

Chapter 9. Gillingham Southern Extension

Paragraph 9.7

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

The reference to the Gillingham Neighbourhood Plan is welcomed, however paragraph 9.7 would benefit from further clarification of the different roles and remits of the Local Plan and the neighbourhood plan in respect to the Gillingham Strategic Site Allocation. In particular this should confirm the primacy of the Local Plan policies relating to the Strategic Site Allocation over any neighbourhood plan for the wider area.

Changes required:

Add the following text to paragraph 9.7:

The Gillingham Strategic Site Allocation is of critical importance to the delivery of the vision and objectives of the Local Plan. The requirements for the development of the site are set out in the strategic policies of the Local Plan, which has primacy over any neighbourhood plan for the wider area.

Paragraph 9.8

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

Paragraph 9.8 should clarify that the Town Design Statement is a document adopted by NDDC as an evidence base study, not as part of the development plan.

Changes required:

Amend the final sentence of paragraph 9.8 as follows:

The TDS is not a development for the purposes of decision making, but has been used to inform the proposals for the southern extension ...

Paragraph 9.9

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

The allocation is primarily for the delivery of new housing as part of a mixed use development. The residential led nature of the allocation should be emphasised.

Changes required:

Amend the first of paragraph 9.9 as follows:

The southern extension of Gillingham will take the form of a sustainable residential led mixed-use development ...

Paragraph 9.11

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

As set out elsewhere in our representations, the requirement to include the new school in the local centre has not been justified. This paragraph should be re-worded in order to retain flexibility over school provision. It should also be clarified that health facilities are to be provided to meet the needs of the additional population on an objectively assessed basis.

Changes required:

Amend final sentence of paragraph 9.11 as follows:

...and Shaftesbury Road (B3081), additional primary school provision and a local centre including small local convenience shops, health facilities, ~~a primary school~~, a community hall and other facilities and services adequate to meet the needs of the SSA population.

Paragraph 9.19

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

As set out in our comments on Policy 21, the 'brief' for a Master Plan Framework should be provided in the supporting text or as a separate document. The policy should focus on the strategic requirements for the site allocation and form the basis for decision making on subsequent planning applications. The Master Plan Framework will provide additional information to support decision making.

Changes required:

Amend the first sentence of paragraph 9.19 as follows:

The Council expects Policy 21, supported by the Master plan Framework, to provide

Amend the second sentence of paragraph 9.19 as follows:

The Master Plan Framework should respond positively to the 'brief' set out by the Council

Paragraph 9.20

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

Paragraph 9.20 states that the Council will expect the Master Plan Framework to be subject to a Habitats Regulations Assessment. This is considered unnecessary; the Local Plan policies allocate the site for development and are therefore the appropriate level at which HRA should be undertaken. The Habitats Regulations Assessment of the North Dorset Local Plan (Part 1) does not provide adequate explanation of the likely significant effects associated with Policy 21 to justify HRA for the Master Plan Framework. The Master Plan Framework does not form part of the development plan. Subsequent planning applications will be screened for HRA and this would be the appropriate stage at which the requirement for any further HRA should be considered.

It is considered unduly onerous to require the Master Plan Framework to include separate plans for climate change, sustainable transport, and green infrastructure.

Changes required:

Amend paragraph 9.20 as follows:

The Council will expect the Master Plan Framework to ~~be subject to a Habitats Regulations Assessment and to identify how it expects strategic Local Plan policy is to be met in respect of:~~ include, as a minimum, the following components: ...

- *A climate change plan...*

- *A sustainable transport plan*
- *A green infrastructure plan*

Paragraph 9.21

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

Paragraph 9.21 is considered unnecessary and inflexible. The SSA covers a large area, and whilst the consortium are working together to prepare a Master Plan Framework, there may be circumstances under which planning applications for developments within the SSA come forward in advance of the completion of the Master Plan Framework. The process of agreement of the Masterplan Framework with the Council is also unclear.

Changes required:

Delete paragraph 9.21

Paragraph 9.22

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

As set out in our comments on Policy 21, the 'brief' for a masterplan should be provided in the supporting text or as a separate document. The policy should focus on the strategic requirements for the site allocation.

Changes required:

Amend the first sentence of paragraph 9.22 as follows:

.... developers are best placed to respond to the 'brief' set out by the Council.

