

FOREST HEATH DISTRICT COUNCIL

LOCAL PLAN WORKING GROUP

WEDNESDAY 30 OCTOBER 2013

4.00 PM - 7.15 PM

Members Present

Mrs R E Burt (Chairman)
R J Millar (Vice-Chairman)
W J Bishop
W Hirst
R D S Hood

M J Jefferys
Mrs C F J Lynch
W E Sadler
T Simmons

The following Councillors were also in attendance:

A Drummond (Red Lodge Ward Member)
D W Gathercole (Lakenheath Ward Member)

Also in attendance

M Magnusson, Planning Officer
M Smith, Place Shaping Manager
S Turner, FHDC Cabinet Officer/Committee Administrator

Apologies

There were no apologies for absence.

Substitutes

There were no substitutes at the meeting.

SCHEDULE OF RECOMMENDATIONS

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
268	<u>COUNCILLOR M K SMITH</u> Prior to the start of the meeting, a one minute silence was observed in memory of Councillor M K Smith, who had sadly died on 25 October 2013.	
269	<u>SITE ALLOCATIONS LOCAL PLAN DOCUMENT (SALPD) AND SINGLE ISSUE REVIEW LOCAL PLAN DOCUMENT (SIRLPD) - OUTSTANDING MATTERS (REPORT NO LOP13/015)</u> The Place Shaping Manager presented this report which explained that Officers were required to undertake a Single Issue Review, (SIR), of Core Strategy Policy CS7 as a consequence of a successful High Court Challenge	

ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
<p>to the adopted Core Strategy Local Plan Document.</p> <p>The Site Allocations Local Plan Document, (SALPD), would allocate sites to meet the district's housing requirement to 2031, (as this emerges via the SIR process), and other requirements, including employment and retail provision, to 2026.</p> <p>Members had previously considered the content of the SIR 'Submission version' draft consultation document on 9 September 2013.</p> <p>On 12 September 2013 and 17 October 2013 Members had considered the available sites, which could potentially meet the district's housing and other land-use requirements, within the Market Towns, Key Service Centres and Primary Villages. This was with a view to their inclusion in a consultation draft 'Further Issues and Options' SALPD.</p> <p>The purpose of this meeting was to consider the outstanding matters arising from the previous meetings, in order that the content of both the SIRLPD and SALPD could be finalised and presented to 8 November 2013. Officers would also be seeking approval for a period of public consultation on both Local Plan documents to be undertaken simultaneously.</p> <p>Appendix A of this report contained a Schedule of Outstanding Matters to-date, tables showing the preferred and rejected sites by settlement to-date including the total capacity of the preferred sites and the previously agreed SIR allocation and the maps showing sites not previously considered by the Working Group and potential changes to the settlement boundaries of Secondary Villages.</p> <p>Councillor R D S Hood referred to paragraph 4.2 of the report which referred to the overall housing requirement contained within the Core Strategy Policy CS7 'submission' version draft consultation document (7,000 dwellings in the period 2011-2031), which was considered to be based on a full and objective assessment of local need.</p> <p>Councillor R D S Hood also referred to paragraph 5.1 of the report which also stated that the 'submission' document established an overall housing requirement for the District that was considered to be based on a robust assessment of local needs.</p>	

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>In relation to these statements, Councillor R D S Hood wished it to be recorded that these figures were supposed to take account of National policy and local circumstances and that the housing in Newmarket was a matter, not only of local interest, but of national interest. Councillor R D S Hood expressed her concerns that local consideration had not been taken into account when determining the overall housing figure based on the most updated figures and when based on any allocations for Newmarket.</p> <p>Councillor R D S Hood further explained the basis of her concerns, being that:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The figure of 7,000 dwellings had not been based on the latest housing figures. 2. The potential allocations for Newmarket were not in line with local circumstances and not enough consideration had been given to the housing figure for Newmarket, given the constraints involved with the horseracing industry. <p>The Place Shaping Manager responded by explaining that the figures had been based on the requirements of the NPPF, which had been outlined in previous reports presented to the Working Group in May 2013 and which had been subsequently endorsed by Cabinet and Council in July 2013.</p> <p>Whilst considering these latest figures, Members had requested Officers to undertake further investigation and, as a result, an additional extract and summary were produced, which summarised the localised figures and how the overall figure of 7,000 dwellings had been determined. If Members wished to remind themselves of this previous work, then reference could be made back to these reports.</p> <p>The Place Shaping Manager also explained that the final housing numbers for Newmarket and for the other towns/villages within the District, had yet to be determined and this was the work currently being undertaken by the Working Group.</p> <p>Members then considered the following outstanding matters as follows:</p>	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Settlement Boundary Amendments – Secondary Villages</u> The Planning Officer reminded Members of the 	

