

## Appellant's Response to Other Party Comments on NPPF 2024

1. The definition of grey belt in the new NPPF is as follows:

**“Grey belt:** *For the purposes of plan-making and decision-making, ‘grey belt’ is defined as land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in paragraph 143. ‘Grey belt’ excludes land where the application of the policies relating to the areas or assets in footnote 7 (other than Green Belt) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development.”*

2. Accordingly, it can be considered that green field land (i.e. non previously developed land) is ‘grey belt’ if it does not ‘strongly’ contribute to any of purposes (a), (b) or (d) in paragraph 143.

3. The effect of being ‘grey belt’ is set out in para 155:

*“The development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should also not be regarded as inappropriate where:*

- a. The development would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan;*
- b. There is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed;*
- c. The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of this Framework;...”*

4. In addition to the Appellant’s primary argument (That the proposed development of Lea Castle Farm not being inappropriate development because it falls within para 154 (h) (previously para 155(a) in the Dec 2023 NPPF - as fully set out in our closing), the Appellant contends that the proposal would also not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt by reference to para 155 of the December 24 NPPF because:

- The site falls within the definition of ‘grey belt’ in the glossary to the new NPPF because:
  - (i) it is not adjacent to any large built up areas so does not strongly contribute to purpose (a);

- (ii) it is not in a gap between 'towns'; and to the extent it is in a gap between villages, it forms only a part of that gap and so does not strongly contribute to purpose (b); and
  - (iii) it is not in the setting to any historic town and so does not contribute to purpose (d); and
- The proposal falls within para 155 of Dec 24 NPPF because:
  - (i) it would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt (see our closing at paras 29 to 42);
  - (ii) there is a demonstrable unmet need (see our closing at para 146 to 161) and
  - (iii) it would be in a sustainable location (our closing at para 174 and see Statement of Common Ground, rID8 para 2.16).