Paragraph 9.23

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

Paragraph 9.23 states that the Council will look to secure financial contributions through its charging schedule proposed for the purposes of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). It is essential for the relationship between section 106 agreements and Community Infrastructure Levy to be co-ordinated and clearly set out in the Local Plan and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan. We note that work on CIL is currently in abeyance and there is currently no clear indication of proposed rates or prioritisation for spending.

Given the substantial infrastructure requirements for the Gillingham Strategic Site Allocation that are set out in the Local Plan, and without the necessary evidence base to demonstrate how the infrastructure requirements for the Gillingham Strategic Site Allocation will be delivered through CIL, we consider that the most appropriate mechanism for securing infrastructure delivery for the SSA is through section 106 agreements. Consideration should therefore be given to setting the CIL charge rate for the SSA to zero.

Changes required:

Delete paragraph 9.23 and replace with the following:

Infrastructure delivery and financial contributions related to the Gillingham Strategic Site Allocation will be provided through section 106 agreements.

Paragraph 9.29 and Figures 9.2 and 9.3 – Concept Statement for Gillingham Southern Extension

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

The 'Concept Statement' (CS) duplicates many of the requirements of other policies of the plan, including:

- General design quality (Policy 24)
- Climate change and sustainable construction (Policy 3)
- Housing mix and standards (Policy 7)
- Infrastructure Delivery (Policies 13, 14 and 15)

Changes required:

The 'Concept Statement' should be simplified to refer only to site-specific issues.

There is no evidence to justify the suggestion in Figure 9.3 and the legend that Cole Street Lane should become a green route.

Flexibility should be maintained to allow changes through the Master Plan Framework and subsequent planning applications where justified.

Paragraph 9.33 and Figure 9.4 – Design Principles for Gillingham Southern Extension

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

The 'Design Principles' largely duplicate the Design Principles set out at Policy 24 (pp 18-25). If Policy 24 is retained in its current form, the design and layout of the SSA could adequately be considered against Policy 24.

Changes required:

The design principles should be simplified to refer only to site-specific issues, with reference back to Policy 24 for generic design principles.

Paragraphs 9.36 and 9.37 Climate Change

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

These requirements in relation to climate change are duplicated elsewhere in policy (Policy 3, 24) and in the Concept Statement and Design Principles.

Changes required:

Delete paragraphs 9.37 and 9.38 to avoid unnecessary duplication.

Paragraph 9.39

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

The requirement to consider a district heating system is not based on any evidence.

Changes required:

Delete paragraph 9.39

Paragraphs 9.41 and 9.42

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

These requirements in relation to flood risk are set out in Policy 3.

Changes required:

Delete paragraphs 9.41 and 9.42 to avoid unnecessary duplication.

Paragraph 9.43

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

These requirements are covered in Policy 4.

Changes required:

Delete paragraphs 9.43 to avoid unnecessary duplication.

Paragraph 9.44

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

Paragraph 9.44 repeats the information provided at paragraph 9.32 on design principles.

Changes required:

Delete paragraph 9.44 to avoid unnecessary duplication.

Paragraph 9.51

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

The second sentence of 9.51 is covered in Policy 8.

Changes required:

Delete the second sentence of paragraph 9.51 to avoid unnecessary duplication.

Paragraph 9.57

Object: this paragraph is not justified

The evidence base does not require additional employment land.

change required:

Delete final sentence of paragraph 9.57 or require the developer to justify alternative development proposals.

Paragraph 9.59:

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

Requirements to demonstrate how off-site proposals can be secured, improved and funded are to detailed for a masterplan.

Change required:

Delete the third sentence of paragraph 9.59

Paragraph 9.60:

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

We do not consider that it is appropriate or justified to require the principal street to be the main access serving Brickfields Business Park. The principal street can provide an alternative route (particularly for journeys to the south) but it should not be designed to serve as the main access road to the employment area and vehicles accessing Brickfields Business Park from the north (which is the significant majority of movements) should continue to use the New Road / Shaftesbury Road junction.