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy CS1 stated that the 'secondary villages' were defined as Barton Mills, Elveden, Eriswell, Freckenham, Gazeley, Holywell Row, Icklingham, Moulton, Tuddenham and Worlington. - Policy CS10 stated that the settlement boundaries would be defined for the Primary and Secondary Villages and would be reviewed as part of the Site Allocations Local Plan process. The review would rationalise the settlement boundaries to become more logical and defensible. <p>Members then considered and recommended the settlement boundaries for each of the secondary villages as follows:</p>	
	<p>(a) <u>Barton Mills</u> The following sites be included within the settlement boundary of Barton Mills:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BM/05 • BM/06 • BM/07 • BM/08 • BM/09 	RECOMMENDED
	<p>(b) <u>Elveden</u> No sites be submitted and no alterations be made to the settlement boundary of Elveden.</p>	RECOMMENDED
	<p>(c) <u>Eriswell</u> No alterations be made to the settlement boundary of Eriswell.</p>	RECOMMENDED
	<p>(d) <u>Freckenham</u> The following sites be included within the settlement boundary of Freckenham:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • F/01 - Land South of Fordham Road • F/02 - Land East of Mortimer Lane • F/05 - Land opposite Village Hall and on north side of Fordham Road • F/06 - Land adjacent to Millfield, Fordham Road • F/07 	RECOMMENDED

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
	(e) <u>Gazeley</u> No alterations be made to the settlement boundary of Gazeley.	RECOMMENDED
	(f) <u>Holywell Row</u> No alterations be made to the settlement boundary of Holywell Row.	RECOMMENDED
	(g) <u>Icklingham</u> Site I/02 be included within the settlement boundary of Icklingham.	RECOMMENDED
	(h) <u>Moulton</u> No alterations be made to the settlement boundary of Moulton.	RECOMMENDED
	(i) <u>Tuddenham</u> No alterations be made to the settlement boundary of Tuddenham.	RECOMMENDED
	(j) <u>Worlington</u> The following sites be included within the settlement boundary of Worlington: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • W/09 • W/10 • W/11 • W/12 • W/13 	RECOMMENDED
	<p>2. <u>Brandon</u> The Planning Officer advised Members of the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To reconsider the allocation of 500 dwellings on <u>Site B/14 (Land off Green Road)</u>, as Councillor W J Bishop (Brandon East Ward Member) had expressed concerns with regards to noise, as this site would be directly under the flightpath associated with USAF Lakenheath. - To consider the allocation of <u>Site B/12 (Land off Manor Road)</u> (which could potentially come forward independently of Site B/17 (Land to west of Brandon)). <p>Members then considered these matters and with 8 voting for the motion and with 1 voting against, it was recommended that:</p>	

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>(a) <u>Site B/12 (Land off Manor Road)</u> be approved for inclusion within the Draft (Regulation 18) Further Issues and Options Site Allocations Local Plan Document (site subject to a Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA)).</p> <p>(b) <u>Site B/14 (Land off Green Road)</u> be approved for inclusion within the Draft (Regulation 18) Further Issues and Options Site Allocations Local Plan Document.</p> <p>The Place Shaping Manager confirmed that the proposed total allocation for Brandon was 1,423 dwellings (an over-allocation of 693 dwellings against the target proposed by the Single Issue Review (Policy CS7)). Members were requested to confirm whether they wished to base the consultation on that proposed figure.</p> <p>Members then considered this matter, where it was recommended that:</p> <p>(c) The consultation for Brandon be based on the proposed allocation figure of 1,423 dwellings.</p>	<p>RECOMMENDED</p> <p>RECOMMENDED</p> <p>RECOMMENDED</p>
	<p>3. <u>Mildenhall</u> The Planning Officer advised Members that an additional site was now being proposed, this being <u>M/41 (Land at Meadow View Cottage, Mildenhall Road)</u>.</p> <p>The site could have a capacity of 116 dwellings (based on 30 dwellings per hectare). There were no significant constraints on this site, but it was isolated from the settlement boundary and was deemed to be in an unsustainable location.</p> <p>Members then considered this additional site, where it was recommended that:</p> <p>(a) <u>Site M/41 (Land at Meadow View Cottage)</u>, be not included as a preferred site within the Draft (Regulation 18) Further Issues and Options Site Allocations Local Plan Document.</p>	<p>RECOMMENDED</p>
	<p>4. <u>Newmarket</u> The Planning Officer advised Members of the</p>	

