

REVIEW OF INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS WITH ISLE OF WIGHT COUNCIL

(Carried out by J Kendall against document provided by IWC following meeting with members of the working group and Bill Murphy (Head of Planning) and Wendy Perera (Deputy Head of Planning) on 11 July 2013) and subsequent update provided by IWC (9 August 2013) in light of changes to Permitted Development in respect of agricultural buildings

IWC Comments related to Ver1 of our draft plan.

Amendments and recommended amendments are all now shown on Ver3 of the Draft Plan.

Policy	IWC Comments	Comments/Recommendations	Actions
Foreword /Introduction	In the final draft consultation document you may like to consider having a foreword and introduction which sets out a bit of background to the plan and how the plan is set out. This is purely a presentational issue and for you to decide as to whether or not you would wish to include something but it gives you the opportunity to see the document up front before you get into the meat of the document itself.	Introduction and Foreword were not provided to IWC and are being developed	In hand
Community objectives	<p>It is good to see that you have a set of objectives, but without the information about how they were arrived at it is difficult for us to comment as to whether there is a clear link between the views of the community and the objectives and then the policies that flow from them.</p> <p>You may like to consider whether you would like to include a vision for Bembridge as part of this section – something at the start of the plan that recognises the attributes that make Bembridge distinctive and can link with the objectives that you have identified to guide delivery of the vision.</p> <p>You should consider expanding this section of the document to</p>	<p>Will link into our evidence base document</p> <p>We already have a vision statement (this section was not provided to the IWC)</p> <p>Already covered in Introduction</p>	<p>In hand</p> <p>In hand</p> <p>No further</p>

	<p>really take the opportunity to set the scene for the plan, the issues for your area evidence why they are important to the area. This is not something new as your early consultation work and evidence gathering should provide you with all the information that you need to add depth to this part of the document.</p> <p>We assume that you will have a plan of the area inserted into this section of the document and we are happy to provide the support to help you with any plans or diagrams that you would like to include, using our GIS systems and information.</p> <p>An Examiner will use this part of your document in terms of looking for something that clearly sets out what your local issues are and why they are important and the lack of explanation as currently drafted will not help the examiner.</p>	<p>Plan will be inserted</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>action required</p> <p>In hand</p> <p>In hand</p>
Island Plan Core Strategy Policies	<p>We are uncertain as to what benefit you have from simply repeating the policies of the core strategy in this way. Your neighbourhood plan (NP) will need to be in general conformity with the policies of the plan. It may be better to use some descriptive text in earlier section that sets the scene for Bembridge rather than repeat policies from the plan.</p> <p>Also the references to payment of CIL to local council's is not necessarily needed at this stage in the plan, because it is a legal requirement for the council to do so if it implements and collects CIL in your area.</p>	<p>Inclusion of Core Strategy Policies was intentionally done to inform users of the plan and to link in with CS. Recommend we keep them in.</p> <p>No reason why we shouldn't keep it in. Recommend we left it (slighted amended)</p>	<p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p> <p>ditto</p>
OL.1	<p>This policy is titled location of development. However as currently worded the only part of the policy that relates to location is simply repeating the core strategy policy. The second part of the policy is not worded so that it relates to the location of development at all – but is about what proposals should demonstrate and we would question what</p>	<p>Recommend delete OL1 and re-number rest of policies</p>	<p>ditto</p>

	<p>value this policy has in terms of being a NP policy. We would suggest that you consider whether policy O1 as currently worded is actually required. Are you looking to actually address where new development should be located in a way that adds to the core strategy policy? Is it really about how new development will be integrated into the existing built area?</p> <p>Additionally there is no justification as to the reasoning for the second part of the policy.</p>		
<p>OL.2</p>	<p>Without a justification for limiting development to small scale, how is this SP2 (and para 5.38) compliant? The last sentence goes beyond SP1 (by requiring a need to be demonstrated for pdl sites – presumably both inside and immediately adjacent), but there is currently no clear justification/evidence for it. As currently worded the policy is not in general conformity with the core strategy.</p> <p>Is this policy about residential development or all development? If all development, may it worth putting in more detailed thresholds (as per the housing) for employment uses, perhaps using major development definitions. Again though, there should be a justification as to why those thresholds. Perhaps the size thresholds could be footnoted or explained early in the text of the document to ‘free up’ the policy?</p>	<p>Justification now done.</p> <p>Policy is about all forms of development not just housing (specific housing policy also drafted)</p> <p>The definition of major development is as follows:</p> <p>development involving any one or more of the following—</p> <p>(a)the winning and working of minerals or the use of land for mineral-working deposits;</p> <p>(b)waste development;</p> <p>(c)the provision of dwellinghouses where —</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i)the number of dwellinghouses to be provided is 10 or more; or</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(ii)the development is to be carried out on a site having an area of 0.5 hectares or more and it is not known whether the development falls within sub-paragraph (c)(i);</p> <p>(d)the provision of a building or buildings where the floor space to be created by the development is 1,000 square metres or more; or</p> <p>(e)development carried out on a site having an area of 1 hectare or</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p>

