

# Green Belt Review Methodology

## Comments and Feedback

March 2009





**Green Belt Review Methodology November 2008**

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Consultation Process</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3. Green Belt Review Methodology Consultation</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4. Next Steps</b>	<b>14</b>

## 1. Introduction

1.1 This consultation statement provides details of the consultation undertaken, the comments received and the Councils response to the Local Development Framework (LDF) Green Belt Review Methodology Consultation. All the comments received during the consultation have been carefully considered by the Council and appropriate actions will be taken as identified in this report. The Green Belt Review, once complete, will be part of the evidence base which will underpin the LDF.

## 2. Consultation Process

2.1 The Council began work in earnest upon the LDF In January 2008 much of the early work focused upon gathering an evidence base and early community engagement. The first formal consultation stage upon the LDF was the Core Strategy Issues and Options consultation. This consultation ran for 11 weeks between 17<sup>th</sup> November 2008 and 30<sup>th</sup> January 2009. The consultation also included the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, and two parts of the evidence base; the Green Belt Review Methodology and Settlement Hierarchy Model. Each of the documents was available both in hard copy and as interactive versions on the council website. In addition leaflets were produced to explain the LDF process and to summarise the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and Core Strategy.

2.3 To compliment the documents and leaflets a number of consultation events were also undertaken. This included 6 drop-in events at venues across the district and 12 workshops/public meetings. Table 1 indicates the number of responses received and the number of people attending events.

**Table 1: Responses to the Consultation**

Consultation method	Number of respondents	Number of comments received
Core Strategy Issues and Options Documents	178	780
Green Belt Review Methodology	20	59
Settlement Hierarchy Methodology	10	27
Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report	10	47
Attending events	389	-

### 3. Green Belt Review Methodology Consultation

3.1 The consultation which ran from 17<sup>th</sup> November 2008 to 30<sup>th</sup> January 2009 was the second phase of consultation upon the Green Belt Review Methodology. The aim of the second phase of consultation was to finalise the methodology prior to undertaking the review. Early consultation upon the Green Belt Review Methodology occurred between 9<sup>th</sup> June 08 and 11<sup>th</sup> July 08. This early consultation was aimed at, but not restricted to, statutory consultees and groups or individuals that the Council considered could provide a technical input into the emerging study methodology. A total of 9 consultees responded to the consultation providing 34 comments.

3.2 In general the respondents to the early consultation were supportive of the fact the Council were looking to review its Green Belt and the methodology proposed. The majority of the comments received related to the criteria against which the Green Belt would be tested.

3.3 The comments received to the second period of consultation and the response of the Council are indicated in the following tables:

**Table 2: Green Belt Review comments – Action required**

Resp No.	Full Name	Organisation Details/Agent	Section/ Para/Table	Response Categories	Summary of Comments	Council Response
35	Mr & Mrs Mark & Amanda Tattersall		5.7	Agree - further action	Please would you clarify which grid squares are being referred to at the first bullet point?	This is a mistake in the methodology and should read areas outside the SPA/ SAC.
19		Development Planning Partnership		Further investigation required	It should be considered how villages within the Green Belt should be dealt with.	The current Green Belt Methodology does not specifically deal with villages and villages over washed by Green Belt. The Green Belt Methodology needs to consider how such areas are assessed.
29	Mr & Mrs Mark & Amanda Tattersall		5.18	Agree - further action	For clarification of which settlements are covered by which paragraph, would the Council please list all the settlements within Calderdale with their corresponding size classification (large built-up area , smaller centres etc)?	Those areas considered to be large built-up areas and town will be listed. All other settlements not included in the list would then by virtue of their exclusion be classified as smaller centres.
46	Mr & Mrs			Agree -	Would the Council please clarify which	The sub-areas referred to are areas for investigation this

