

Summary of the key issues raised in response to the Development Management Submission Document by policy

Policy	Key Issue
Policy DM1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	Use of the word sustainable is misleading. With economic over ruling any other impact, it will not balance needs of communities or the environment adequately or fairly against the interests of business
Policy DM2 – Creating Places – Development Principles and Local Distinctiveness	Question why criterion c) is restricted to Conservation Areas
	Delete 'any concept statement' from Criterion d)
	Wish to re-introduce word 'large' in criterion e) in relation to gardens
	Criterion f) does not make provision for strategic country parkland
	Not sufficiently flexible
	Should be amended to require designs based on BREEAM standards
Policy DM3 - Masterplans	Concept Statements prepared by LPA do not take enough account of developers comments, resulting in undeliverable elements which alienate community
	Key Service Centres need masterplanning approach to address existing problems before further development proceeds.
	Unnecessary tier of bureaucracy which will delay sustainable development contrary to the aims of national policy
	Will place a strain on council's resources, with a danger that developments will not be able to progress.
	Should include clear threshold of when policy will apply
	Criterion g) requires clarification
Policy DM4 – Development Briefs	Unnecessary tier of bureaucracy which will delay sustainable development contrary to the aims of national policy
	If required, development Briefs should be incorporated at the planning application stage
	Too prescriptive for the majority of applications and allocations
	Should include provision for the elderly and elderly in care
	Proportion of affordable homes must be kept reasonable

Working Paper 1

Policy	Key Issue
Policy DM5 – Development in the Countryside	Does not give sufficient scope to allow development in the countryside
	Does not go far enough to promote the rural economy
	Criterion k) should include character
	Should limit the impact of light pollution
	Tension between policy and Core Strategy until settlement boundaries are redrawn
Policy DM6 –Flooding and Sustainable drainage	Cumulative impact could put implementation of development strategy at risk
	Too vague and onerous for small scale schemes
	Allowing any further development near flood areas will not help reduce flooding
	Does not consider potential detrimental effect on water quality
Policy DM7 – Sustainable Design and Construction	Policy needs to reflect importance of water conservation
	Policy should reflect lifetime homes standard
	Policy requires compliance with other regimes which is unnecessary, burdensome and contrary to NPPF
	Requiring pre-assessment certificates will increase costs
	Not an issue which the development plan needs to address as covered by Building regulations
Policy DM8 – Improving Energy Efficiency and reducing Carbon Dioxide Emissions	Conflicts with NPPF para. 173 and 174
	Not consistent with Government’s Reducing Regulation Made Simple
	Content already effectively covered by Building Regulations
	Complex Building Regulations allow companies to dodge conformity
Policy DM9 – Low and Zero Carbon Generation	Criteria a) and g) unsound as not consistent with NPPF paras. 98,113 and 118
	Suggest inclusion of ‘technology or’ after ‘alternative’ in criterion b)
	Proposals should not be considered unless at least 50% efficient or other meaningful target
Policy DM10 – Infrastructure Services and Telecommunications Development	Criterion a) conflicts with NPPF para. 46 as LPAs should not question need
	Suggest new para relating to impact on use of highway

Working Paper 1

Policy	Key Issue
Policy DM11 – Impact of Development on Sites of Biodiversity and Geodiversity Importance	NPPF para. 118 sets a lower threshold of ‘significant harm’
	Supporting paragraphs should make reference to updated regulations
Policy DM12 – Protected Species	Misrepresents status of European sites, with insufficient consideration given, other than Breckland SPA
	Conflicting and onerous tests give rise to uncertainty where clarity is required
Policy DM13 – Mitigation, Enhancement, Management and Monitoring of Biodiversity	Policy is not consistent with CIL Regs
	Should ensure beneficiary is populous at large, not just one section of the community or the developer
Policy DM14 – Landscape Features	NPPF para. 118 sets a lower threshold of ‘significant harm’
	Stour Valley should be recognised as being a Special Landscape Area
	Reference to ‘gaps between settlement and their settings’ is too vague
	Does not provide process whereby amenity value may be identified through a process of public consultation
Policy DM15 – Safeguarding from Hazards	No issues
Policy DM16 – Listed Buildings	Policy is too prescriptive preventing buildings from being safeguarded
	Unlike NPPF, policy makes no specific provision for high quality architecture
	Unlike NPPF, policy does make reference to Design Review
Policy DM17 – Local Heritage Assets and Buildings Protected by an Article 4 Direction	There should be greater protection for local areas.
Policy DM18 – Conservation Areas	Policy is too prescriptive and too long imposing obstacles and hurdles to town centre rejuvenation and economic growth
Policy DM19 – New Uses for Historic Buildings	Policy is too negative and prescriptive
	Term ‘substantial’ is secondary and open to interpretation
	No requirement for criteria a), b) or c) as these are covered in opening of policy