	As currently drafted there is no evidence provided to an examiner which demonstrates why the policy is appropriate and how it has been developed.	more; Recommend policy be re-drafted.	
OL.3	<p>Will need to check this policy against the current permitted development rights, to ensure it complies, particularly with reference to the re-use of redundant or disused buildings.</p> <p>What are the defining characteristics of the local area? Have you got this documented? How would you expect applicants to demonstrate this? Perhaps in the supporting text more information could be provided on how you expect developers to demonstrate how they have met the requirements, which will also make the DC officer's decision-making easier and presumably aligned as closely as possible with your aspirations.</p> <p>Same point for the 'highest standards of architecture'. What criteria would you use to demonstrate highest standards – how would a developer know what you mean? How much of this policy repeats requirements from other policies?</p> <p>The same point about justification for the policy applies here.</p>	<p>Draft consultation document to increase rights for change of use of agricultural buildings to residential. Not yet enacted. Recommend justification refers to development not covered by the GPDO (as amended).</p> <p>Recommend amend 2nd section</p> <p>Ditto</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p> <p>ditto</p>
OL.4	Are there any plans to give a commitment to a regular review/update of the Neighbourhood Action Plan? Is the Neighbourhood Action Plan part of the delivery plan for your NP – this is the first mention of it and it is unclear as to how it relates to the NP. Presumably this will be addressed in any	<p>Recommend we make a commitment to regular review/update of Neighbourhood Action Plan. Need to decide how often.</p> <p>Need to make reference to NAP in Introduction to this</p>	<p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p> <p>Approved</p>

	<p>delivery section that you have in your NP?</p> <p>Why is it just the Health & Wellbeing board that are being consulted upon?</p> <p>You need to be aware that there are restrictions upon pooling of CIL monies and S106 contributions so that you are sure that this policy can be delivered in the way that you intend it to. You also need to be aware that CIL is a community infrastructure levy and that its purpose is to be used to delivery local infrastructure to support the community – the emphasis here is that it is capital funds. You may also like to consider that it is possible for a developer to also provide direct delivery of off-site works.</p>	<p>section.</p> <p>Recommend we delete Health and Wellbeing Board and replace with “relevant departments” (or similar)</p> <p>Recommend this is covered in NAP</p> <p>Recommend this is covered in NAP</p>	<p>18 Sept 13 (see update)</p> <p>Ditto</p> <p>Ditto</p> <p>ditto</p>
H Intro	<p>Para 4: The Core Strategy doesn’t break the 980 figure down, so it would be helpful to have further justification for this method of calculating the figure of 6 units per year. It is important to remember that the core strategy specifically does not breakdown the total rural service centre figures and specifically relates provision/future planning to meet an “identified local need”. Therefore whilst your commentary about the simplified methodology may appeal to be a way of calculating what should be provided in the local area, it is an over-simplified methodology and what the LPA would expect to see is discussion on the findings of your Housing Needs Survey and how this will be provided for.</p> <p>Para 11: How does the first sentence sit with the policy</p>	<p>Recommend:</p> <p>we delete paragraph 4 of the introduction (“The Island Plan Core Strategy defines Bembridge as one of the eleven”)</p> <p>Expand para 5 to further qualify life of HNS</p> <p>Delete paras 9, 10, 11 (regarding NHS findings – these only relate to next 5 years, whereas BNP is valid until 2027 and needs may alter during this time. I’ve already recommended OL1 is deleted and if they are referring to the final paragraph then OL3 is irrelevant</p>	<p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p> <p>ditto</p> <p>ditto</p>

