

Woughton NDP
Proposed Revised/Updated sections WNP6 Local Green Space
Changes in blue

Context

This note sets out the suggested updates to the original report. For convenience, I have cut/pasted the original text and added new text in blue

Suggested updates

- 7.27 I saw many of the LGS as part of my visit to the Plan area. I saw that, in their different ways, that they sat at the heart of the communities that they served within their Grid Squares. The Eaglestone Local Park and the Alphabet Park are good examples of LGS fulfilling this function. All of the proposed LGS with the exception of the Grand Union Canal Corridor LGS comfortably meet the three criteria set out in the NPPF and therefore meet the basic conditions.
- 7.28 At 15.78 ha the proposed Grand Union Canal Corridor LGS is significantly bigger than the other identified LGSs. In addition, it is well beyond the size of a LGS anticipated to be 'local in character and not an extensive tract of land'. (Replace the final three sentences of 7.28 to 7.XX below).
- 7.XX The representation submitted by the Canal and River Trust provides detailed commentary on the proposed designation of the Grand Union Canal Corridor LGS. It helpfully describes its charitable role and functions. It also advises that it has permitted development rights which would remain unaffected by the proposed designation.
- 7.XX The Trust sets out its concerns about the implications of LGs designation. In particular it argues that the application of 'Green Belt policies within these areas may restrict the ability of the Canal & River Trust and other landowners to provide facilities on the off-side of the canal that support active and thriving waterways'. It suggests that examples would be for outdoor sports and recreation facilities (where these in some way impinge on openness) or facilities associated with moorings.
- 7.XX The Trust's specific reservation about the designation reflect its clearly-defined responsibilities and the distinctive nature of the proposed LGS. The Community Council and the Trust are in agreement about the role of the canal in visual terms and the footpath in access and recreational terms. There is a common desire to protect this valuable asset. The Trust's concern is in relation to possible unintended consequences of the policy. I recommend modification to the supporting text to address this important matter.
- 7.XX [Repositioned text] Nevertheless, I am content that the designation of the Grand Union Corridor (LGS-k) meets the basic conditions in terms of how it is defined in the Plan. It represents key elements of the eastern boundary of the Plan area and acts as an important visual and recreational facility within the wider area. Furthermore,

whilst the Plan describes it as a single LGS it is in effect a series of separate LGSs each within its own separate context and environment.

In 3.22 final sentence delete 'on'

Insert the following additional supporting text at the end of paragraph 3.22:

'The designation of sections of the Grand Union Canal as local green space reflect its very distinctive nature within the environment of the Plan area. It is a significant part of its built heritage. The canal and its footpaths offer extensive opportunity for recreation and accessibility both to local residents and to visitors in canal and house boats. The designation of the area as LGS is not intended to hinder the normal operational requirements of the Canal and Rivers Trust in general, and the provision of mooring facilities, recreation facilities and general maintenance work in particular.

Other Changes

Change 4.9 to 4.10

Insert a new 4.9 to read:

'In September 2017 MKC asked me to consider an additional representation to the Plan from the Canal and Rivers Trust. For administrative and technical reasons, it had not been provided to me as part of the main examination process. I have considered the representation and amended the report accordingly. The changes are addressed in paragraphs [list] of this updated report. In particular I have recommended a modification to the text of paragraph 3.22 which was not included in the initial report'.

Andrew Ashcroft
11 September 2017