

BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL

COUNCIL MEETING – 11TH APRIL 2006 – AGENDA ITEM 8(c)

PAPER E314 – APPENDIX B (REVISED)
WHICH INCORPORATES ADDITIONAL WORDING REQUIRED BY
STRATEGY COMMITTEE

NB. Only Post Inquiry Modifications 3/58 & 3/59 on page 4 – (Glensford and Great Cornard respectively) have been revised.



Babergh Local Plan Alteration No 2

**Schedule of All (non substantive) Changes Now
Proposed in Response**

Table of Changes proposed following representations

PIM Number	Proposed Change to Modification	Reason for Change
<p>1/3 (RSS para 1.15a)</p>	<p>The Regional Planning Guidance Spatial Strategy is currently being updated and will cover the new East of England Region. The first consultation draft of the new guidance (RPSS14) covers the period up to 2021 and consultation took place between in September 2002 and December 2002. The draft RPSS14 is due in mid-2003; followed by the second consultation period and the new guidance is expected to be adopted sometime in 2004 to be submitted to the Secretary of State was 'banked' in February 2004, with a twelve-week consultation period starting ending in March 2004-2005. The public examination is expected to be in October 2004 ended in March 2006, with the final publication due likely in July 2005 Spring 2007.</p> <p>These are some of the key highlights from the first consultation draft document relating to the spatial strategy for the region and sub-regions are set out below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Spatial Planning Vision Division for the East of England is to develop a prosperous, outward-looking and more sustainable region, respecting its diversity, maintaining and enhancing its assets, and sustaining and improving the quality of life for its people who live in, work in or visit the region;... 	<p>Wording updated and spelling corrected. Minor changes.</p>
<p>2/10 (Policy EN10)</p>	<p>Add/amend words in <i>italics</i> (minor wording change only): -</p> <p>The use of Sustainable Drainage Systems* for dealing with surface water run-off from new developments will be required unless, <i>following an adequate assessment</i>, soil conditions and/or engineering feasibility dictates otherwise. (remainder as PIM2/10)</p>	<p>Environment Agency has suggested amended wording to make it more precise.</p>

2/12 (Proposals Map)	Amend Proposals Map to show location / route of any known hazardous installations and pipelines under the Health & Safety Executive's remit. This is only a minor technical change for completeness of information – no change in policy approach necessary or proposed	In response to rep. 25 (by Health & Safety Executive) and rep. R1081 (by Go East) on earlier decision not to accept Inspector's recommendation
3/48 (Hadleigh Map)	Minor alteration to Inset 10 . See PIM 11/3 below	To correct an error – so that Inset Map correctly reflects Policies HS09H and EM02b.
3/53 (Policy HS09Q)	Add new paragraph of supporting text to follow policy, as shown: 'In considering development proposals for this site regard will be paid both to the need to make the most efficient use of land and to the most suitable development density for this particular site. Some constraints on the site are known, including the need to retain important landscape features, to incorporate further landscaping and the site's location where the village edge and open countryside meet. Other constraints are not yet known, including potential contamination. As a result, factors including the exact net developable area and the most appropriate development density cannot be identified precisely yet. The figures quoted in the policy are therefore notional estimates.'	In response to GO East representation R1082 and as helpful note to ensure conformity with PPG3 / PPS3. Also decision on response to Inspector's recommendation now retaken and recommendation will be accepted (by addition of explanation)
3/55 (Para 8.30a, relates to new Policy HS09T)	Add additional sentence to end of new paragraph 8.30a, minor change: 'Any hotel proposals for this location will need to satisfy the requirements and tests of PPS6: Planning for Town Centres.'	In response to GO East representation R1075 and as helpful note to ensure conformity with PPS6.

<p>3/58 (new Policy HS09U)</p>	<p>Add 3 further additional notes after Policy HS09U (<i>NB Note 2 agreed by, and Notes 3 and 4 requested by Strategy Committee, 30 March 2006</i>): -</p> <p>Note 2: In relation to criterion four above the Transport Authority advise that notwithstanding any physical improvements that may be achieved at the junction of Crownfield Road and Brook Street, the minimum required to satisfy this criterion is that the developer should promote any Traffic Orders necessary to achieve traffic management measures designed to improve visibility at this junction.</p> <p>Note 3: Satisfactory measures for surface water and foul drainage will need to be agreed before any development scheme for the site is implemented.</p> <p>Note 4: The development of this site will have to be planned and implemented in a comprehensive way and piecemeal development must not occur.</p>	<p>To meet the Transport Authority's objection that the proposed highway criteria in this policy are not sufficiently precise.</p>
<p>3/59</p>	<p>Add new supporting text as new para. To follow the policy: Satisfactory detailed proposals for transport measures to serve this site will need to be agreed before any development scheme is implemented. Therefore, planning permission will not be granted until these matters are resolved. The transport proposals should be based on sustainable development principles and adequate for the detailed residential scheme. Accordingly, road widening of the C732, throughout its length, will not be considered acceptable. Consequently, it is possible that the development of this site might not come forward in the earliest part of the Local Plan's lifespan.</p>	<p>In response to Transport authority comments and further consideration of transport / highways matters for this proposal</p>