	approaches in OL1 & OL3?	because it relates to outside settlement.	No further action
H.1	<p>It is considered that the general approach is in general conformity with SP1 (and further details a specific 'local sequential test'); however, it does go further by requiring pdl sites to demonstrate a local need. Justification for this, along with evidence to support it, will be extremely useful to be able to defend the position and ensure that such a requirement is not unduly onerous on developers/landowners. Without such justification the policy goes beyond that which would be considered to be in conformity with the core strategy.</p> <p>The policy as currently worded muddles provision in relation to the over simplified breakdown of the core strategy figures and provision in line with the housing needs survey and needs to be completely reviewed.</p> <p>Last para: What's the reference to support this? There is nothing to suggest this in SP2 and para 5.38 talks about smaller-scale development <i>not</i> the GDO definition of minor development. Your assertion that large scale development schemes of 10 or more units are contrary to the core strategy SP2 is a completely inaccurate interpretation of policy SP2.</p>	<p>Will cover this in the justification</p> <p>Agree whole policy needs reviewing in light of HNS</p> <p>Recommend we delete the final paragraph of policy H1</p>	<p>In hand</p> <p>In hand</p> <p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p>
H.2	<p>Will need to explain why the method of calculating the 36 units figure is appropriate and how/if it matches up with local need. Again the policy is muddling an over-simplified calculation based on strategic figures with what your housing needs survey is telling you about local need.</p> <p>We would suggest that as currently worded this is more in line with justification text that explains how you have arrived at</p>	Recommend policy be reviewed and reworked.	Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)

	figures rather than being a specific policy.		
H.3	<p>We do have a concern whether as currently worded the policy conflicts with the ECHR. Local need can be for a range of types of housing, including open market housing and we are not convinced that there is any legal way to prevent any individual from purchasing a house on the open market. Are you confusing meeting a local need with affordable housing? How is existing resident defined?</p> <p>The policy could be re-worked on a local-lettings basis, with a property being marketed to parish residents first for an agreed period, then Island residents and then open market. This would then be applied to affordable housing, but could only be applied to open market housing if the developer were prepared to enter into a s106 agreement. However a s106 agreement usually costs about £1k, and if this is the only element of the agreement and bearing in mind the BPC's preference for development of less than 9 units it may impact on viability of a site. How would you envisage this policy working for 1 open market housing unit?</p> <p>We have serious reservations as to both the legality and enforceability of such an approach.</p>	<p>The purpose of this policy was to put in place a mechanism to ensure that any development approved on the basis of a justification of meeting a local need should be delivered to that local need, in this case either a Bembridge resident or an Isle of Wight resident who wants to move into the village.</p> <p>If a local need has been accepted then there should be no reason for the development to be offered to the wider market in the first instance otherwise it makes a mockery of the justification for approval.</p> <p>We have not confused this with affordable housing.</p> <p>The situation created by this policy is no different to, for example, planning permission being granted for an agricultural workers dwelling (meeting local need) and restricting its occupation to an agricultural worker by condition.</p> <p>I believe our justification will explain the purpose of the policy including a definition of existing resident and I recommend the policy remains as drafted</p>	<p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p>
H.4	<p>Have the discussions with the Safe and Secure Homes Team been held, and if so what were the outcomes?</p> <p>You need to bear in mind that the preferred approach to the delivery of affordable housing is for on-site delivery and the</p>	<p>We have changed policies to 12 units to match findings of HNS.</p> <p>I would recommend we remove the reference to the</p>	<p>Approved</p>

