

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: 22 November 2013

Appendices: APPENDIX 1 – Schedule of Planning Policy Consultations received

APPENDIX 1

Planning Policy Consultations Received

ORGANISATION:	South Norfolk District Council
DOCUMENT:	Development Management Policies
LINK	http://www.south-norfolk.gov.uk/planning/5165.asp
RECEIVED:	1 November 2013
DUE DATE:	13 December 2013
STATUS:	Regulation 19 – pre submission consultation.
PROPOSED LEVEL:	Planning Committee endorsed.
NOTES:	<p>The purpose of the Development Management Policies Document is to make clear what the Council expects of all new developments and set the policy framework that the Council will use to promote sustainable development and decide planning applications in the future. These Policies will replace the remaining 'saved' policies of the South Norfolk Local Plan (2003) and sit alongside the Joint Core Strategy (which applies in Norwich, Broadland and South Norfolk Councils), national planning policies (as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework) and other planning documents when adopted in South Norfolk (including the Wymondham Area Action Plan, Long Stratton Area Action Plan, Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document and the Cringleford Neighbourhood Plan).</p> <p>Following consultations on the Issues and Options in Spring 2012 and the Preferred Options in Spring 2013, the Council has taken into account the comments made and are now publishing the Pre-Submission document.</p>
PROPOSED RESPONSE:	<p><u>Development Management DPD</u></p> <p>Draft comments on the SNDC Development Management DPD were discussed with SNDC Officers and are summarised below.</p> <p>Concern was expressed regarding policies DM2.3 (Working at Home), DM3.6 (Replacement dwellings and additional dwellings on sub-divided plots within development boundaries) and DM3.8 (Residential Annexes) as they seem to allow development on gardens. This was a concern to the BA because of the potential impact on the landscape of the Broads from changes to the edge of settlements. SNDC officers explained that there is a history of these kinds of applications and these policies give a policy context to determine applications within. Officers also emphasised that JCS Policy 2 will be of great relevance and used to determine planning applications. On how these policies would work in practice, SNDC Officers explained that any development is expected to be 'modest' and the policies require that development sits well in relation to the existing development. SNDC Officers also pointed out that DM3.6 refers to '...maintains or enhances the character and appearance of... surroundings' which</p>

	<p>will cover impact on the Broads.</p> <p>Concern was expressed about DM3.4 where there are two levels of criteria – ‘key considerations’ and ‘requirements’. Criteria b) and d) of the key considerations are of importance to the Broads. SNDC Officers said that if there was a 5 year supply of Gypsy and Traveller Sites (as required by the NPPF) then all the criteria will have equal weighting, but if there was not a 5 year supply then SNDC will need to be less restrictive on criteria (namely the key considerations criteria). SNDC Officers believe that the need for being less restrictive will not occur. This is explained in section 3.34.</p> <p>Policy DM2.8 relates to expanding residential curtilage onto agricultural land. The BA concern was that this policy combined with policies DM 2.3, 3.6 and 3.8 could have impacts on the Broads. SNDC officers explained that there is a history of these kinds of applications and these policies give a policy context to determine applications within. Furthermore SNDC remove Permitted Development Rights from such developments to restrict what can be done outside the normal planning application process.</p> <p>It was explained to SNDC Officers that ‘significant adverse impact’ is a term that is common throughout the document, but different scale impacts can harm the Broads. SNDC Officers explained that using the term ‘significant’ weeds out any minor impacts. All development is likely to have some kind of impact on something/someone, so the use of the term ‘significant’ is a pragmatic approach. SNDC Officers also emphasised that all relevant policies will be used to determine applications.</p> <p>The issues of some language being firmer and stronger towards the end of the document when compared to language covering the same issues in early parts of the document and the potential lack of consistent message was also raised. SNDC Officers explained that all relevant policies will be used to determine planning applications so if language is stronger in the environmental policies when compared to economic policies, the environmental policies are there to be used as well.</p> <p>➤ Main Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy DM2.3 – bullet a) could mention landscape impacts and the supporting text could mention the Broads to expand on ‘...or on the character and appearance of the area...’. • Policy DM3.6 – could supporting text include reference to the impact on the Broads to explain bullet a) where it refers to ‘surroundings’? • Policy DM3.8 – request that there is reference to landscape impacts in the policy and reference to the Broads in the supporting text. • Section 3.34 could usefully clarify that if there is a demonstrated 5 year land supply, the criteria under ‘key considerations’ of the policy will need to be met as well as the criteria under ‘requirements’. • Section 4.2 - Renewable energy generation, especially wind power, in the South Norfolk planning area has the potential to impact upon the landscape and other important characteristics of the Broads designated area. This should be highlighted in any policy on the matter. We would like to emphasise the issue of the impacts on landscape (and consequently tourism
--	---