Resp No.	Full Name	Organisation Details/Agent	Section/ Para/Table	Response Categories	Summary of Comments	Council Response
	Mark & Amanda Tattersall			further action	areas or type of areas are being referred to when using the phrase "sub-areas" in paragraphs 5.24 and 5.25?	will be made more explicit in the final methodology.
16	Mr Ian Smith	English Heritage	5.25	Agree - further action	Given that the Calderdale part of the Green Belt represents only a section of the West Yorkshire Green Belt, it is essential that the assessment takes account of distances from settlements within neighbouring local authority areas.	Paragraph 5.25 does not exclude settlements within neighbouring local authorities. However it is considered this should be made more explicit to ensure settlements in neighbouring authorities are accounted for.
9	Mr James Durkan		5.25	Further investigation required	Keep Clifton Separate	The distance between built-up areas will be assessed as part of the Green Belt Review Methodology as this is recognised as an important contributor to Green Belt.
17	Mr Ian Smith	English Heritage	5.31	Agree - further action	We broadly support the criterion proposed to assess to what extent an area of land preserves the character and setting of Calderdale's historic towns. However, whilst examining VIEWS OUT of Conservation Areas will enable the Council to make some assessment to what extent an area of land preserves the "setting" of the town and whether that view contributes to its "special character", there are other elements which might contribute to a historic settlement's "special character" which such an analysis would not pick up.	The criteria for assessing the historic character requires reconsideration in the light of these comments.
44	Mr Andrew Donaldson		5.31	Further investigation required	The areas around Brighouse should not be excluded.	The issue of Brighouse and its historic Core will be considered in the light of any amendments to the criteria within Purpose 4.
13	Ms Sara	conservation officer		Further	Previously developed land may have	This will be considered as part of a review of the

Resp No.	Full Name	Organisation Details/Agent	Section/ Para/Table	Response Categories	Summary of Comments	Council Response
	Robin	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust		investigation required	greater value for wildlife than intensively farmed land. Sites need to be assessed on an individual basis.	methodology.
12	Ms Sara Robin	conservation officer Yorkshire Wildlife Trust	Table 2	Further investigation required	Buffer zones around sites of special scientific interest (SSSIs) and also sites of interest for nature conservation (SINCs) should be included in the green belt. Housing and other developments right up to wildlife areas can have a very negative effect on such areas.	This will be considered as part of a review of the methodology.
28	Mr & Mrs Mark & Amanda Tattersall		Table 2	Further investigation required	We feel that a constraint of preserving and developing wildlife corridors should be inserted into this table. Wildlife corridors are necessary for the preservation of biodiversity.	Wildlife corridors are included within the designations provided in the RCUDP. Consideration will be given as to whether this should be included as a criteria under purpose 3.
45	Mr & Mrs Mark & Amanda Tattersall		Table 3	Agree - further action	It is not clear why the Council has given points scores under many of the criteria to areas that do not at all meet the criteria definition.	The scoring will be amended.

**Table 3: Green Belt Review comments – Noted**

Resp No.	Full Name	Organisation Details	Section/ Paragraph / Table	Response Categories	Summary of Comments	Council Response
32	Mr D R Witcher	Shibden Valley Society		Noted	The Society is very concerned that the methodology fails completely to take account of the positive roles of the Green Belt, listed in Paragraph 3.5 of the Methodology Consultation. The Society regrets that it did not have the opportunity to comment on the	The Green Belt Review Methodology does not propose to use the objectives for PPG2 as criteria because PPG2 states: 'The extent to which the use of land fulfils these objectives is however not itself a material factor in the inclusion of land within a Green Belt, or in its continued protection.' (Para 1.7 PPG2). The initial consultation upon the methodology was focused upon groups which have a

					methodology when it was available for selective comment in June and July last.	particular expertise in the Green Belt and its purpose allowing initial ideas to be tested. This has then been rolled out to other organisations through this consultation.
<b>18</b>	Dr Lesley Mackay			Noted	There may well be incremental incursions into the Green Belt. In the past, this has been due to weak planning strategies, policies and enforcement.	The review of the districts was a recommendation of the public inquiry into the adopted Replacement Calderdale Unitary Development Plan. In addition the adopted RSS, May 2008, identified a need for a Green Belt review within West Yorkshire. Once the Green Belt Review has been completed this will provide a robust evidence base upon which to designate Calderdale's Green Belt for the next 30 years. The LDF will be subject to Sustainability Appraisal and therefore will be assessed for the sustainability of its strategy.
<b>20</b>	Unknown	Robert Derek Barker and JLLST LLP/ ID Planning		Noted		The spatial options provide guidance upon how development could be accommodated in the district until 2026, particularly concentrating upon housing. However until the strategy is set the numbers for each area and amount of Green belt, if any, which may be required to fulfil this need will vary. However to conform with the RSS the majority of growth will need to be concentrated within the Halifax and Brighouse areas. The Green Belt Review will look forward for at least the next 30 years and therefore will need to take account of development pressure post 2026. The potential sites for investigation are for illustrative purposes only and do not represent an exact boundary of the areas where the Green Belt will need to be considered. In addition further investigation may lead to the area being protected if it is deemed it adequately fulfils the purposes of Green Belt. The site submitted will be considered and subject to consultation later in the LDF process.
<b>33</b>	Mr D R Witcher	Shibden Valley Society		Noted	The Society therefore wishes to emphasise that the designation of the Shibden Valley as a whole as Green	The purpose of the Green Belt Review Methodology is to identify a methodology to assess whether or not the current Green Belt within Calderdale is fit for purpose,



