

Consultation Documents Update and Proposed Responses
Report by Planning Policy Officer

Summary:	This report informs the Committee of the officers' proposed response to planning policy consultations recently received, and invites any comments or guidance the Committee may have.
Recommendation:	That the report be noted and the nature of proposed response be endorsed.

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Appendix 1 shows selected planning policy consultation documents received by the Authority since the last Planning Committee meeting, together with the officer's proposed response.
- 1.2 The Committee's endorsement, comments or guidance are invited.

2 Financial Implications

- 2.1 There are no financial implications.

Background papers: None

Author: Natalie Beal
Date of report: 9 May 2014

Appendices: APPENDIX 1 – Schedule of Planning Policy Consultations received

Planning Policy Consultations Received

ORGANISATION:	Broadland District Council
DOCUMENT:	Development Management Policies
LINK	http://www.broadland.gov.uk/PDF/3_Development_Management_DPD_Proposed_Submission.pdf
RECEIVED:	14 April 2014
DUE DATE:	30 May 2014
STATUS:	Regulation 19 – pre submission consultation.
PROPOSED LEVEL:	Planning Committee endorsed.
NOTES:	<p>The Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD) is a Local Plan in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)(England) Regulations 2012 (section 6). It forms part of the Broadland Development Plan. It sets out generic policies that are to be applied throughout the Broadland planning authority area (i.e. Broadland District excluding the Broads Authority Executive Area). It is in conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk adopted in March 2011 with amendments adopted in January 2014. It should be read in conjunction with these and other Development Plan Documents that make up the Broadland Development Plan. Together these documents make up an overarching plan for the future development of the area which forms the basis for decision-taking.</p> <p>The anticipated timetable following the Proposed Submission publication is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed Submission – period for representations on soundness 14 April to 30 May 2014 • Submission to Secretary of State – August 2014 • Examination in Public – December 2014 • Adoption – March 2015
PROPOSED RESPONSE:	<p><u>Development Management DPD</u></p> <p>The following comments are more significant comments. Whilst we are not saying the document is fundamentally unsound, the comments raised are of great importance to the Broads and its setting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The second sentence of 2.15 seems to belong in policy GC3 as these seem to be further criteria to consider when converting buildings outside of settlement limits. Indeed these criteria are of particular importance to the Broads which is an area renowned for its landscape with a status equivalent to a National Park. As an aside, a site may be in walking distance (2.17), but there could not be pedestrian provision. How does pedestrian provision relate to the distance from the settlement limit?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GC5 and 2.29. Renewable Energy and its transmission infrastructure can have a landscape impact. A reference to the Broads and the Landscape Character Assessment of the Broads seems relevant here (http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/planning/landscape-character-assessment.html) as well as the Broads Landscape Sensitivity Study for Renewables and Infrastructure (http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/planning/landscape-character-assessment/landscape-studies/landscape-sensitivity-study-for-renewables-infrastructure.html). The Broads has equivalent status to a National Park and is a nationally designated area. <p>The following comments are not soundness objections, but could usefully be taken on board in the final document to aid clarity and linkages to the Broads.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The introduction to the document could usefully state that these policies do not apply to the area of Broadland District that is within the Broads. This was requested in 2011. Further to this, it would be useful if the Policies Maps would show the area of the Broads. • GC2 is confusing. It is not clear what the term ‘Development Plan’ refers to. The order of wording seems to also not add to the clarity and intent of the policy as the thrust of section 2.14 is not obvious in the policy. • Environment section. As stated in our response in 2011, this section should mention areas outside of the plan area but potentially affected by development within it. • EN1. Reference to the Broads Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) and BAP Framework (http://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/managing/broads-biodiversity-action-plan.html) seems appropriate. • We previously commented on the importance of water quality and impact on the Broads, yet this is not mentioned in the document (although water resource is). The Broads are susceptible to potential adverse impacts from run-off from development for example. Policy EN4 refers to pollution, but is quite generic and non-specific in relation to water and the Broads are not mentioned in this section. Is the Council relying on Policy 3 of the Joint Core Strategy? This issue was raised in 2011. • Policy EN3 seems to be of great importance to the Broads and its wildlife. A reference to the Broads seems appropriate here. • 3.22 – the Broads Authority will be interested in this SPD. • H3 – the equivalent Broads Authority policy refers to replacements on a one for one basis. Perhaps Broadland might wish to consider this addition. • H4 – third criterion. Is this <i>public</i> benefits? If so, this could usefully be
--	---

	<p>included. In 4.24, is traffic and access another consideration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H5 – it is not clear if residential institutions outside of settlement limits have three criteria to meet (i.e. the two relating to inside settlement limits as well as the one relating to outside settlement limits) or just one (the one in the paragraph that relates to outside of settlement limits). The 'in addition to the above' does not seem to act as an obvious linkage. • 5.7 – as mentioned in our response in 2011, the Authority would wish to see reference to the importance of the Broads and the potential for supportive or complementary provision and use across the Broads boundary.
ORGANISATION:	Broadland
DOCUMENT:	Sites Specifics Allocations and Policies Document
LINK	http://www.broadland.gov.uk/PDF/3_Site_Allocations_DPD_Proposed_Submission.pdf http://broadland-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/sadpd/
RECEIVED:	14 April 2014
DUE DATE:	30 May 2014
STATUS:	Regulation 19 – pre submission consultation.
PROPOSED LEVEL:	Planning Committee endorsed.
NOTES:	<p>The Site Allocations (DPD) identifies or allocates areas of land for specific types of development such as housing, employment, community facilities, etc. The scale of development reflects the requirements set out in the JCS. It also includes the definition of development boundaries or "settlement limits" for those places where some growth may take place. It excludes the area proposed for major growth known as the Old Catton, Sprowston, Rackheath and Thorpe St Andrew Growth Triangle which will be subject to a separate planning document, and also does not include the Broads Area.</p> <p>The anticipated timetable following the Proposed Submission publication is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed Submission – period for representations on soundness 14 April to 30 May 2014 • Submission to Secretary of State – August 2014 • Examination in Public – December 2014 • Adoption – March 2015
PROPOSED RESPONSE:	BDC have taken on board some of the comments the Broads Authority raised in response to the Preferred Options consultation. The rest were discussed with a BDC officer who pointed out some other changes that tackled the initial comment as well as explained reasoning for not taking on board some comments. This is reasonable.

	<p>PS13-02: The Witton run is an existing corridor for wildlife (nesting birds etc) and increased access for people and their dogs should be planned on the upland edge away from the river in the green buffer and require fencing to protect the river corridor wildlife and undisturbed views for users. This does not seem to be addressed in the document.</p>
--	---