

From: David Meechan

Sent: 22 November 2018 08:50

To: Programme Officer NEDDC

Subject: Concern over Council response to Inspector's question on DR1

Louise,

I believe that the Council may have given an inaccurate reply to one of the Inspector's questions regarding DR1 yesterday and that this has important consequences.

I think the Inspector asked whether if it was accepted that removal of this site from the GB reduces the strategic gap then would that change the overall assessment score for this site. I think Mr Gartland replied that it would not. I believe that this is incorrect and that the assessment methodology set out in the Green Belt Review Part 2 would have resulted in this site having an overall score of "Red" , ie "considered to meet at least one of the purposes robustly". This would have resulted in this site being ruled out for being carried forward to Stage C of the assessment and therefore not considered by the Council as a potential site for removal from the Green Belt.

My detailed reasoning is set out below:

1. It is clear from the map that the south western part of this site is closer to Unstone (however defined) than the existing adjacent development.
2. On the proforma for this site (parcel reference DRO/GB/042) in the North East Derbyshire Green Belt Review Part 2 Appendix 2 (EB GB2e) this would change the answer to the question "Would removal from the GB reduce the strategic gap? (purpose 2b)" from "No" to "Yes" and then the score for Purpose 2a (width of strategic gap) would not be reduced from Red. Therefore the overall score for purpose 2 would change from Amber to Red.
3. This would give overall scores in Stage B of the assessment for this parcel of: Purpose 1: Green, Purpose 2: Red, Purpose 3: Red, Purpose 4: Green, Purpose 5: Amber
4. In the supplementary assessment, after purpose 3 is removed, the site would have 1 Red, 1 Amber and 2 Green scores.
5. Table 3.8, page 22, of the Green Belt Review Part 2 (EB GB2b) shows the parcel scoring matrix for the supplementary assessment. The combination of Red, Amber, Green, Green is not shown but the overall score for all of the combinations with at least one Red are shown as having an overall score of Red,

This parcel would therefore have had an overall score of Red, and "considered to meet at least one of the purposes robustly".

6. Paragraph 3.63, page 22 of EB GB2b says "Stage B assesses each parcel and rules out those considered to be robustly fulfilling at least one of the purposes of including land within the Green Belt (subject to the supplementary assessment set out above). Any remaining parcels of land within the study which did not wholly meet any (or only partly) of the set criteria for measuring each purpose of the Green Belt are to be carried forward to Stage C.". So this parcel would have been ruled out at Stage B.

I would be grateful if you could bring this to the Inspector's attention as I believe that it is a critical point relating to the allocation of site DR1.

I shall be at the hearing this afternoon and would be happy to clarify anything. Dr Gadsden will be there this morning and is aware of this issue.

Regards,

David Meechan on behalf of Dronfield Green Belt Residents Group