	<p>threshold for this type of development is 10+ units in areas that are not Key Regeneration Areas (Policy DM4 of the core strategy). Given your earlier policy approach relating to only supporting smaller sites then it would not be possible to deliver on-site affordable housing in Bembridge.</p> <p>This means that as a policy approach you will be totally reliant upon contributions to deliver the affordable housing need identified in your local needs housing survey. How can you demonstrate that this approach will work given that contributions are only paid on the basis that a development commences so there is no certainty that delivery can be achieved?</p>	<p>consultation with IWC Safe and Secure Team (Housing) as this can be included in the Action Plan.</p>	<p>18 Sept 13 (see update)</p>
H.5	<p>In order to aid the reader and ensure clarity we would suggest that some punctuation might be useful.</p> <p>Para 2: If it is a replacement dwelling then you will need to be mindful of what could be built under current PD, when considering the 'similar size and scale to the original building'.</p>	<p>This policy has been superseded by D3.</p> <p>Recommend H5 be deleted entirely.</p>	<p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p>
WS Intro	<p>Are there any vacant units in Bembridge? Any primary data information on this could substantiate the first sentence.</p> <p>What is the evidence behind the congestion assertion in para 2?</p> <p>How have the four areas been identified and what is the evidence to support their identification / bespoke policy approach?</p> <p>If you would like some assistance in ensuring consistency in mapping we can provide support to provide/ draw maps for</p>	<p>I will include a reference to an audit of the shops/businesses in Bembridge. I have put the production of an audit in hand.</p> <p>We need to link this into the evidence base and I have put the production of a parking assessment in hand</p> <p>I will do an explanation and link into evidence document</p> <p>The maps were only ever temporary. The LPA's previous "support" for mapping was just a link to a web site which didn't help at all as I didn't have the software. However,</p>	<p>In hand</p> <p>In hand</p> <p>In hand</p> <p>Volunteer came forward to assist with</p>

	you.	I will press LPA for bespoke maps.	plans
WS.1	<p>The marketing requirement goes further than DM10, so it will need to be evidenced that there is an issue and justified that it is the right approach. Both of these issues may be partially identified through the SA process, with an assessment of the different options considered.</p> <p>Conflict with new GPDO permitted development: Applications for new A2 and A3 uses will be supported where this does not result in the loss of existing retail premises. This is now allowed under GPDO Class D.</p> <p>This class permits changes of use from shops to financial and professional services, restaurants and cafes and business for floor areas under 150sqm.</p> <p>This class is limited for 2 years and at the end of this units should revert back to their original use.</p>	<p>I have addressed this in the justification</p> <p>In the light of amendments to the GPDO, we will have to delete the first paragraph of WS1 entirely.</p>	<p>In hand</p> <p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p>
WS.2	<p>What is the evidence to demonstrate that such a policy is required? What is the traditional appearance – where have you described this in any detail? Are you intending to have any local design discussion at all in a separate document that you can sign-post to?</p> <p>Para 1: The first sentence refers to Conservation Areas. Does</p>	<p>Justification will provide a definition of traditional and signpost to VDS</p> <p>I will amend this policy. Justification will provide</p>	<p>In hand</p> <p>In hand</p>

	<p>to the rest of the para and para 2 cover just CA as well, or is it intended to be village centre wide? Why should fascia's and projecting signage be kept to a minimum?</p> <p>Para 3: Could this be amalgamated with para 2 in any way? This could save repeating a lot of text within the policy.</p> <p>Para 4: Is it worth moving this, or having it in conjunction with the first sentence of para 1 as they both refer to the Conservation Area? Does it clash though, as they refer to 'traditional appearance' which could be achieved without being constructed of 'traditional materials'?</p> <p>Para 5: Why? If this is about protecting the quality of dark skies, then this approach needs to be clearly articulated in any justification for the policy approach – what is the quality within Bembridge?</p> <p>Conflict with other regulations: Policy Restricts illuminated signage. Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 2007 Advert regulations give 'deemed consent' for different types of adverts. Some of these can be illuminated through Part 1. Illuminated signage is also not restricted to street lit areas.</p>	<p>explanation</p> <p>No – it was done deliberately to differentiate between the two areas.</p> <p>Recommend first reference to Conservation Areas be replaced with "Village Centre". Also introduce "composite materials" as these are now approved for use in Conservation Areas.</p> <p>I will review the policy and add reference to dark sky map</p> <p>I will address in justification</p>	<p>No further action</p> <p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p> <p>In hand</p> <p>In hand</p>
WS.3	<p>There is no flexibility in this policy. If, a suitable local-scale employer wanted to set up in an area outside of these for practical (and evidenced) reasons, then you would on the basis of the policy as written advocate refusal and are you sure that is what you want to do? The Core Strategy policy approach allows for such a need to be demonstrated for such locations. There is concern that the current policy doesn't have that and</p>	<p>Recommend adding to the end of the first part of the policy:</p> <p>"unless an economic need is demonstrated for development outside these areas or the development relates to the re-use of redundant or disused buildings which would lead to an enhancement of the immediate</p>	<p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p>