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Site N/09 (Brickfield Stud, Exning Road)</u> – Consideration of this site had been held in abeyance, awaiting the outcome of the retail application. - <u>Site N/11 (Land at Fitzroy Stable, Rowley Drive)</u> – Consideration of this site had been held in abeyance, awaiting the outcome of the retail application. - <u>Site N/14 (Land east of Newmarket, south of A14 (Hatchfield Farm))</u> – Consideration needed to be given to the capacity and land use for this site. <p>Whilst considering this site further at the meeting, Councillor R D S Hood wished it to be recognised that this site was outside of the settlement boundary for Newmarket.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>N/18 (George Lambton Playing Fields)</u> – Consideration of this site had been held in abeyance, awaiting the outcome of the retail application. - <u>N/19 (Land off Hamilton Road)</u> – This site had not been formally submitted and was also subject to equine policy constraints. - <u>N/21 (Land south of Exning Road and adjacent to Hamilton Road)</u> – Consideration of this site had been held in abeyance, awaiting the outcome of the retail application. - <u>N/31 (Former Scaltback Middle School Site)</u> – Consideration had been given to the use of this site, which was being proposed for community use. - <u>N/32 (St Felix Middle School Site)</u> – Consideration had been given to the use of this site, which was being proposed for residential use. <p>Members then considered these matters, where it was recommended that:</p> <p>(a) <u>N/09 (Brickfield Stud, Exning Road)</u> - be not included as a preferred site</p>	<p>RECOMMENDED</p>

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>within the Draft (Regulation 18) Further Issues and Options Site Allocations Local Plan Document.</p> <p>(b) <u>N/11 (Land at Fitzroy Stables, Rowley Drive)</u> –</p> <p>(i) Site to be included as a preferred site within the Draft (Regulation 18) Further Issues and Options Site Allocations Local Plan Document (65 dwellings).</p> <p>(ii) Site to be renamed to '<i>Black Bear Lane and Rowley Drive Junction</i>'.</p> <p>(c) <u>N/14 (Land east of Newmarket, south of the A14 (Hatchfield Farm))</u> – to be included as a preferred site and identified for generic mixed use within the Draft (Regulation 18) Further Issues and Options Site Allocations Local Plan Document (700 dwellings).</p> <p>(d) <u>N/18 (George Lambton Playing Fields)</u> – to be included as a preferred site and identified for mixed use (including 200 dwellings) within the Draft (Regulation 18) Further Issues and Options Site Allocations Local Plan Document (subject to the adequate relocation of the playing fields within the Town).</p> <p>(e) <u>N/19 (Land off Hamilton Road)</u> - be not included as a preferred site within the Draft (Regulation 18) Further Issues and Options Site Allocations Local Plan Document, as the site had not been formally submitted by the landowner.</p> <p>(f) <u>N/21 (Land south of Exning Road and adjacent to Hamilton Road)</u> - be not included as a preferred site within the Draft (Regulation 18) Further Issues and Options Site Allocations Local Plan Document.</p> <p>(g) <u>N/31 (Former Scaltback Middle School Site)</u> – to be included as a preferred site and identified for community use within the Draft (Regulation 18) Further Issues and Options Site allocations Local Plan Document.</p>	<p>RECOMMENDED</p> <p>RECOMMENDED</p> <p>RECOMMENDED</p> <p>RECOMMENDED</p> <p>RECOMMENDED</p> <p>RECOMMENDED</p> <p>RECOMMENDED</p>