<p>3/61 (Policy HS11: Housing Density)</p>	<p>Add new supporting text as new para. 3.62a to follow the policy: 'In applying Policy HS11 and considering any exceptions to it, the following circumstances will be considered as material:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Situations where a development solution with a density of 30 dwellings per hectare (or higher) cannot be achieved, in terms of the impact of the scheme on the character and appearance of the locality; (b) The need to demonstrate that the lower density sought makes the most efficient use of land, whilst taking into account the character and appearance of the local area; and (c) The need to demonstrate that higher density schemes would lead to unacceptable outcomes (such as increasing the need to travel) in terms of the incremental expansion of villages with few or no local facilities (including passenger transport services) and where there is little or no likelihood of such facilities being provided.' 	<p>In response to GO East representation R1076 and as helpful note to ensure conformity with PPG3 / PPS3.</p>
<p>3/70 Smaller Dwellings</p>	<p>Delete the word "seek " from the final sentence of paragraph 3. 83 - sentence should read: -</p> <p>Subsequent surveys will determine whether this figure should change over the plan period.</p>	<p>To correct an error. It was intended to use the Inspector's recommended wording for this proposed modification to paragraph 3. 83.</p>
<p>4/8 (Policy EM02d)</p>	<p>A minor amendment to the fifth bullet point is proposed to read: -</p> <p>"Provision of a new access from the A137 (designed and constructed to adoptable standards) to serve both the existing"</p> <p>remainder of bullet point as in PIM 4/8</p>	<p>The reason for this suggested amendment is understood, however, it is not appropriate to require adoption of an access road in the policy. However, a minor addition to this bullet point would facilitate adoption of the access road.</p>
<p>4/25 (Inset Map 17)</p>	<p>The Proposals Map is to be amended to show Inset 17 (minor map change)</p>	<p>Omitted in error</p>

<p>8/1 Playing Fields, para 8.14) relates to Policy RE03)</p>	<p>Paragraph 8.14 proposed amended version: -</p> <p>The District Council will encourage the County Council to allow increased public use of school playing fields. PPG17 strongly resists the loss of such facilities where they are in active use and paragraph 15 of the PPG sets out a series of tests that should be met in order to allow the development of playing fields. Furthermore, Sport England are a statutory consultee on proposals that affect playing fields, and the 1998 Playing Fields Direction requires local planning authorities to notify the Secretary of State in circumstances where they are minded to allow development affecting playing fields, but where Sport England has objected. Sport England's Planning for Sport and Active Recreation: Objectives and Opportunities (Interim Statement 2005) sets out the circumstances where there may not be a reason to object to such an application.</p>	<p>Technical corrections and updates.</p>
<p>8/2 Policy RE03 Playing Fields</p>	<p>Add note at end of Policy RE03: -</p> <p>Note: the above policy should be read in conjunction with, and is in addition to, the criteria set out in paragraph 15 of PPG17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation (July 2002)</p>	<p>Minor amendment to draw attention to national policy, particularly the tests in paragraph 15 of the PPG.</p>
<p>11/3 (Hadleigh Map)</p>	<p>Inset 10 - Update base map and make consequential changes/updates (i.e. development and structural landscaping completed, and new BUAB in these areas). Reveal extent of Local Nature Reserve. See PIM 3/48 above</p>	<p>Ordnance Survey base recently updated to show new housing in north Hadleigh and extension of Lady Lane industrial estate. Correction to show that part of Local Nature Reserve that had been covered by SLA shading.</p>
<p>12/19 (Chilton Development Policy CP01f)ii)</p>	<p>Add new brief supporting text note to clarify retail planning position on new neighbourhood centre: 'Note: In considering proposals for development for the centre all provisions of PPS6 will be applied.'</p>	<p>In response to GO East representation R1077 and as helpful note to ensure conformity with PPS6.</p>