and controls.

## Section 5 Conclusions and Recommendations

- Conclusions
  - Recommendation
-

Contact:  
**Greg Lee**

Colin Buchanan  
Newcombe House  
45 Notting Hill Gate  
London  
W11 3PB  
T 020 7309 7000  
E [greg.lee@cbuchanan.co.uk](mailto:greg.lee@cbuchanan.co.uk)