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>their buffers, the principle of development would be acceptable to Natural England. The Planning Officer also advised Members of the other following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>L/25 (Land east of Eriswell Road and south of South Road)</u> – A site of 3.6 hectares could allocate 90 dwellings at 25 dwellings per hectare or 108 dwellings at 30 dwellings per hectare. - <u>L/27 (Land south of Broom Road)</u> - This site could be 13 hectares or reduced to 3 hectares to avoid the noise constraint zone. <p>The site could allocate 90 dwellings (3 hectares) or 390 dwellings (13 hectares) at 30 dwellings per hectare.</p> <p>A school site would require 4 hectares (resulting in a reduction of 120 dwellings)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>L/04 (Land at 35 Station Road)</u> – Consideration had been given to the allocation/density on that site and it was being proposed for 10 dwellings at 20 dwellings per hectare. - <u>L/09 (Land to rear of 11-13 Back Street)</u> – Consideration had been given to the allocation/density on that site and it was being proposed for 10 dwellings at 20 dwellings per hectare. - <u>L/10 (Land to rear of 27-29 Eriswell Road)</u> – Consideration had been given to the allocation/density on that site and it was being proposed for 6 dwellings at 20 dwellings per hectare. - <u>L/13 (Rabbithill Covert, Station Road)</u> – Further information had been obtained on the planning and nature conservation status of this site as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There were area TPOs and individual TPOs to the south and west boundary of the site (approximately 0.5 hectares). - There were some protected species records on the site. - Planning applications for a single dwelling held been refused in 1985 and 1986. - A planning application for 100 dwellings on 	

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>this site had been submitted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>L/28 (Middle Covert, Land south of Station Road)</u> – Further information had been obtained on the allocation/density of that site, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site was subject to a provisional 'group TPO' (5.2 hectares) which had been made on 19 September 2013. - An existing TPO ran east to west, east of Cornfield Avenue. - Outline planning applications for residential use had been refused in 1985 and 1988. <p>Members then considered these matters, where it was recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) <u>L/04 (Land at 35 Station Road)</u> - to be included as a preferred site within the Draft (Regulation 18) Further Issues and Options Site Allocations Local Plan Document (10 dwellings at 20 dwellings per hectare). (b) <u>L/09 (Land to rear of 11-13 Back Street)</u> - to be included as a preferred site within the Draft (Regulation 18) Further Issues and Options Site Allocations Local Plan Document (10 dwellings at 20 dwellings per hectare). (c) <u>L/10 (Land to rear of 27-29 Eriswell Road)</u> - to be included as a preferred site within the Draft (Regulation 18) Further Issues and Options Site Allocations Local Plan Document (6 dwellings at 20 dwellings per hectare). (d) <u>L/13 (Rabbithill Covert, Station Road)</u> – to be included as a preferred site within the Draft (Regulation 18) Further Issues and Options Site Allocations Local Plan Document (100 dwellings). (e) <u>L/25 (Land east of Eriswell Road and south of South road)</u> - to be included as a preferred site within the Draft (Regulation 18) Further Issues and Options Site Allocations Local Plan Document (3.6 hectares to be allocated for 90 dwellings at 25 dwellings per hectare). 	<p></p> <p>RECOMMENDED</p> <p>RECOMMENDED</p> <p>RECOMMENDED</p> <p>RECOMMENDED</p> <p>RECOMMENDED</p>

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>(f) <u>L/27 (Land south of Broom Road)</u> - to be included as a preferred site within the Draft (Regulation 18) Further Issues and Options Site Allocations Local Plan Document (270 dwellings and provision of school site).</p> <p>(g) <u>L/28 (Middle Covert, Land south of Station Road)</u> - be not included as a preferred site within the Draft (Regulation 18) Further Issues and Options Site Allocations Local Plan Document.</p> <p>The Place Shaping Manager confirmed that the proposed total allocation for Lakenheath was 1,000 dwellings (an over-allocation of 200 dwellings against the target proposed by the Single Issue Review (Policy CS7)). Members were requested to confirm whether they wished to base the consultation on that proposed figure.</p> <p>Members then considered this matter, where it was recommended that:</p> <p>(h) The consultation for Lakenheath be based on the proposed allocation figure of 1,000 dwellings.</p>	<p>RECOMMENDED</p> <p>RECOMMENDED</p> <p>RECOMMENDED</p>
6.	<p><u>Red Lodge</u> The Planning Officer advised Members of the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>RL/01 (Land to rear of 2-4 Elms Road and 6-8 Turnpike Road)</u> – Consideration had been given to the inclusion of this site as a preferred option. Officers were recommending that this site not be included at this stage and to see if interest emerged via the formal consultation process. - <u>RL/02 (Land to rear of 14-16 Turnpike Road)</u> - Consideration had been given to the inclusion of this site as a preferred option. Officers were recommending that this site not be included at this stage and to see if interest emerged via the formal consultation process. - <u>RL/06 (Land adjoining Twins Belt)</u> – Officers had re-drawn the site to accommodate an allocation of 400 dwellings to the southern 	