	<p>would therefore not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development or be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The requirement for marketing any employment site goes beyond the Core Strategy. What is the evidence and justification to do this?</p>	<p>setting.” (So as to comply with OL3)</p> <p>It employs the same marketing requirement as Core Strategy SP4 uses for loss of tourism bed spaces. I am surprised it did not feature in Core Strategy DM10 (loss of retail uses) for consistency. Justification will cover this.</p>	<p>In hand</p>
WS.4	<p>We would be interested to know what the evidence for such a facility is. Is this something that the site owners are supportive of? Is the redevelopment of the site referred to exclusively as a car park or could it be the provision of a car park along with something else? How do you envisage the public car parks will be funded and maintained? Is this something that you would envisage any CIL funding contributing towards the delivery of?</p>	<p>In the light of WG discussions to favour support for parking solutions rather than providing a car park I would recommend we retain the aspiration of the village centre car park but amend the policy to encourage other means of addressing the problem and remove the reference to the BT site into the justification.</p>	<p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p>
WS.5	<p>You have a map setting out the Embankment Industrial Zones, but no map illustrating what you mean by Bembridge Harbour. Do you mean the actual harbour?</p> <p>See comments on WS.3. What happens if there isn't enough space for existing businesses to expand on pdl?</p> <p>Para 3: What is the evidence for this – has some form of visual assessment been undertaken? If you are supporting marine uses, what if someone needs an indoor facility where a boat can be service upright and remain masted? This is a good example of where evidence to justify the policy approach is needed to be able to convince an examiner that this is the right policy approach for the area.</p>	<p>Recommend we delete reference to Bembridge Harbour</p> <p>Recommend we expand policy to include the following wording: “Development schemes outside the zoned area will need to demonstrate that no PDL is available or an economic case can be made for expansion of existing businesses outside the zoned areas”</p> <p>Recommend we delete reference to 2 storeys (we have other policies requiring development to be in character and keeping with surrounding development)</p>	<p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p> <p>ditto</p> <p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p>

	<p>Conflict with GPD: Previously developed land' Part 8 Class A - This class permits erection, extension or alterations to industrial buildings or warehouses. This class does not restrict development to previously developed land.</p> <p>'Maximum height of 2 storeys' – GPDO Part 8 Class A Permitted development allows 5 metres within 10 metres of the boundary and 15m or equal to the highest building in the area which ever is the lower, further than 10 metres from the boundary</p>	<p>I will amend policy to clarify it relates to development proposals outside the remit of PD</p> <p>Recommended above we delete reference to 3 storeys</p>	<p>In hand</p> <p>In hand</p>
WS.6	<p>To what end is the support in this policy given? If it is, for example, due to localised economic benefits then this should be explained.</p> <p>Presumably it is not the intention to support development on the air strip itself – but as currently worded this policy approach would not preclude such a proposal.</p> <p>What is meant by air services?</p>	<p>Will be provided in justification</p> <p>Will amend Bembridge Airport zone map</p> <p>Will define in justification</p>	<p>In hand</p> <p>In hand</p> <p>In hand</p>
WS.7	<p>Your policy numbering needs updating as it duplicates the previous policy.</p> <p>Does the policy have regard to national policies and has it taken into account the recent PD changes to agricultural buildings?</p> <p>In order to ensure the policy is being applied correctly, might it be helpful to the decision-maker for small businesses, recreation and tourism purposes to be defined?</p>	<p>Corrected</p> <p>Yes. IWC have since screened and have advised PD does not affect this policy</p> <p>I will include definitions in justification</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>No further action needed</p> <p>In hand</p>

