

From: Hannah Langler <Hannah.Langler@hambleton.gov.uk>
Sent: 24 October 2018 17:10
To: 'Rudby Parish Council' <rudbyparish@btinternet.com>
Subject: RE: Steering Group questions on Green Space Designation

Dear Ann,

I have tried to see if I can find any more specific information on how agricultural fields have been treated during an examination.

The key comes back to the NPPF criteria and purpose. This is set out within national policy and the associated guidance. I have previously provided the views of our greenspace consultant on the matter.

You need to be clear that the site meets the criteria set out in NPPF. This needs to be evidenced.

Is it close to the community, is it local in character

Is it special to the community

Is it locally significant for one or more of the following beauty, historic significant, recreational value, tranquillity or richness in wildlife. In assessing the agricultural field in question you must be able to demonstrate it meets one of these criteria in addition to the above. The guide from Cotswolds gives some pointers on the things to consider here. <https://www.cotswold.gov.uk/media/880697/Local-Green-Space-toolkit.pdf>

This is the inspectors report for Cotswolds which gives an indication on the level of assessment where there maybe concerns over ownership and the ability to retain the green space over the long term <https://www.cotswold.gov.uk/media/1605407/Cotswold-Local-Plan-Report-Final.pdf>. There is only one field that is discussed and this has informal access at present.

I would reiterate that land may be considered for designation if there is no public access (where the site is valued for its wildlife, historic significance or beauty). With regards to the agricultural field is it valued for its beauty (itself), or its historic significance or wildlife value? What is the evidence to support that view. Our greenspace consultant indicated in his response that it is difficult to demonstrate that the field itself has any beauty (itself).

This is an example from Harrogate there are a couple of sites that are marked as fields in their assessment this may help to give you a steer to putting the advice into practice?

https://www.harrogate.gov.uk/downloads/file/3200/2017_november_local_green_space_update_report_part_1

Finally having considered the criteria and whether you have sufficient evidence to support the view that it meets the criteria you need to be able to demonstrate that they are capable of surviving beyond the plan period. This could be challenging. Would the current use be compatible with a greenbelt style policy?

The designation has to be compatible with the local planning for sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services.

I hope that this is of some use. The key message is there needs to be clear evidence to support the designation especially in the case of something that does not have public access. Hopefully the documents I have provided links to will give an indication of the nature of evidence that would be required.

I have not provided comments in relation to a specific site. The approach that the neighbourhood plan group/parish take should be consistent and transparent for all sites assessed.

Kind regards,

Hannah

Hannah Langler

Planning Policy Officer

Planning Policy

Tel: 01609 767185

Email: Hannah.Langler@hambleton.gov.uk

Website: www.hambleton.gov.uk

From: Rudby Parish Council [<mailto:rudbyparish@btinternet.com>]

Sent: 17 October 2018 17:50

To: Hannah Langler

Subject: Steering Group questions on Green Space Designation

Hello Hannah

The Parish Council would like some clarity on your response to Part 1 in your email dated 10 September.

[This is Rob's response ... (a) an agricultural field beauty of itself

(b) gardens – these Method to protect the amenity of the space.]

Specifically an agricultural field could be grubbed up and the cropping or livestock changed just as a private garden does, so what criteria does an agricultural field need to satisfy to enable inclusion as green space? Is the prevention of future planning a valid argument for inclusion?

Ann