Change required:

The principal street should be designed primarily to provide the main means of vehicular access to the land south of Ham. It should also provide an alternative link to the employment areas on New Road, with vehicular access to the extended employment area to/from north to continue to be via an improved New Road / Shaftesbury Road junction in order to minimise overall vehicle kilometres and to minimise the impact on future residents within the Ham Farm parcel and on existing residents along Shaftesbury Road

Paragraphs 9.61 and 9.64

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

The design principles referred to in paragraphs 9.61 and 9.64 are covered elsewhere.

Changes required:

Delete paragraphs 9.61 and 9.64 to avoid unnecessary duplication.

Paragraphs 9.63, 9.69, and 9.70

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

There is no evidence to support the requirement that access to Cole Street Lane should be restricted and that it should become a green lane.

Changes required:

Justification should be provided or these references should be deleted.

Paragraph 9.68

Object: this paragraph is not justified

Pedestrian and cycle routes crossing the river will depend on engineering and other technical considerations.

Change required:

Add "...subject to engineering and other technical considerations." to para 9.68

Paragraph 9.72

Object: this paragraph is not justified

The requirement for contributions to the enhancement of Gillingham railway station are not adequately justified. It is unclear whether there are any Network Rail proposals and additional funding in place for this, and delivery mechanisms are not set out. There is no requirement in Policy 17 for a contribution to these improvements, so it should not be included in the supporting text. There is a risk that an absolute requirement to deliver these improvements will undermine the viability of other strategic infrastructure to the detriment of the SSA.

Changes required:

Delete the first sentence of paragraph 9.72.

Paragraph 9.73

Object: this paragraph is not justified

The contribution towards the Enmore Green Link Road should be proportionate to the impact of the SSA, this would have to be ascertained through modelling so that any contribution is reasonably related in scale to the impact of the development

Changes required:

Amend last sentence of 9.74 as follows:

Developers of the southern extension will be expected to contribute towards the provision of the link road at Enmore Green. The level of the contribution would be reasonably related to the impact of the development upon this junction as determined by modelling.

Paragraph 9.74

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

The requirements for grey infrastructure provision are covered in Policy 13.

Changes required:

Delete paragraph 9.74 to avoid unnecessary duplication.

Paragraph 9.76

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

The justification for the requirements listed in paragraph 9.76 is unclear. Flexibility the scale and location of health, education and community hall provision set out in the first three bullet points should be retained. It is unclear how the floor areas in the fourth bullet point have been arrived at, there does not appear to have been an assessment included of retail needs in the SSA, this would be best dealt with as a masterplanning consideration.

Changes required:

Add the following text to the first bullet of paragraph 9.76 as follows:

..... may be included in the local centre, although the location will be confirmed through the Master Plan Framework.

Replace the second bullet of paragraph 9.76 as follows:

new health facilities to a nature and scale be agreed subject to further assessment of the likely needs generated by the development. These may include new health facilities including a doctor's surgery, dentist and pharmacy

Replace the fourth bullet point as follows:

small local convenience shops to meet the day-to-day needs of residents

Paragraph 9.80

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

The justification and evidence for the contributions listed in paragraph 9.80 is unclear. For example, the need for contributions towards 'improvement of expansion of the existing facilities at RiversMeet [sport centre] and the provision of a new community centre' is sought because it is 'unlikely' to meet the needs of the growing community. It is not clear on what objective basis this has been concluded. The 'most appropriate' solution may in fact be on-site / alternative provision.

Similarly, the need to extend the fire station does not appear to result from an objective assessment of capacity

Changes required:

Amend paragraph 9.80 to:

Following further assessment, these might include: the further...

Paragraphs 9.83 to 9.86 and 9.88 (5-metre greenway requirement)

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

The justification and evidence for the areas referred to in paragraphs 9.83 to 9.86 is unclear.

Changes required:

Further justification and evidence in support of these requirement should be provided.

Figure 9.5 and Proposals Map for Gillingham Southern Extension

Object: not justified or effective

The areas identified for housing growth in figure 9.5 and the Gillingham Southern Extension Proposals Map are supported, however In order to provide greater flexibility in relation to the location of the proposed Local Centre, the Shaftesbury Road corridor should be extended to include the Orchard Park Garden Centre. This would allow established and allocated employment areas to remain, as proposed elsewhere in the Local Plan.

Changes required:

Extend Shaftesbury Road Corridor (Local Centre) to include the Orchard Park Garden Centre.