Working Paper 1

Policy	Key Issue
Policy DM20 – Development Affecting Parks and Gardens of Special Historic or Design Interest	No Issues
Policy DM21 - Archaeology	Add 'adequate ' before 'recording'
Policy DM22 – Enabling Development	Policy is too long, too prescriptive and too negative
	Suggest 'At Risk' is inserted in first line
Policy DM23 – Residential Design	Criterion c) not in conformity with NPPF
	Criteria f, g, h, i & j lack clarity.
	Criteria k, l, m & n more appropriately dealt with under building Regulations
	Criteria f & l unsound
	No specific provision for high quality architecture
	No reference to Design Review
	Should make reference to 'best' characteristics
	No more than 10 houses to be served by cul-de-sac
	Nursing homes should be exempt from criteria c) to n)
Policy DM24 – Special Housing Needs	Criterion c) is not consistent with NPPF para. 55
	Need to identify healthcare impacts from such development
Policy DM25 – Alterations or Extensions to dwellings, including self contained annexes and Development within the Curtilage	No specific provision for high quality architecture
	No reference to Design Review
	Contradictory and unclear
Policy DM26 – Extensions to Domestic Gardens within the Countryside	All appropriate situations are restricted
Policy DM27 – Agricultural and Essential Workers Dwellings	No Issues
Policy DM28 – Housing in the Countryside	Promotes unsustainable development poorly served by amenities and public transport

Working Paper 1

Policy	Key Issue
	Policy needs to cross reference protected species
	Could encourage sites to become nuisance to gain alternative permission
Policy DM29 – Residential Use of Redundant Buildings in the Countryside	Unduly restrictive. Not consistent with NPPF paras. 28 & 55
Policy DM30 – Appropriate Employment Uses and protection of Employment Land and Existing Businesses	Contrary to NPPF para. 111 as it is discouraging use of brownfield land
	Implies a level of evidence which would be burdensome and beyond the control of many applicants.
Policy DM31 – Farm Diversification	Should include provision for residential institutions
Policy DM31 – Business and Domestic Equine Related Uses	Suggest landscape mitigation is incorporated
Policy DM33 – Re-Use or Replacement of Buildings in the Countryside	Criteria c) & d) not consistent with Taylor Review or CLG response
	B2 use should be small scale
Policy DM34 – Tourism Development	No Issues
Policy DM35 – Proposals within the Town centre Boundaries	Need to take more flexible approach to non A1 uses
	Should require impact assessment for proposals in excess of 2,500 m ²
	Objections to boundaries of Newmarket and Bury St Edmunds Town Centre Map
Policy DM36 – Protection of Local Centres	No Issues
Policy DM37 – Public Realm Improvements	Fails to pass CIL regulation 122
	Too inflexible
	Should apply to Key Service Centres
Policy DM38 – Shop Fronts and Advertisements	Amend to read 'hoardings or advertisements unrelated....'
Policy DM39 – Street Trading and Street Cafes	Should be reference to provision for residential institutions, nursing homes and community facilities

Working Paper 1

Policy	Key Issue
Policy DM40 – Ancillary Retail Uses	Need to encourage provision of grocery/convenience goods sales in rural communities
Policy DM41 – Community Facilities and services	Policy is unjustified in NPPF terms, being inflexible and an inappropriate strategy for the delivery of healthcare facilities and services
	Could promote loss of facilities as many community facilities are not businesses and are not economically viable
	Need clarification identifying need and how it is assessed and quantified
	Need clarification that provision would only be required where directly related to development
	Additional policies requested in relation Health impact Assessments and Military Housing
Policy DM42 – Open Space, Sport and Recreational Facilities	Adopted standards need to be set out in development plan
	Final paragraph onerous
	Needs a provision where an area is deficient in parkland
Policy DM43 – Leisure Facilities	Should not involve loss of high grade agricultural land
Policy DM44 – Rights of Way	No Issues
Policy DM45 – Transport Assessments and Travel Plan	Policy fails to address agreed need for cycle routes
Policy DM46 – Parking Standards	Policy does not provide a standard and will not address current problems resulting from a lack of parking
Policy DM47 – Development Relating to the Horse Racing Industry	Not prepared in accordance with SCI
	Planners define 'need' as 'want'
	Expansion of horse training into traditional paddock land is contrary to Conservation Area Appraisal
Policy DM48 – Development Affecting the Horse Racing Industry	Contrary to Policy DM1 and NPPF
	Not prepared in accordance with SCI
	Planners define 'need' as 'want'
	Expansion of horse training into traditional paddock land is contrary to Conservation Area Appraisal

Working Paper 1

Policy	Key Issue
Policy DM49 – Re-Development of Existing Sites Relating to the Horse Racing Industry	Protectionist policies have damaging effect on Newmarket preventing economic growth
	Where sites have been long term vacant, the 'exceptional' circumstances test should not be required
Policy DM50 – Securing the Restoration of Horse Racing Related Assets	Requires understanding of likely effects and impacts in the setting of Heritage Assets
Policy DM51 – Horse Walks	Planners define 'need' as 'want'
	Expansion of horse training into traditional paddock land is contrary to Conservation Area Appraisal
Policy DM52 – Rural Housing Exception Sites	Should include element of private housing to aid viability