	<p>Point 1 – why is that particularly a consideration?</p> <p>Point 5 – why have in this particular policy, but not in others? Is it worth considering a more general traffic-based policy (supported by evidence?)</p>	<p>Because reconstruction changes the character of the building. Justification will cover.</p> <p>This point was included because it is dealing with rural locations. Recommend keeping it as it is.</p>	<p>In hand</p> <p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p>
T.1	<p>Whilst the Tourism Development Plan informed the approach in the Core Strategy and is referred to in the ‘you may also like to look at’ box, it is almost 10 years old (2005), and I would be very concerned now to use such a dated evidence document (unless it can be demonstrated that it is still relevant - although as it is pre-recession). We do not understand what you mean by the Council’s Green Tourism Plan. If you want to continue referring to these documents it would be useful to put in hyperlinks.</p>	<p>Recommend we delete 2nd paragraph of policy. (NB Eco Island did have a Green Tourism Plan but since they have updated their website it has disappeared)</p>	<p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p>
T.2	<p>It would appear that this policy repeats SP4, so the question is what is locally distinctive about this policy that adds value to the Core Strategy policy.</p> <p>The reference should be to SP4, not SP5</p>	<p>Agreed – recommend we delete this policy entirely</p> <p>Corrected</p>	<p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update) Done</p>
T.3	<p>Need to check logistics of including such a condition, mainly around its enforceability.</p> <p>Specific design policies are referred to in this policy, but we could not find any; rather, design is mentioned in a number of other policies in relation to a whole range of subjects. If design is considered to be sufficiently important could/should it have a dedicated section or policies?</p>	<p>Policy reflects strong community desire. Recommend we retain this policy and see how it stands up to examination.</p> <p>Design policies had not been done at that time</p>	<p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p> <p>In hand</p>
EH Intro	<p>Para 3: Refer to Flood Zones 2 and 3 a & b.</p>	<p>Amend</p>	<p>Done</p>

	<p>Para 3: You really need to reference the source of the identification of the Fluvial Area Potentially Susceptible to Climate Change. What does this mean to Bembridge and is the policy approach appropriate? The SA process would be the place to tease this out.</p> <p>Para 4: It might be useful to consider having a percentage figure for how much of the parish is covered by the AONB.</p>	<p>Source was proposals map Island Plan Core Strategy. This reference has been inserted</p> <p>Amend accordingly. (NB Parish is 915ha. AONB is approx 35%)</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>Done</p>
EH.1	<p>Para 1: It might be helpful to the applicant / decision-maker to have amenity defined in more detail (in the supporting text or as a footnote).</p> <p>Para 2: Again this refers to the design policies of the plan. If there are other design policies, what will these add beyond this policy and DM2?</p>	<p>Will define “amenity” in footnote</p> <p>Design policies will add detail but recommend reference be removed in favour of a “catch all” policy cross reference in the introduction.</p>	<p>In hand</p> <p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p>
EH.2	<p>Para 1: As written all applications should be accompanied by some form of statement identifying and assessing the heritage asset and the impacts from the proposed development. Firstly, is this something that is already required through the planning application validation process (if so reference can be made to this)? Secondly, how does this requirement (if it isn't in place already) sit with the Government's drive to reduce the requirements for submitting information?</p> <p>Para 1: What does this add / do differently beyond DM11?</p> <p>Para 2: See comments above re design policies.</p>	<p>Consultation indicates community is keen to retain existing character of Bembridge. Parish Council Planning Committee Members have indicated that Heritage Statements have no prescribed form and often do not address these issues properly.</p> <p>Recommend this policy be amended to state that Heritage Statements accompanying planning applications must identify the heritage assets etc</p>	<p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p>
EH.3	<p>Para 1, first sentence: What does this have to do with landscape? These issues are already covered in other policies, so do they really need to be repeated here?</p>	<p>This is to guide development in the rural areas and to reinforce new development must be justified. What's wrong with this cross referencing with other policies? Core Strategy does this. Recommend we leave it in.</p>	<p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p>

	<p>Para 1, 2nd sentence: The protection afforded to the AONB is already enshrined in national and local policy, so does it need to be repeated here?</p> <p>Para 2: Can you demonstrate that there is a sufficient problem with such development that requires this element of the policy? Has the problem been picked up through the SA process?</p> <p>Para 3: See comments above re design policies.</p>	<p>Core Strategy does not have a specific AONB policy. Our policy provides greater guidance. Recommend we leave it in.</p> <p>The whole point of this part of the policy is to guide new development of this nature. There is clear evidence across the IW that stable proliferation does impact on the rural landscape. Community is anxious to protect the parish from the same problem. Recommend we leave it in and add in agricultural buildings as well.</p> <p>Justifications of the policies will reinforce the above points</p>	<p>Ditto</p> <p>Ditto</p> <p>In hand</p>
EH.4	<p>Is overriding need greater than the local need referred to in other policies? Is it intended as something different, and, if so, is that too prescriptive?</p> <p>One comma in five lines makes it a very difficult policy to read. For example, is it just the hedges that are of importance, or is it the trees, woodland and hedges of importance?</p> <p>How is importance been identified and defined? Is it mapped anywhere?</p>	<p>Justification will demonstrate overriding need is different to local need. The purpose of policy is to indicate that loss of trees/hedgerows will only be permitted in exception circumstances.</p> <p>I will reword the policy to deal with this</p> <p>Justification will define.</p>	<p>In hand</p> <p>In hand</p> <p>In hand</p>
EH.5	<p>Bearing in mind policy DM15 Coastal Management, how does this policy add value to the applicant or the decision-maker?</p> <p>...coastal defence works ... will be supported where this protects land property – is there any other reason that a</p>	<p>DM15 sets out the IWC's approach to managing development in coastal areas and I agree that our policy did not add any value to this.</p> <p>Agree there is no other reason for coast defence scheme. I believe what we were trying to achieve was protection</p>	