Policy 21 - Gillingham Strategic Site Allocation

Object: this policy is not justified, effective, or consistent with national policy

The allocation of land to the south of Gillingham as shown on figure 9.5 for a sustainable urban extension comprising housing, employment provision, education facilities, a local centre and associated infrastructure is fully supported. The site is extremely well located with jobs, healthcare, education, open space, shops and facilities all available within walking and cycling distance. Good linkages to the built up area will ensure that the proposed development will be well connected to services and amenities in Gillingham and the surrounding area by sustainable modes of transport.

The majority of the land within the area proposed for the southern extension of Gillingham area is controlled by CG Fry & Son, Welbeck Land, Taylor Wimpey, and the landowners at Newhouse Farm, who are working together as a consortium to ensure a co-ordinated approach to the delivery of the Gillingham Strategic Site Allocation.

Significant progress is being made by the consortium to progress proposals for the site, and the consortium has been proactively engaged in emerging planning policy. A range of technical studies has been undertaken to confirm the suitability and delivery of the site and its associated infrastructure requirements, and work is underway to provide the Master Plan Framework sought by the Council to guide future planning applications.

In summary, the consortium considers that the proposed Gillingham Strategic Site Allocation represents a highly sustainable, well located and deliverable opportunity for a mixed use urban extension and its allocation is supported in principle as a logical site to select through the local plan process for the delivery of housing in a sustainable manner.

However, we have some concerns in relation to the detailed wording of Policy 21 and in order to be more effective and soundly justified the policy should be amended as detailed below. In line with our comments on the rest of the plan, there is scope to make the policy more precise by avoiding unnecessary duplication of matters covered elsewhere in the plan. Consideration should be given to including the Gillingham SSA policy and supporting text within the Gillingham section of Chapter 8 as this would help make the plan more coherent and avoid repetition.

Master Plan Framework

Policy 21 as currently worded is focused on providing a development brief for the Master Plan Framework, but the policy status of the Master Plan Framework and process of agreeing it with the Council is unclear.

The statement that the Council will not support proposals for development within the southern extension prior to the production of the Master Plan Framework is considered unnecessary and inflexible. The SSA covers a large area, and whilst the consortium are working together to prepare a Master Plan Framework, there may be circumstances under which planning applications for developments within the SSA come forward in advance of the completion of the Master Plan Framework.

Policy 21 would be more effective if it is re-worded to focus on the key requirements for the site allocation. Duplication of issues covered in other sections of the plan should be avoided, and the brief for the Master Plan Framework should be provided as part of the supporting text. An alternative policy wording for the Gillingham SSA has been proposed by the consortium and is set out below as an alternative option to re-wording Policy 21.

Climate Change

Criteria (c) largely repeats Policy 3. Criteria (d) and renewable and low carbon energy is also covered at Policy 22. The requirement to 'meet the requirements of the Government's Zero Carbon Buildings policy' is not specific and does not give certainty to the decision maker. The Government's policy on this matter is emerging and evolving and sets a future target date for zero-carbon building standards. It is unclear whether carbon neutrality would have to be achieved before then. In any case, the primary route for this will be through the building regulations. The Policy should not duplicate other legislation.

Criteria (d) is similarly unclear in terms of current and future requirements. Sustainable construction requirements should be clearly set out in Policy 3.

Criteria (f) repeats the requirements of requirement (g) of Policy 3.

Criteria (g) repeats the requirements of requirement (gg)

Environment

Criteria (i) repeats the requirements of Policy 4

Meeting Housing Needs

Criteria o requires a minimum of 35% affordable housing provision. This is covered in Policy 8 and should be reviewed on the basis of up an up to date assessment of the overall viability of the plan, with the affordable housing provision expressed as a target.

Criteria l indicates that 1,240 homes will be delivered in the plan period to 2026. It is important that that the policy also confirms that in the longer term the SSA will deliver at least 1,800 units.

Supporting Economic Development

As set out in our comments on the Proposals Map, the Shaftesbury Road corridor should be extended to include the Orchard Park Garden Centre as an alternative location for the local centre. This would allow existing employment land to be retained.

Grey Infrastructure

The justification for criteria w is unclear, as set out in our response to paragraph 9.72.