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>section (at 30 dwellings per hectare).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>RL/08 (Land to rear of 4-14b Turnpike Lane)</u> – The planning history for this site was as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In 2008 a planning application had been submitted for 238 dwellings (which had been withdrawn). - Protect species records/small part of flood zone 3 - <u>Waste Water Treatment Capacity</u> – Anglian Water had confirmed their latest position on the Waste Water Treatment Capacity as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significant works had been undertaken at Tuddenham Water Recycling Centre (WRC), including the process treatment enhancement, which removed the previous 2021 date constraint. - There was capacity available at the WRC for the proposed allocation of 840 dwellings within the current permit. A further network assessment would need to be undertaken, as and when, the developments came forward for pre-planning. <p>Members then considered these matters, where it was recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) <u>RL/01 (Land to rear of 2-4 Elms Road and 6-8 Turnpike Road)</u> - to be included as a preferred site within the Draft (Regulation 18) Further Issues and Options Site Allocations Local Plan Document. (b) <u>RL/02 (Land to rear of 14-16 Turnpike Road)</u> - to be included as a preferred site within the Draft (Regulation 18) Further Issues and Options Site Allocations Local Plan Document. (c) <u>RL/08 (Land to rear of 4-14b Turnpike Lane)</u> - to be included as a preferred site within the Draft (Regulation 18) Further Issues and Options Site Allocations Local Plan Document. (d) <u>Waste Water Treatment Capacity</u> – Officers to commission an independent review with regard to the waste water treatment capacity issues, to be able to 	<p></p> <p>RECOMMENDED</p> <p>RECOMMENDED</p> <p>RECOMMENDED</p> <p>RECOMMENDED</p>

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>quantify (or otherwise) the position of Anglian Water. This independent review to run in parallel with the consultation on the Draft (Regulation 18) Further Issues and Options Site Allocations Local Plan Document.</p> <p>Officers to report back to the Working Group on the outcome of this independent review to be able to consider whether any amendments need to be made to the phasing of development within Red Lodge.</p> <p>The Place Shaping Manager confirmed that the proposed total allocation for Red Lodge was 1,121 dwellings (an over-allocation of 281 dwellings against the target proposed by the Single Issue Review (Policy CS7)). Members were requested to confirm whether they wished to base the consultation on that proposed figure.</p> <p>Members then considered this matter, where it was recommended that:</p> <p>(e) The consultation for Red Lodge be based on the proposed allocation figure of 1,121 dwellings.</p>	RECOMMENDED
	<p>Councillor Mrs C F J Lynch left the meeting at 6.30 pm, during the consideration of the outstanding matters for Red Lodge.</p> <p>Councillor M J Jefferys left the meeting at 6.45 pm, following the conclusion of the consideration of the outstanding matters for Red Lodge.</p>	
	<p>7. <u>Potential Employment Land</u></p> <p>The Planning Officer explained that consideration needed to be given to an allocation of additional employment land along the A11 (near Barton Mills), as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site BM/11 (5.88 hectares). • Sites BM/12 (10.09 hectares) and BM/13 (10.29 hectares) were located within zones which were protected under the Birds and Habitats Directive. <p>This proposed allocation would be contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS6, as it related to the siting of</p>	

