

# Planning Committee

05 January 2024

Agenda item number 11

## Consultation responses

Report by Planning Policy Officer

---

### Summary

This report informs the Committee of the officer's proposed response to planning policy consultations received recently and invites members' comments and guidance.

### Recommendation

To note the report and endorse the nature of the proposed response.

---

## 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 comments, guidance and endorsement are invited.

Author: Natalie Beal

Date of report: 12 December 2023

Appendix 1 – East Suffolk Council draft Healthy Environments SPD

Appendix 2 – East Suffolk Council draft Rural Environments SPD

# Appendix 1 – Planning Policy consultations received

East Suffolk Council

Document: [Draft Healthy Environments Supplementary Planning Document](#)

Due date: 10 January 2024

Status: Draft

Proposed level: Planning Committee endorsed

## Notes

The SPD says that:

The guidance in this document promotes approaches to development that:

- respond effectively to identified health and wellbeing challenges in the locality of the development;
- improve the availability, access to, and quality of the essential elements necessary for building and maintaining healthy lifestyles for people of all ages, levels of ability, and for those with additional barriers to engagement, such as those on lower incomes;
- incentivise healthier choices and lifestyles (and disincentivise the reverse) by making the healthier choice the easiest (or at least an easy) choice, and where relevant, the least healthy choice the least (or at least less) convenient;
- reduce the experience of deprivation and inequality in the built environment through raising awareness of some of the barriers to engagement and additional need of some groups and addressing them through appropriate design and adequate infrastructure provision to ensure inclusion, and;
- adequately reduce the potential for exposure to sources of environmental harm (e.g. noise pollution) by providing neighbourhoods of high environmental quality.

## Proposed response

### Summary of response

The SPD is supported. The Authority will need to endorse this as it includes standards for open space and play and we defer to/have regard to the open space policies of our Districts. The proposed comments relate to light pollution, water stress and all types of alternative forms of transport.

### Detailed comments

Para 1.2 – suggest you change this wording like you did for the affordable housing SPD as we have regard to/defer to the policies of our districts relating to open space and play and this document includes standards to do with open space. Therefore, we should endorse it. So, this needs changing. We endorsed the GYBC open space SPD FYI.

Where you refer to artificial sports pitches, have you considered the issue that some astro turfs need water – they are water based? The issue being that the East is an area of water stress and therefore should water based astro turfs be put in place when there are adequate alternatives that do not use water? The SPD might want to refer to this issue. There may be alternatives that collect rain water and use it, but water use of such facilities needs considering.

Open space section – might want to say that the BA will have regard to these standards as well.

The issue of water smart landscaping might need considering – planting that may not need as much watering as the East is an area of water stress.

Should the SPD talk about cycle parking and push scooter parking provision? That is how many access parks and open space and play areas.

Should the SPD talk about lighting of open space and to be justified and only on when needed and well designed?

Allotments section page 45 – along the water stress theme, perhaps the SPD may need to mention the harvesting of rain water by use of water butts will be expected or required?

2.135 and 3.42 – along Marriott's way in Norwich near Halfords and also in Pointer's Fields Park in Norwich, there are lights that are triggered by movement – they come on when someone is near to them and then go off. That kind of design would be beneficial.

Active travel section – would benefit from talking about push scooting and wheeling.

Active travel section – would benefit from a section of scooter parking provision, similar to cycle parking.

# Appendix 2 – Planning Policy consultations received

## East Suffolk Council

Document: [Draft Rural Development Supplementary Planning Document](#)

Due date: 10 January 2024

Status: Draft

Proposed level: Planning Committee endorsed

### Notes

The SPD says:

The information and guidance contained in this Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) will assist in the implementation of planning policies in the Local Plans for East Suffolk regarding development in rural areas. This SPD covers a broad range of rural issues and topics including guidance on barn conversions, rural worker dwellings, farm diversification, rural annexes, economic development, equestrian development and more.

### Proposed response

#### Summary of response

The SPD is supported but there needs to be much greater mention of the Broads and its setting as these types of development in these areas have the potential to impact the setting.

#### Detailed comments

Para 1.2 – please mention the Broads. I know you don't plan in our area, but the Broads is one of your beautiful landscapes and needs to be mentioned.

The landscape impact of schemes in rural areas does not really feature as much as it should. In particular, the impact on the Broads and its setting is a key consideration for development proposals in parts of East Suffolk. Reference needs improving on this.

6.23 - 6.25 Have you thought of biodiversity enhancements featuring in the SPD? I know BNG is coming, but not all development will need to provide BNG. So, for those that do not need to do BNG, enhancements to benefit biodiversity should be included.

6.16, 6.29, 6.30 and 6.31 – Lighting should be thoroughly justified. The text does not say that. It automatically moves to allowing it.

6.32 – Reducing impact from noise is particularly important where economic development takes place with the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty **or near to the Broads**. Although this is chiefly an issue for tourism uses there are also employment uses in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) **and near the Broads**.

6.35 – . New economic developments should be located so as to minimise impact on the AONB, Heritage Coast and built and historic environment **and not impact the Broads**.

6.40 – design the location of junctions so hedgerows don't need to be removed and replanted?

6.69 – title needs to say Note AONB and heritage coast **and the Broads.**

6.69 – needs to include the impact on the Broads in this section. Landscape impact is particularly important within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Heritage Coast **and the setting of the Broads.**

6.70 – the title for this is included in 6.69 and therefore needs formatting – it is 'setting of heritage assets' but that is the last few words of 6.69.

6.79 – This is particularly important where a car park is in the setting of a listed building, a conservation area or a protected landscape, such as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or Heritage Coast **or the setting of the Broads.**

6.82 This is particularly important in a designated landscape such as the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and conservation areas **and the setting of the Broads.**

6.124 Diversification schemes involving new buildings should also not impact upon the surrounding landscape, especially where a development is located in the Coasts and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty **or in the setting of the Broads.**

After 9.83 say something about the impact on the setting of the Broads from turbines and refer to our Landscape Character Assessment.