



**Newark and Sherwood Amended Core  
Strategy DPD**

**MATTER 8 – NOTTINGHAM-DERBY  
GREEN BELT – SP4A and SP4B**

**Statement on behalf of Newark and  
Sherwood District Council**

**January 2018**

**Question 8: Are Spatial Policies SP4A and SP4B (national policy) compliant in terms of their approach to Green Belt and do they properly reflect 4 above?**

- 8.01 Spatial Policy 4A sets out the overall approach to the extent of the Green Belt in Newark & Sherwood and reflects the policy set out in paragraph 83 of the NPPF. An essential characteristic of the Green Belt is its permanence, with boundaries only being altered in exceptional circumstances, through the Development Plan process. In reviewing boundaries there is the expectation that regard shall be had to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period. As set out in the Issues Paper (CS/23) since the Core Strategy (CS/04) was adopted the Government has restated Green Belt policy in the NPPF. The Government has placed an increased emphasis, particularly in its decision making, on ensuring that the exceptional circumstances required to change Green Belt boundaries are just that – exceptional. Therefore it is unlikely that a review such as was completed by the Council in 2013 would now be undertaken. This reinforces the Council’s position in the Allocations & Development Management DPD (CS/05) set out in the introduction - namely that once the review was undertaken there would be no further review to release more land in the green belt. Taking account of this, the fact that the proposed new plan period (2013 – 2033) overlaps with the existing (2006 – 2026) and that Green Belt boundaries were only recently amended, in 2012, the Council does not consider any further review as appropriate or necessary.
- 8.02 Copesticks o/b/o Mr Bradbury [Representor 50] believes that a further review of the Green Belt should be undertaken because the area is popular and therefore further housing should be delivered and one of the allocations, BI/Ho/3 is not deliverable. As set out in response to Matter 5, the Council is confident that the spatial distribution of growth is appropriate; furthermore in considering the allocation of further housing in a green belt location the Council needs to be clear that exceptional circumstances exists to do so as set out in 8.01 above. One such exceptional circumstance would be a lack of available land to deliver housing requirements. As set out in Matter 5, the District Council has more than sufficient land identified to meet its housing requirement without further recourse to land in the Green Belt. With regard to the deliverability of BI/Ho/3 the applicant and the District Council have concluded a pre-application process and the District Council is currently considering an application on the site.
- 8.03 Spatial Policy 4B sets out the approach to Green Belt Development; it has been amended to clarify the status and policies which will apply to all the communities in the Green Belt and those which are ‘Inset’ in the Green Belt. The Policy is now clear that development in the two Principal Villages in the Green Belt are covered by Spatial Policy 1 and DM1, that the other inset settlements, Gunthorpe and the part

of Bulcote attached to Burton Joyce, are judged according to Spatial Policy 3. Beyond that all settlements are washed over and in line with NPPF paragraph 89 the District Council has defined a number of villages as suitable for affordable housing exceptions sites but has not defined any washed over settlements for limited infilling.

- 8.04 Spatial Policy 4A was reviewed as part of the PAS Review of Policies (CS/25) which concluded the following:

*“In order to be in full conformity with NPPF paras 83-85, Spatial Policy 4A would have to demonstrate that the housing requirements of Blidworth, Lowdham and Rainworth are 'exceptional circumstances' justifying revision of Green Belt boundaries, which they probably are not; recent ministerial statements and case law have made it clear that housing need alone does not constitute exceptional circumstances in Green Belt terms. Given that there is much land in the District not covered by Green Belt, it may instead be necessary to divert the housing requirements of villages in the Green Belt to non-Green Belt settlements in the same Housing Market Area where possible, if necessary working with neighbouring authorities under the Duty to Co-Operate. In any case, Green Belt review work has already been undertaken, meaning this point is effectively academic.”*

It further concluded that Spatial 4B was in conformity with the NPPF. The District Council sets out in its Matter 5 statement that sufficient land is provided to more than meet the housing requirement set out in the Amended Core Strategy (CS/01-02) and therefore the policies are properly constituted in terms of national policy and with reference to Spatial Policy 1 and 2.