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>employment land (ie a relatively unsustainable location). The allocations also conflicted with 'core planning principles' under paragraph 17 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Members then considered this matter, where it was recommended that:</p> <p>Sites BM/11, BM/12 and BM/13 be not included as a preferred site for potential employment land within the Draft (Regulation 18) Further Issues and Options Site Allocations Local Plan Document.</p>	RECOMMENDED
	<p>8. <u>Gypsy and Traveller Provision</u> The Planning Officer explained that the Council would need to address the need for permanent sites for gypsies and travellers. Therefore, as part of the consultation process, it was being proposed for a 'call for sites' process to identify this provision.</p> <p>Members then considered this matter, where it was recommended that:</p> <p>A 'call for sites' for gypsy and traveller provision, be undertaken as part of the consultation process.</p>	RECOMMENDED
	<p>Councillor T Simmons left the meeting at 6.50 pm, following the conclusion of the discussions on the Gypsy and Traveller Provision.</p>	
270	<p><u>DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS</u></p> <p>The Chairman referred to the next meeting of the Working Group being held on Friday 8 November 2013 at 2.00 pm, to consider the final consultation documents for the Core Strategy Single Issue Review and the Site Allocations Local Plan document.</p> <p>The Chairman proposed that, as the funeral for Councillor M K Smith was now also taking place at 12.30 pm on that day, for the time of the meeting of the Working Group to be brought forward to 9.00 am.</p> <p>It was agreed for the time of the meeting of the Local Plan Working Group taking place on Friday 8 November 2013 to be brought forward to 9.00 am (from 2.00 pm).</p>	RESOLVED

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
271	<p data-bbox="277 210 619 241"><u>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</u></p> <p data-bbox="277 280 1034 311">The following items of Other Business were raised:</p> <p data-bbox="277 349 1126 454">(a) <u>Joint Development Management Policies Submission Document: Sustainability Appraisal Addendum 2013</u></p> <p data-bbox="355 492 1126 629">The Place Shaping Manager presented this report which provided an update on the latest stage of the Joint Development Management Policies Document.</p> <p data-bbox="355 667 1126 1093">The 'submission version' consultation of the Development Management Policies was due to be considered by Council on 13 March 2013, with a recommendation to approve the Joint Development Management Policies for submission to Secretary of State for Examination. However the report was withdrawn as legal advice had been received prior to the meeting, which indicated further work would be required to the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment document in order for the Joint Development Management Policies to be legally compliant.</p> <p data-bbox="355 1131 1126 1308">This work had been undertaken to supplement the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) which accompanied the Joint Development Management Document. This SEA Addendum was attached as Appendix A and Appendix B to the report.</p> <p data-bbox="355 1346 1126 1659">This additional work needed to be subject to consultation and legal advice had been sought on how this consultation would fit procedurally with submitting the Joint Development Management Policies document for Examination. Counsel's advice supported consultation on the Addendum, as soon as possible, but stated that this need not delay the submission of the document to the Secretary of State.</p> <p data-bbox="355 1697 1126 2018">A number of comments were received from statutory consultees and adjoining authorities to the submission (final) consultation on the Joint Development Management Policies document between October and December 2012. Three additional comments had since been received which were not previously reported and the Local Plan Working Group were asked to note these comments at Appendix C.</p>	

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>It was recommended to Cabinet that:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The additional consultation responses received to the Joint Development Management Submission Document be noted. 2. The consultation on the SEA Addendum be commenced, prior to the submission of the Joint Development Management Policies Document to the Secretary of State. <p>(b) <u>Joint Development Management Policies - Submission</u></p> <p>This report updated and reported on the latest stage of the Joint Development Management Policies, following the most recent 'submission version' consultation which took place between October and December 2012. This consultation sought comment on matters of 'soundness' and 'legal compliance'.</p> <p>This report was previously considered by the Local Plan Working Group (FHDC) on 4 February 2013 and the Sustainable Development Working Party (SEBC) on 7 February 2013 and agreed for submission to the Secretary of State by Council (SEBC) on 13 March 2013. The same document was due to be presented to FHDC on 13 March 2013, however the report was withdrawn, as legal advice had been received prior to the meeting, which indicated further work would be required to the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) document in order for the Joint Development Management Policies to be legally compliant.</p> <p>Officers had completed an SEA Addendum in accordance with the legal advice received. It did not suggest that any changes were made to the Joint Development Management Policies that was the subject of consultation in October 2012. Therefore, Officers were now seeking approval to submit the Joint Development Management Policies Document to Council on 11 December 2013.</p> <p>Following consideration by each full Council, it would be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate, (anticipated to be at the end of December 2013). Following this, an Examination in Public would be held, at a date to be determined, with adoption to</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>RECOMMENDED</p>

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>follow the Inspector's report.</p> <p>It was recommended to both Cabinet and Council that the Joint Development Management Policies Document (Working Paper 2 of Cabinet Report No CAB12/024 presented to Cabinet on 4 September 2012) be approved for submission to the Planning Inspectorate.</p>	<p>RECOMMENDED</p>