					Belt will contribute significantly to the positive roles of the Green Belt, and that any significant encroachment into the existing green belt area could seriously undermine these roles.	against PPG 2: Green Belts. At this stage no areas of Green Belt have been suggested for release. The comments made will help to shape this methodology.
36	Mr & Mrs Mark & Amanda Tattersall			Noted	We received a letter and email from the Council telling us that the Core Strategy Development Plan Document - Issues and Options Paper and the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report were available for comment. However, no reference to the Settlement Hierarchy Methodology Document or the Green Belt review Document was made.	These documents are technical documents and hence the focus of these consultations was upon individuals, groups and organisations who it was considered could have a significant input into the methodology. However the Council did not wish to preclude others from commenting upon these documents.
38	Toni Rios	Network Planning Manager Highways Agency		Noted	The only observation is that the sifting of options for releasing areas of Green belt for development does not include any form of accessibility analysis. Land should only be released for development if it is capable of being served by public transport and if travel demand could be met in a sustainable manner.	The Green Belt Review will only be used as evidence rather than policy, it will need to be considered in the light of other evidence such as the Settlement Hierarchy which does include accessibility criteria.
49	Mr B Howarth	Dacre Son & Hartley		Noted	We welcome the fact that the Council are acknowledging the need to review the Green Belt boundaries, bearing in mind the need to deliver the levels of housing growth within the District in accordance with the RSS. On behalf of our client we would like to formally request that land at Greetland (CFS-139) is considered as an appropriate site for investigation into the removal of this land from the Green Belt.	Site specific issues will be dealt with through the Land Allocations and Designations DPD. The Green Belt Review will be undertaken independently of whether any sites have been submitted for an area.

51	Mr S Wright	Dacres Commercial		Noted	We welcome the fact that the Council are acknowledging the need to review the Green Belt boundaries, bearing in mind the need to deliver the levels of housing growth within the District in accordance with the RSS. On behalf of our client we would like to formally request that land at Ripponden is considered as an appropriate site for investigation into the removal of this land from the Green Belt.	Site specific issues will be dealt with through the Land Allocations and Designations DPD. The Green Belt Review will be undertaken independently of whether any sites have been submitted for an area.
57	Mr S Wright	Dacres Commercial		Noted	Given the lack of future development sites (Brownfield or Greenfield) within the Calderdale District, the removal of this site (land at Ripponden) from the Green Belt will not undermine urban regeneration initiatives elsewhere in the district in terms of developing previously developed land in urban areas.	Site specific issues will be dealt with through the Land Allocations and Designations DPD. The Green Belt Review will be undertaken independently of whether any sites have been submitted for an area.
1	Mr James Durkan		2.4	Noted	No further erosion of green belt in Brighouse and re-allocation of areas off Wakefield \Road back to Green Belt	The purpose of the Green Belt Review Methodology is to identify a methodology to assess whether or not the current Green Belt within Calderdale is fit for purpose, against Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: Green Belts. At this stage no areas of Green Belt have been suggested for release.
10	Mr Stephen Webster		2.4	Noted	There is no need for more business parks and extra housing, keep the green belt we have and don't put any more pressure on the current resources.	The purpose of the Green Belt Review Methodology is to identify a methodology to assess whether or not the current Green Belt within Calderdale is fit for purpose, against PPG 2: Green Belts. At this stage no areas of Green Belt have been suggested for release.
22	Mr Andrew Donaldson		2.4	Noted	The existing Green Belt areas between Hipperholme/Lightcliffe and Hove Edge plus that of Clifton should not be reduced or modified but made	The purpose of the Green Belt Review Methodology is to identify a methodology to assess whether or not the current Green Belt within Calderdale is fit for purpose, against PPG 2: Green Belts. At this stage no areas of