	<p>and biodiversity) of the transformer stations and underground and over ground cables on the Broads. The Broads is an area renowned for its important landscape, biodiversity as well as for tourism and navigation. Inappropriate siting of supporting infrastructure could harm these special qualities of the Broads. The 'Broads Landscape Character Appraisal' and the 'Broads Landscape Capacity Study for Turbine, PV Arrays and Associated Infrastructure Requirements for Renewable Energy Production' may be of future use in assessing any such proposals having inter-visibility with the Broads designated area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does policy DM4.6 relate to the Broads? Specifically 'Development proposals that would cause serious adverse impact on the distinctive landscape characteristics of an area will be refused'? Development can have a range of impacts on the Broads which may be unacceptable. Reference to the Broads Landscape Character assessment could be of use. <p>There are also a number of more minor and factual comments which are not included in this report which it is proposed to send to SNDC.</p>
ORGANISATION:	South Norfolk District Council
DOCUMENT:	Sites Specifics Allocations and Policies Document
LINK	http://www.south-norfolk.gov.uk/planning/4620.asp
RECEIVED:	1 November 2013
DUE DATE:	13 December 2013
STATUS:	Regulation 19 – pre submission consultation.
PROPOSED LEVEL:	Planning Committee endorsed.
NOTES:	Consultations have taken place since 2010 on the sites proposed by landowners and developers and, having taken account of over 13,000 comments, the Council is now publishing its proposed Pre-Submission Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document.
PROPOSED RESPONSE:	<p>In general, the DPD is logically laid out and well-presented. It is very neat and user friendly.</p> <p>Draft comments on the SNDC Development Management DPD were discussed with SNDC Officers and are summarised below.</p> <p>On some occasions, the land allocated seems excessive compared to the numbers of dwellings allocated. For example Gillingham is 1Ha for 10 dwellings and Broome Heath is 0.45Ha for 5 dwellings. SNDC Officers explained that the actual development that is expected is along the frontage only rather than another 'estate' type development. It is for the applicant to show that the design and density is acceptable. But conversely this does allow some flexibility on numbers of dwellings delivered over the plan period whereby more dwellings could come forward than originally allocated.</p>

	<p>The Sites DPD on some occasions throughout the document states that a particular settlement has few facilities, but is still allocated a development boundary (Haddiscoe, Claxton, Aldeby for example). This is of relevance to the Broads as this is different to our approach (for the part of the settlement in the Broads) as well as linking back to the Development Management Policies DPD that allow gardens to be developed. SNDC Officers explained that this reflects the fact that the JCS Policy 16 says that those settlements will have a development boundary (and the Sites DPD needs to be in conformity with the JCS).</p> <p>➤ <u>Main comments</u></p> <p><u>Broome</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We note there is no mention in the form and character section of the County Wildlife Site (CWS) and Local Nature Reserve (LNR). • Main concern with BRO2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concerned that 0.45ha of the CWS and LNR is allocated for only 5 dwellings. Query why such a large area for 5 dwellings? A smaller site could still deliver the dwellings but develop less of the CWS and LNR which could then be brought into a condition more favourable for biodiversity. ○ Previously represented that ‘Semi-natural habitat including the mature trees (particularly those to the East of the proposed site) should be retained on site, and therefore access should be carefully considered’ yet this is not a criteria in the policy with no explanation as to why not. SNDC Officers suggested that as part of the mitigation measures required in the policy and also resulting from survey work undertaken to support an application, existing vegetation could be enhanced or retained, but the BA suggest that mature native trees should be retained as part of any development where it is possible to do so. As well as being an important food and nesting resource for birds and insects, tree belts are regularly used as commuting routes by bats allowing them to move between different roosts and feeding sites. The Broads has equivalent status to a national park with high quality habitats for a wide range of wildlife. Tree lines linking to the Broads area are particularly important allowing the movement of species such as bats between the Broads and semi-natural habitats in the wider area. <p>There are also a number of more minor and factual comments which are not included in this report which it is proposed to send to SNDC.</p>
--	--