

Oadby and Wigston Borough Council - Local Plan : Pre- Submission Consultation Document

Inspection Hearing May 2nd 2018 Ref: Document LP6 – 13: Pre-submission Consultation 2017 – representer order Saffron Trees Action Group representation: pps. 203 - 210

Matter 11 : Local Green Space – Policy 45 - page 131

1. **Unsound wording of Policy 45:** highlighted section in italics is not consistent with the NPPF.

“Any development proposal which will result in the loss of a site designated as Local Green Space on the Adopted Policies Map will not be permitted, *unless the harm of losing the asset is significantly outweighed by the benefits of the proposed development.*”

That wording in italics was not in the 2016 draft plan – and, in our view, it appears to be in direct contradiction of paragraph 76 of the NPPF, that:

“By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out development other than in very special circumstances..... Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.”

Designating a green area as Local Green Space gives protection consistent with that in respect of Green Belt – NPPF para 78. Therefore, the following highlighted wording is proposed to replace the wording which is of concern. The proposed replacement wording is taken directly from paras 76, and 87 of the NPPF.

Proposed replacement wording for Policy 45:

Policy 45 Local Green Space

Any development proposal which will result in the loss of a site designated as Local Green Space on the Adopted Policies Map will not be permitted: inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Local Green Space and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.”

Proposals put forward to the Council for Local Green Space designation are assessed against the criteria set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. **Council response to Landmark Planning – pp 121 – 123 – re SW3 and SW6.** We do not view the Council responses as consistent with the NPPF. The Council appears to offer reassurance that expansion or extension of the business would not be hindered, that there is still flexibility, and that planning permission could be granted – using the same form of words again – “...*unless the harm of losing the asset etc.*.” We do not view this as consistent with the NPPF. We are mindful of NPPF paras 186 and 187, however, in our view, the Council response shows how the **current draft** policy 45 wording about which we have raised concerns, has been used in response to a land owner, to further weaken protection even before any planning proposal has been made, rather than stating the stronger protection which the designation confers.

3. **Concerns about the LUC Sustainability Assessment changes to the wording of SA8 as per the representation in LP6 - 13.**