This guide goes through the sections on the on-line consultation document in order, picking out those relevant to people wishing to oppose greenbelt deletion in Belper. Each response should be individual to the writer, so the following is guidance only, which should be reworded individually by the responder.

Your email address goes in the ‘introduction’ section!

You don’t have to respond to all sections.

You can state whether you feel the plan is legally compliant at each point.

You also have chance to comment on whether the plan is ‘sound’, these are the grounds for saying ‘not legally sound’:

* Not positively prepared- does not meet assessed development and infrastructure requirements.
* Not justified- not founded on robust and credible evidence…should provide the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives.
* Not effective- not deliverable, does not embrace sound infrastructure delivery planning…
* Not consistent with national policy

It is important to make some response to compliance and/or soundness as this is the basis for accepting or rejecting the plan.

**Paragraph 6.2/ Policy SS2 Housing need & Housing Land Provision & Distribution-**

It is not very clear how commenting on the ‘paragraph’ and the actual policy differs, you could just repeat the same in each section. You may wish to comment on the following-

* The duty to co-operate with neighbouring South Derbyshire and Derby city works both ways: having adopted some of the housing need for Derby city some time ago, this now needs revisiting as SD and DC have both exceeded their targets and could potentially ‘help’ with AV’s shortfall. To not explore this, means that the plan is possibly ‘not positively prepared’.

To make the plan compliant, this co-operation needs further exploration for an up to date assessment of need.

**6.9/ SS9 Green Belt**

The following are required to be explored, before ‘exceptional circumstances’ for considering deleting greenbelt to meet housing land requirements can be claimed and to comply with national policy-

* The duty to co-operate with neighbouring South Derbyshire and Derby city: this works both ways and, having adopted some of the housing need for Derby city some time ago, this now needs revisiting as SD and DC have both exceeded their targets and could potentially ‘help’ with AV’s shortfall.
* Brownfield alternatives- these have not been properly assessed. Belper Neighbourhood Plan for example, is proposing enough brownfield options to fulfil need in this area without resorting to greenbelt.

The types of modification needed therefore-

* Further exploration of the co-operation between AV and Derby City/ South Derbyshire councils.
* Brownfield review- taking account of Belper Neighbourhood Plan.

**6.10 Amendment to green belt**

National Planning Policy has not been heeded; the following are core purposes of greenbelt as identified in national policy:

* Purpose 2- to prevent neighbouring towns merging
* Purpose 4 is ‘*to preserve the setting and special character of historic town’*

**6:10:24-26 Development at Far Laund**

Point out that this area has been assessed as having **a high impact** on the ‘wider strategic green belt function’.

**6:10:63-67 Land South East of Belper**

Acknowledge that it is right to reference the fact that the World Heritage Site and its buffer zone had not been inscribed at the time of the last green belt review and that this land should now be included in greenbelt.

**policy SS10**

**Deletion of Far Laund from Green belt**

This does not comply with national policy which identifies the purpose of greenbelt:

National Planning Policy-

* Purpose 2- to prevent neighbouring towns merging- this development proposal erodes the area of separation between Belper and Heage
* Purpose 4 is ‘*to preserve the setting and special character of historic town’- this development threatens Belper’s historic setting and therefore, status as a World Heritage Site.*

Furthermore, development is not sustainable:

* Flood risk
* Road congestion etc.

**Inclusion of land to south east of Belper**

You may wish to support this inclusion as a means of protecting the World Heritage Site buffer zone from speculative developers.

**Policy HGS5**

**Belper Lane**

You may wish to support deletion of Belper Lane as a housing growth site: this is part of the World Heritage Site buffer zone and needs the same protection as that afforded by the Inspector to land at Bullsmoor.

**Policy HGS19**

**Far Laund**

If you wish to oppose inclusion of Far Laund, points to make may include-

* development is not sustainable- talk about all your concerns regarding pressure on infra-structure.
* There are no clearly stated assessment/plans for infrastructure.