					permanent as their need fully incorporates the basic essentials for the need and relevance of Green Belt.	Green Belt have been suggested for release.
39	Mr Andrew Donaldson		3.2	Agree - no further action	The Green Belt is as relevant or even more so now than ever before and the fundamental principles should not be ignored.	The purpose of the review is to ensure these fundamental principles are adhered to.
2	Mr James Durkan		3.5	Noted	Retain Clifton as a village /town prevent merging into surrounding areas and creating an urban sprawl	The purpose of the Green Belt Review Methodology is to identify a methodology to assess whether or not the current Green Belt within Calderdale is fit for purpose, against PPG 2: Green Belts. At this stage no areas of Green Belt have been suggested for release.
23	Mr Andrew Donaldson		3.5	Noted	Sites submitted for development in existing Green Belt between Hipperholme/Lightcliffe and Hove Edge should be in effect thrown out so that precious time and effort can be placed on more realistic and justifiable area submissions which can produce positive development for communities rather than destructive outcomes.	The purpose of the Green Belt Review Methodology is to identify a methodology to assess whether or not the current Green Belt within Calderdale is fit for purpose, against PPG 2: Green Belts. At this stage no areas of Green Belt have been suggested for release.
3	Mr James Durkan		3.6	Noted	retention of open countryside, agricultural land attractive landscapes and preserve nature conservation	The issue of Calderdales Green Belt and need for review was identified in the Inspectors report into the Replacement Calderdale Unitary Development Plan. The purpose of the Green Belt Review Methodology is to identify a methodology to assess whether or not the current Green Belt within Calderdale is fit for purpose, against PPG 2: Green Belts. At this stage no areas of Green Belt have been suggested for release.
5	Mr James Durkan		3.7	Noted	Reduction in green belt should not be allowed as it would no longer comply with guidelines indicated.	The purpose of the Green Belt Review Methodology is to identify a methodology to assess whether or not the current Green Belt within Calderdale is fit for purpose, against PPG 2: Green Belts. At this stage no areas of Green Belt have been suggested for release.
25	Mr Andrew		3.7	Noted	Site submissions for Green Belt	The purpose of the Green Belt Review Methodology is to

	Donaldson				between Hipperholme/Lightcliffe and Hove Edge should be removed from consideration.	identify a methodology to assess whether or not the current Green Belt within Calderdale is fit for purpose, against PPG 2: Green Belts. At this stage no areas of Green Belt have been suggested for release.
<b>4</b>	Mr James Durkan		3.8	Noted	Conformity with guidelines , size of green belt	The purpose of the Green Belt Review Methodology is to identify a methodology to assess whether or not the current Green Belt within Calderdale is fit for purpose, against PPG 2: Green Belts. At this stage no areas of Green Belt have been suggested for release.
<b>6</b>	Mr James Durkan		3.11	Noted	Very Little Green belt in Brighouse/ Clifton / Calderdale	The Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), adopted May 2008, identified Halifax as a Sub-regional town and Brighouse as a Principal Town. This means that Halifax should be the prime focus for growth within the district and Brighouse the main local focus for growth in the district. The Calderdale LDF must be in conformity with the RSS.
<b>26</b>	Mr Andrew Donaldson		3.11	Noted	This interpretation of new development focused in Brighouse is flawed and narrow in thinking .The glass is near full and to put proposed high percentage in will push it over the edge on to the bar and make a mess. Try a less full glass which has capacity.	Brighouse has been identified in the RSS as a Principal Town meaning it should be a main local focus for development. Without strong evidence to the contrary the Core Strategy needs to be in general conformity with the RSS to ensure it is found to be 'sound' at examination.
<b>47</b>	Mr. Darren martin		3.11	Noted	Clifton cannot cope with all the houses and units it is proposing to build let alone Brighouse.	The purpose of the Green Belt Review Methodology is to identify a methodology to assess whether or not the current Green Belt within Calderdale is fit for purpose, against PPG 2: Green Belts. At this stage no areas of Green Belt have been suggested for release.
<b>21</b>	Mr Peter Butterfield		3.12	Noted	Object	No reasons given for the objection however Paragraph 3.12 is a matter of fact and relates to the outcomes of Inspectors Report into the Replacement Calderdale Unitary Development Plan. The purpose of the Green Belt Review Methodology is to identify a methodology to assess whether or not the current Green Belt within Calderdale is fit for purpose, against PPG 2: Green Belts. At this stage no areas of Green Belt have been suggested