The justification for criteria x is unclear, as set out in our response to paragraph 9.73.

The justification for criteria u (closure of Cole Street Lane) is unclear, as set out in our response to figure 9.3

Criteria y duplicates the requirements of Policy 13

Social Infrastructure

Criteria z duplicates Policy 17 requirements. Also, flexibility regarding the location of school provision is required as set out in our comment in relation to paragraph 9.11.

The justification for criteria bb is unclear, as set out in our comments on paragraph 9.80.

Green Infrastructure

Criteria cc and dd are overly prescriptive and leave little flexibility for the Master Plan Framework

Criterion hh is considered unnecessary if the green infrastructure needs of the new population are to be provided on-site. There is no justification towards further off-site green infrastructure contributions.

Changes required:

Either amend Policy 21 as follows:

Delete the first, second and fourth paragraphs of the policy and insert the following text at the start of the third paragraph:

A Master Plan Framework will be prepared to support Policy 21 as the basis for determining future planning applications for development on the site.

Delete criteria a – g relating to climate change as these are unnecessary and covered in other sections of the plan.

Delete environment criterion i as this are unnecessary and covered in other sections of the plan.

Amend criteria l to recognise that delivery of the Strategic Site Allocation at Gillingham will continue beyond the plan period.

Review criteria o on the basis of up an up to date assessment of the overall viability of the plan, and express affordable housing provision as a target rather than a minimum.

Amend criteria r to provide for the retention of existing employment land, with the extension of the Shaftesbury Road corridor to include land at Orchard Park Garden Centre, allowing greater flexibility for the location of the local centre.

Delete criterion u (closure of Cole Street Lane)

Amend criterion w, 2nd sentence to: As necessary, such improvement may include...

Amend criterion x to : proportionate contributions towards the provision...

Delete criterion y

Criteria z to bb relating to social infrastructure are covered in other sections of the plan, and should be removed or amended as follows:

criterion aa: A new local centre to serve local needs, to include small shops, a community and health facilities as required to support the new population. New primary school provision will be provided within the SSA to serve identified needs.

criterion cc: Following an assessment of likely demand and impact, developers will be expected to make reasonable and proportionate contributions to the further improvement or expansion of the existing facilities at RiversMeet, the provision of a new community hall, Gillingham Town Library and Gillingham Fire Station

Amend criterion cc and dd to:

cc Public open space, including sports pitches, children's play spaces, allotments and community orchards.

dd Informal public open space primarily along the river corridor.

Delete criterion hh

Or replace policy 21 with the following Gillingham SSA policy as proposed by the south Gillingham consortium:

ALTERNATIVE POLICY 21: GILLINGHAM STRATEGIC SITE ALLOCATION

Land to the South of Gillingham, as defined on the Proposals Map as Site [****], is allocated for a sustainable urban extension comprising housing, employment provision, education facilities, a local service centre and associated infrastructure.

Proposals for development will be supported where they provide up to 1,800 net residential units, around [****]sq.m (net) B1, floorspace and primary school provision. A new local centre shall be provided within the broad area shown on the proposals map and may include a local convenience store, a doctors surgery, community facilities and other local services.

The urban extension will be brought forward in a series of phases progressing south and eastwards. A first phase of residential development will comprise up to 200 dwellings within the broad area shown on the proposals map. The next phases of development will be accompanied by highway junction improvements at the B3081 Shaftesbury Road/B3092 New Road junction. A new vehicular link connecting Shaftesbury Road and New Road will be completed as part of the final phase of development.

Employment provision will be in the form of an extension southwards on the Brickfields Business Park, the rate and phasing of employment development will reflect market conditions.

The development should include a range of densities, house types, styles and sizes across the site to achieve a comprehensive neighbourhood area, but achieve on average around [25] dwellings per hectare. The exact mix of dwelling types will be subject to discussion with the local planning authority on a phase by phase basis.

The proposals for new housing development will require, subject to viability, the provision of 35% affordable housing units on site. The affordable dwellings should provide for a mix of dwelling types in accordance with local housing needs.

