

NORTH TYNESIDE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Matter 6: Green Belt, including Safeguarded Land

1. The following hearing statement is made for and on behalf of the Home Builders Federation. This statement responds to selected questions set out within Matter 6 of the Inspector's *Schedule of Matters, Issues and Questions* (exam ref: EXINS11).
2. The Inspector's Issues and Questions are included in bold for ease of reference. The following responses should be read in conjunction with our comments upon the submission version of the Local Plan, dated 14th December 2015. The HBF has also expressed a desire to attend the examination hearing sessions.

Issue 1 – Whether the Local Plan's approach to the Green Belt in North Tyneside is justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

a) to f), h)

3. The HBF has no further comments at this stage.

g) *Is the plan sound (paras. 4.32 & 4.34) (including the Council's proposed modifications) to identify that monitoring would be the trigger to consider whether there would be a need for a Green Belt Review, including additional safeguarded land, as part of a future Local Plan Review? Are the Green Belt boundaries capable of enduring beyond the Plan period?*

4. The HBF considers that the plan should identify triggers which identify when a review of the plan (either full or partial) would be necessary. We note and support the intentions of Policy S9.1, as proposed to be amended. However the actions identified whilst laudable lack specificity about when they would be engaged. The HBF recommend greater clarity is provided regarding when these actions would be undertaken and when a review of the Local Plan would be undertaken.

Issue 2 – Is the Plan's approach to safeguarded land sound?

a) to b)

5. The HBF has no further comments.

c) Is the overall amount of safeguarded land identified sufficient? Should additional safeguarded land be identified in: (a) the North West Priority Investment Area? And (b) Between the Metro Line and A186 between Shiremoor and Wellfield/Earsdon?

6, Whilst the HBF would not wish to stipulate which areas should include additional safeguarded land we do consider that the designation of additional safeguarded land would provide greater certainty that the Green Belt boundaries would endure beyond the plan period. This would conform with NPPF paragraph 83.

d) Does the limited amount of safeguarded land present a risk that the Plan has limited flexibility? Is it likely to endure for the plan period or until the Plan is reviewed?

7. As noted above the HBF considers that the plan would benefit from the provision of additional safeguarded land this would provide greater flexibility and certainty over the longevity of the Green Belt boundary. The HBF recommends that the Council undertake further analysis of the amount of safeguarded land, taking account of other sources of supply, which would be required to ensure that amendments to the Green Belt are not required either during or at the end of the plan period. The HBF notes that Cheshire East have provided such an analysis in response to concerns raised by their Inspector.

e) Should a quantum of safeguarded land be the 'sequential' contingency rather than a review of the Plan if housing delivery falls below the trajectory?

8. Yes, the HBF considers this would provide greater flexibility to the plan. It would also accord with the NPPF requirements for plans to include flexibility and choice and be able to 'adapt to rapid change' (paragraph 14).

f) Should Policy DM1.8 include reference to biodiversity and wildlife corridors?

9. The HBF has no further comments.

Yours sincerely,

MJ Good

Matthew Good

Planning Manager – Local Plans

Email: matthew.good@hbf.co.uk

Tel: 07972774229