						for release.
<b>41</b>	Mr Andrew Donaldson		5.5	Noted	In review pressure should not be put on the outcome so as to satisfy a numbers target for housing but solely whether the areas satisfy the Green Belt criteria and community needs for this.	The purpose of the Green Belt Review is to identify if areas of land are fit for purpose when assessed against Green Belt purposes. It will be an evidence document which influences but does not make policy. Policy decisions regarding the release of land will be made through the Core Strategy based upon all the evidence available and with full public scrutiny.
<b>7</b>	Mr James Durkan		Figure 5.3	Noted	Brighouse /Clifton needs its green belt areas	Figure 5.3 is provided for illustrative purposes only and is meant as a starting point for areas of potential investigation of the Green Belt boundary. Figure 5.3 does also include areas within the west of the district.
<b>31</b>	Mr & Mrs Mark & Amanda Tattersall		Figure 5.3	Noted	We object to Stainland being included in this Green Belt Review, as a potential site for investigation, because of the errors we have pointed out within the SHM.	The purpose of the Green Belt Review Methodology is to identify a methodology to assess whether or not the current Green Belt within Calderdale is fit for purpose, against PPG 2: Green Belts. At this stage no areas of Green Belt have been suggested for release. The criteria for determining which areas are looked at in greater detail will be dependent upon the changes made in relation to this consultation.
<b>34</b>	Mr & Mrs Mark & Amanda Tattersall		Figure 5.3	Noted	We are concerned that the term “broad” is used to define areas for investigation. As the review of any area of green belt is a sensitive issue, we feel the Council should be attempting to provide a more detailed map at figure 5.3.	The purpose of the Green Belt Review Methodology is to identify a methodology to assess whether or not the current Green Belt within Calderdale is fit for purpose, against PPG 2: Green Belts. At this stage no areas of Green Belt have been suggested for release. A more detailed map will be produced once the initial results from the review become available.
<b>50</b>	Mr B Howarth	Head of Planning Dacre Son & Hartley	Figure 5.3	Noted	We would comment that Figure 5.3 is not particularly clear in terms of whether a specific site will be considered. While we understand that the diagram illustrates 'broad search areas' we request in particular that land south of Greetland off Saddleworth Road should be	Figure 5.3 is provided for illustrative purposes only indicating which areas may be given further consideration. Site specific issues will be dealt with through the Land Allocations and Designations DPD. The Green Belt Review will be undertaken independently of whether any sites have been submitted for an area.

					considered in the methodology for potential removal from the Green Belt.	
<b>52</b>	Mr S Wright	Dacres Commercial	Figure 5.3	Noted	We would comment that Figure 5.3 is not particularly clear in terms of whether a specific site will be considered. While we understand that the diagram illustrates 'broad search areas' we request in particular that land north of Ripponden, on the east side of Halifax Road, adjacent to the river Ryburn should be considered in the methodology for potential removal from the Green Belt.	Figure 5.3 is provided for illustrative purposes only indicating which areas may be given further consideration. Site specific issues will be dealt with through the Land Allocations and Designations DPD. The Green Belt Review will be undertaken independently of whether any sites have been submitted for an area.
<b>27</b>	Mr & Mrs Mark & Amanda Tattersall		5.11	Noted	We believe the Council should minimise any further incursions into the green belt, partly with a view to maximising public confidence in the integrity of the green belt.	The purpose of the Green Belt Review Methodology is to identify a methodology to assess whether or not the current Green Belt within Calderdale is fit for purpose, against PPG 2: Green Belts. At this stage no areas of Green Belt have been suggested for release.
<b>42</b>	Mr Andrew Donaldson		5.11	Noted	This further reinforces the Green Belt designation between Lightcliffe and Hove Edge which provided unprecedented public concern and outcry when last threatened.	The purpose of the Green Belt Review Methodology is to identify a methodology to assess whether or not the current Green Belt within Calderdale is fit for purpose, against PPG 2: Green Belts. At this stage no areas of Green Belt have been suggested for release.
<b>43</b>	Mr Andrew Donaldson		5.19	Noted	Further development between Hipperholme/Lightcliffe and Brighouse should be stopped to ensure the 2 areas do not merge to the detriment of local communities as was highlighted in the inspectors report on several sites.	The purpose of the Green Belt Review Methodology is to identify a methodology to assess whether or not the current Green Belt within Calderdale is fit for purpose, against PPG 2: Green Belts. At this stage no areas of Green Belt have been suggested for release.
<b>53</b>	Mr S Wright	Dacres Commercial		Noted	The removal of this site (land at Ripponden) from the Green Belt will not contribute to the sprawl of Ripponden, given that the residential neighbourhood of Kebroyd is linked to	Site specific issues will be dealt with through the Land Allocations and Designations DPD. The Green Belt Review will be undertaken independently of whether any sites have been submitted for an area.