Proposals for development shall have regard to the following principles in order to achieve a sustainable form of development:

- a) Highway improvements will be implemented as required to support the development, including improvements to the junction of Shaftesbury Road and New Road and the provision of a new vehicular link connecting Shaftesbury Road and New Road. The new vehicular link will be phased to progress in line with the residential development and will be connected as the scheme is completed.
- b) Education provision on site shall be located in an area which maximises access to new and existing properties in the vicinity, in consultation with the Local Education Authority;
- c) Employment provision shall be principally situated to the south of Brickfields Business Park in the area shown on the proposals map. The local centre may also contain some employment uses subject to addressing identified needs.
- d) Appropriate planting should be provided along Cole Street Lane to screen views into and out of the site and mitigate the visual impact of the development from the south.
- e) Those parts of the site identified to be at risk from flooding should be managed to maximise value for flood storage, improve the diversity and function of habitats and contribute to a net gain in biodiversity. Where possible, linear boundary features

including ditches and hedgerows should be protected, retained and enhanced through incorporation into the development.

- f) Create new pedestrian/cycle links to/from the town centre and residential areas including opportunities along the River Lodden.
- g) The development shall include public open space and formal and informal leisure and recreation provision that maximises opportunities for access to the River Lodden. It shall also provide children's equipped play areas to relevant standards. The development shall provide allotments and community orchards as part of the overall open space provision.
- h) Implementation of a Travel Plan.

Chapter 10. Development Management Policies

Policy 22 - Renewable and low carbon energy

Object: this policy is not justified or effective

Policy 22 could be improved by removing the text under the subheadings and including this information within the supporting text. Whilst this is useful information, it is unnecessary to include this information within the policy wording itself.

Changes required:

Remove the text under the subheadings Impacts, Mitigation and Benefits from Policy 22 and include it in the supporting text.

Paragraphs 10.53 and figure 10.1

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

The 'design principles' set out in figure 10.1 duplicate 'By Design'. It is considered unnecessary to repeat large sections of this document in the Local Plan and this figure should be replaced by a reference to the design principles set out in 'By Design'.

Changes required:

Delete figure 10.1 and amend paragraph 10.53 as follows:

10.53 The CABE and DETR publication 'By Design' breaks down key elements of design into a systematic set of principles which can be applied to development sites to establish a clear mechanism for good design which reflects the local area.

Paragraph 10.54 and figure 10.2

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

The 'aspects of development form' set out in figure 10.2 duplicate 'By Design'. It is considered unnecessary to repeat large sections of this document in the Local Plan and this figure should be replaced by a reference to the design principles set out in 'By Design'.

Changes required:

10.54 Any built development and its surrounding spaces are made up of a number of different aspects of built and un-built form. A summary of these aspects can be found with 'By Design'. The development form influences how the space functions, its appearance and how people use it for their everyday activities.

Paragraph 10.55 and figure 10.3

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

The requirement for cycle parking space is covered under Policy 23 and its supporting text. The reference at paragraph 10.55 is considered an unnecessary duplication and should be deleted.

The inclusion of standards for the length of clothes drying line in figure 10.3 is considered over prescriptive and should be deleted.

Changes required:

Delete first bullet of paragraph 10.55.

Delete Figure 10.3.

Paragraph 10.56

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

Paragraph 10.56 is an unnecessary duplication of the non-residential cycle parking standards covered under Policy 23.

Changes required:

Delete paragraph 10.56

Paragraph 10.59

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

The impact on neighbouring properties is best dealt with under Policy 25: Amenity

Changes required:

Delete paragraph 10.59

Paragraphs 10.60 and 10.61

Object: these paragraphs are not justified or effective

This section of the plan would benefit from clarification of the status of Town and Village Design Statements. Where adopted, they are adopted as SPD and as such are material considerations, not part of the development plan.

Changes required:

Add the following text at the end of 10.55: *Where adopted, Town and Village Design Statements are guidance documents to be given weight as a material consideration. They do not otherwise form part of the development plan for the purpose of decision making.*

Amend the first sentence of 10.56 as follows: "Where a town or village design statement has been produced, development proposals should seek to reflect any design principles or guidance that are relevant where it is appropriate and viable to do so."

Paragraph 10.66

Object: this paragraph is not justified or effective

Paragraph 10.66 should recognise that it may not always be possible or desirable to incorporate all landscape vegetation into the public domain.

