

Question (b)

PLP10 clause 2 is neither adequate nor useful. Development in the Green Belt should be consistent with Green Belt policies, not simply 'have regard' to Green Belt policies. The clause also does not appear to say anything about the rural economy. We might infer from this that the intention of PLP10(2) is to provide for a relaxation of Green Belt policy requirements where there is a rural economy opportunity. To do so is unnecessary and confusing, because each case should be considered on its own merits and may be approved if it demonstrates very special circumstances for developing in the Green Belt.

Although the clause could be argued to be superfluous, a simpler and more robust wording would make it sound, along the lines that: "Where development is proposed in the Green Belt, it should be consistent with the Green Belt policies in this plan and in national planning policy."

Question (c)

We would prefer to see the policy re-framed so that it plans more positively for protecting and enhancing the character and appearance of the countryside. Clearly this extends well beyond areas of particular environmental sensitivity, and should apply to all development.

Given that the policy is concerned with the rural economy, it should be more clear that the economic function of the development, not just its appearance, should be appropriate to its locality. In this context, the phrase 'where proposals would lead to unsustainable development' seems needlessly euphemistic, and wide open to challenge on a case-by-case basis.

Insofar as permitted development rights operate separately from the Local Plan, there is no need to refer to them in the policy. If, however, there are localities or circumstances where it is considered appropriate to restrict permitted development rights, then these should be specified.