

# Core Strategy: Proposed Submission Document Consultation 2012

Event Name	Core Strategy: Proposed Submission Document Consultation 2012
Comment by	Banstead Village Residents Association (Mr Roger Collins)
Comment ID	CS53
Response Date	12/04/12 10:08
Consultation Point	Consultation Document ( <a href="#">View</a> )
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.4
(1) Name:	Roger Collins
(2) Organisation (if relevant):	Banstead Village Residents Association
Policy:	CS4
Paragraph:	4 B & C
Box/map:	No no.- P34
(a) Legally compliant?	Yes
(b) Sound?	No
(5) Do you consider the Core Strategy is unsound because it is not:	Positively prepared

**(6) Please give details of why you consider the Core Strategy: Proposed Submission Document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible, referring to the compliance matters and tests of soundness. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Core Strategy: Proposed Submission Document, please also use this box.**

IN RELATION TO BANSTEAD VILLAGE WARD: ?This paragraph opens the door to changing the status of Green Belt which currently covers all currently undeveloped areas of the village Ward ?If it is planned, or becomes necessary, to develop on Green Belt, the Core Strategy should include a clear statement of reserve areas of current Green Belt that could be utilised in such an event ? a statement

of the criteria for selection is not sufficient? In particular, it should be made clear that the area between Banstead village, Burgh Heath/A217 and Kingswood, generally referred to as the Banstead Estate, will not be utilised for any form of development. **If it becomes essential to identify an area for development, first consideration should be given to the UOL at the foot of Bolters Lane. All other Green Belt areas in Banstead Village Ward should be preserved from development at all costs.**

**(7) Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at question (5) above where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the Core Strategy legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.**

Policy CS4 requires the insertion of a Schedule of areas to be designated as 'Reserve Areas' for development in the event that utilisation of some Green Belt becomes inevitable.

**(8) If your representation is seeking a change to the Core Strategy: Proposed Submission Document, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?** Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

*Please note: The Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.*

**(9) If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:**

In the current absence of defined reserve areas for the possible extension of development into current Green Belt areas, it is a complex matter to define possible wording for the Core Strategy and only a verbal submission to any hearing would suffice.