Changes required:

Replace the first part of paragraph 10.66 as follows:

~~All landscape vegetation, whether new or existing retained vegetation, Where viable, landscape features should be incorporated into the public domain~~

Paragraphs 10.67, 10.68, 10.69 and 10.70

Object: these paragraphs are not justified or effective

Paragraphs 10.67, 10.68, and 10.69 appear to replicate information that would usually be set out in a Design and Access statement, which is a statutory requirement. The need for a further Design Quality Assessment is considered unnecessarily onerous.

Paragraph 10.70 includes an unjustified requirement for the application of 'Building for Life' standards. It is unclear in what circumstances a design review process would be required, or why this should be at the developer's expense.

Paragraphs 10.67 to 10.70 should therefore be deleted

Changes required:

Delete paragraphs 10.67, 10.68, 10.69 and 10.70

Policy 24 - Design

Object: the policy is unsound as it is not positively prepared, justified or effective

The first two paragraphs of Policy 24 are unclear and do not give a clear indication as to how a decision maker should react to a proposal. The design principles and standards are not clearly set out or referenced. This section should be re-worded to describe how development proposals should respond to local context.

The approach to contemporary design set out in the third paragraph is not justified and is contrary to paragraph 60 of the NPPF.

The fourth paragraph relates to amenity, which is covered in Policy 25.

Paragraph 5 should be amended to encourage engagement and for developers to take into account consultation feedback as far as is practicable and reasonable.

The reference in paragraph 6 to cycle parking is unnecessary as this is covered in Policy 23.

Changes required:

Amend Policy 24 as follows:

~~Development should be designed to improve the character and quality of the area within which it is located. Proposals for development will be encouraged permitted to ensure where the layout, siting, alignment, design, scale, mass and materials used complements and respects the character of the surrounding area or would actively improve the legibility or reinforce the sense of place. required to justify how the relevant aspects of development form address the relevant design principles and standards set out in this policy and how the design responds to the local context.~~

~~Developments will be permitted provided that the relevant aspects of development have been designed to reflect the relevant design principles and have satisfactorily addressed the relevant~~

~~standards. A proposal that uses development forms which do not reflect the relevant design principles and standards, or which otherwise conflict with the design principles, will not be permitted.~~

~~In certain circumstances, an exceptionally well-designed 'contemporary' or 'modern' scheme may be acceptable.~~

~~Development proposals that are of an overbearing nature or where the enjoyment of the existing properties is significantly diminished will be refused.~~

~~Developers will be required encouraged to engage with the local community and offer realistic opportunities for local people to influence development proposals demonstrate that feedback has been taken into account as far as it is practicable and reasonable to do so. Where existing relevant local guidelines have been established, these should be reflected taken into consideration in development proposals.~~

~~Developments will be required to provide adequate space for cycle parking, storage for bins and recyclables and in addition in the case of residential developments, laundry drying.~~

~~Developments will be expected to incorporate existing mature trees and hedgerows and other landscape features into the public realm of the development layout and provide sufficient additional landscape planting to integrate the development into its surroundings.~~

Paragraph 10.75

The reference in paragraph 10.75 to 'unwanted social contact' is unclear.

Changes required:

Delete the third sentence of paragraph 10.75 as follows:

~~Poorly designed public spaces and routes can also lead to unwanted social contact.~~

Policy 25 - Amenity

Policy 25 is considered unnecessarily long and should be replaced by a criteria based policy as set out below. The requirement for noise and/or vibration impact assessments should be covered in the supporting text.

Changes required:

Delete Policy 25 and replace with a concise criteria based policy as follows:

POLICY 25 AMENITY

Development will be permitted provided that:

- It is designed to protect the privacy of its occupants and those of neighbouring properties;
- Gardens or communal open spaces are provided as appropriate to the needs of the intended occupants;
- It does not result in inadequate levels of daylight or excessive overshadowing;
- External lighting is designed to control light direction and intensity in order to minimise potential pollution from light scatter, spillage, or glare;
- It does not generate significant noise, vibration or unpleasant emissions unless it can be demonstrated that the impact on the amenity of local residents will be made acceptable through appropriate mitigation and control measures; and

- Development which is sensitive to noise or unpleasant odour emissions will not be permitted in close proximity to existing sources where it would have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of future occupants.