					Ripponden by development along the A58 which extends southwards beyond this site.	
8	Mr James Durkan		5.22	Noted	Prevent further urban sprawl in Brighouse	Paragraph 5.22 concerns the criteria which will be used to assess the Green Belt. This comment does not relate to any of the criteria.
30	Mr & Mrs Mark & Amanda Tattersall		5.23	Noted	Would the Council please give further details as to the size of areas being considered in this paragraph? As development along roads is to be studied, we would like to know if this means only buildings directly adjoining the roads or if it is to include buildings radiating out from the roads. If it is the latter, how wide an area will be taken into consideration?	The size of the area being studied will vary due to the issues noted in paragraphs 5.8 - 5.10 of the methodology.
54	Mr S Wright	Dacres Commercial		Noted	The development of this site (land at Ripponden) would not give rise to incremental coalescence with any other settlement.	Site specific issues will be dealt with through the Land Allocations and Designations DPD. The Green Belt Review will be undertaken independently of whether any sites have been submitted for an area.
55	Mr S Wright	Dacres Commercial		Noted	While development would inevitably encroach onto what is currently open countryside, in common with any Green Belt release, significant mitigation measures can be taken in master planning the site (land at Ripponden) to limit the encroachment and improve accessibility to the open countryside.	Site specific issues will be dealt with through the Land Allocations and Designations DPD. The Green Belt Review will be undertaken independently of whether any sites have been submitted for an area.
56	Mr S Wright	Dacres Commercial		Noted	Consideration of this function is of relevant in this case (land at Ripponden).	Site specific issues will be dealt with through the Land Allocations and Designations DPD. The Green Belt Review will be undertaken independently of whether any sites have been submitted for an area.
59	Mr Anthony Rae	Friends Of The Earth (Calderdale)	7.3	Noted	Whilst we have reviewed the methodology - and noted the expert	The requirement for a Green Belt Review was noted in the Inspectors Report into the RCUDP.

					comment contained in appendix 2, to which we cannot add - we remain opposed to a Green Belt review being undertaken in order to facilitate excessive housing supply.	
58	Mr Colin Holm	Government Team (West) Natural England	Table 4	Noted	Natural England provided comments in July 2008 in relation to the initial consultation on the Green Belt Review Methodology. We note the Council's response to our comments as set out in Appendix 2 of the updated methodology document. With regards to Response Number 21, we note the Council's response but would however like to clarify that a Landscape Character Assessment could aid this review by informing the definition of the study areas within the green belt.	This issue was dealt with during the previous consultation.

**Table 4: Green Belt Review comments – Disagree/ Not relevant**

Resp No.	Full Name	Organisation Details	Section/ Para/Table	Response Categories	Summary of Comments	Council Response
48	Mr Roger Drayton			Disagree	I am concerned that the Green Belt review will be used as an opportunity to release land for development as an easy option to meet house building targets.	The purpose of the Green Belt Review Methodology is to identify a methodology to assess whether or not the current Green Belt within Calderdale is fit for purpose, against PPG 2: Green Belts. At this stage no areas of Green Belt have been suggested for release. The reason for undertaking the review emanates from the inspectors report into the RCUDP and RSS policy.
40	Mr Andrew Donaldson		3.12	Disagree	This paragraph 3.12 should be rewritten so as not to infer a general dilution of the Green Belt is acceptable and also where the two notable	Paragraph 3.12 provides a summary of the RCUDP review process.



Resp No.	Full Name	Organisation Details	Section/ Para/Table	Response Categories	Summary of Comments	Council Response
					examples are given these must be more specific and further qualified or left out so that importance of other Green Belt land in the adjacent area can't be diluted .	
37	Mr Peter G Ratcliffe		7.3	Disagree	Please add: "and also to provide for the future need of householders to be able to grow their own food within the curtilage of their home."	This document is looking at the strategic use of Green Belt, detailed issues such as those noted would be inappropriate to be included.

#### 4. Next Steps

4.1 All the actions noted in this document will feed into the final Green Belt Review Methodology. Following a revision of the methodology the Green Belt Review will be undertaken, it is currently anticipated this work will be completed in summer 2009. Once complete the results will form part of the Local Development Framework (LDF) evidence base and will be used to inform the production of the Core Strategy and Land Allocations and Designations documents which will form essential elements of the LDF.

4.2 Once complete the Green Belt Review will be made available on the Council's website ([www.Calderdale.gov.uk](http://www.Calderdale.gov.uk)).