

## **PATTINGHAM**

The decision to only allocate sufficient land to meet housing needs in South Staffordshire up to 2038 will almost certainly result in Green Belt boundaries having to be amended again when the Local Plan is next reviewed. Given that the scale of unmet need arising from the GBBCHMA is unknown and therefore no reliance can be put on the figure of 4,000 houses to be the District's contribution to unmet need, consideration needs to be given to releasing areas of safeguarded land in accordance with paragraph 143 of the NPPF.

It is acknowledged that the release of existing safeguarded land is to be considered before looking at allocating sites in the Green Belt, but this should not be where developing safeguarded land would represent inappropriate development or where it would threaten the permanency of other land in the Green Belt. The proposed allocation is safeguarded land but it has no physical or recognisable southern boundary that would act as a permanent long-term boundary to the Green Belt. As a consequence, the proposed allocation would significantly prejudice the long-term permanence of the remaining Green Belt land to the south, the cumulative effect of which would be to cause significant harm to the purposes of the Green Belt. Furthermore, the proposed allocation, would represent an unplanned bolt-on to the existing cluster of houses allowed as an exception site, which again contains no defensible southern boundary and no onsite open space.

By contrast SHEELA site 255 represents a far more logical and sustainable extension to the village. It is large enough to accommodate a wide mix of housing and incorporate on-site open space providing a low density and wholly appropriate transition to the open countryside beyond, in sharp contrast to the high-density unplanned intrusion into open land that the proposed allocation would be. Site 255 has established development on its northern, western and eastern boundaries and a strong defensible southern boundary in accordance with paragraph 143(f) in the NPPF. The site has no constraints that would prevent it from being developed and it would allow Pattingham to accommodate the level of growth that more befits its tier 3 status.