	<p>coastal defence scheme would be proposed? How does the policy approach reflect what the Shoreline Management Policy approach is for the Bembridge area?</p>	<p>of residential property and curtilage and/or businesses and their associated land from further coastal erosion.</p> <p>I have looked at the SMP and it appears to me that the proposals for managing coastal retreat are all contained therein and I do not see how we are adding anything to this where the policy is to protect. If our policy is to support coastal defence where the SMP is advocating Managed Realignment or No Active Intervention then we are at odds with the SMP and I can't see how our policy could be supported.</p> <p>On balance I recommend we delete this policy. This will necessitate the removal of the 2nd community objective as there will be no supporting policy.</p>	<p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p>
LW.1	<p>It might be useful to cross refer to the Core Strategy proposals map – where open spaces are shown. If you discuss overriding need would you not also consider and the re-provision elsewhere – if this is the case what would this policy add that the policy approach in the core strategy does not already cover?</p> <p>Para 2: Could this site (and any of the others listed in the introduction) be designated as Local Green Space through the NP? This is something proactive that you could achieve whereas the designation as an area as a village green has to be supported by evidence of longer term use and is the subject of a completely separate legal process.</p>	<p>Core Strategy open space will be overlaid on our plan of Bembridge in the Introduction section of our NHP</p> <p>Not all the open space in and around Bembridge is shown on the CS proposals map. The whole point of the policy is because the community recognises the various open spaces do contribute to the character of the area and they wish to see them protected from inappropriate development.</p> <p>There are other green spaces in and around the village not identified on our list in the introduction. Furthermore, whilst some have public access they are clearly privately owned.</p> <p>I would recommend we separate out the CS strategy</p>	<p>In hand</p>

		<p>designated open space (which only comprises Lincoln Way, playing fields at Steyne Park and adjacent school playing fields and the two cemeteries in Lane End) and identify the Local Green Spaces and amend the policy to reflect this. (I have prepared and Local Green Spaces audit)</p> <p>I would also recommend we amend our references “public open space” to “open space to which the public has access”.</p>	<p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p> <p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p>
LW.2	<p>Para 1: Is this as a replacement for the existing facility at St Helens (as suggested by the wording of the community objective and introductory paragraphs)? Have there been any discussions with the PCT (or relevant body) and St Helens over this? Do you have a site in mind? Is this simply an aspiration or a deliverable policy action?</p> <p>Para 2: Bearing in mind the emphasis placed on demonstrating need throughout the other policies, can you demonstrate that the surgery is currently operating at or near capacity or for example perhaps that the layout of the current building doesn't work (and are any of these having an adverse impact on the service)?</p> <p>Para 3: Rather than include this statement in this policy, would it give greater impact and coverage if this is stated explicitly upfront in the NP, then it can apply to all policies.</p> <p>Perhaps the new medical centre and extension to the surgery</p>	<p>This is entirely aspirational. However, IWC has advised us that a NHP can be aspirational. The policy reflects community wishes and thus if a site came forward in the future, there would be a policy in place to support it. I would recommend policy is retained.</p> <p>Aspirational (see above).</p> <p>Agreed. Recommend we remove this paragraph.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p> <p>No further action</p> <p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p>

	could be listed in the Neighbourhood Action Plan referred to in policy OL.4 Community Infrastructure Payments?		
LW.3	<p>Para 1: Bearing in mind that the public toilets are existing structures, what NP policies are relevant to refurb/improvements? What makes this a land use policy that is relevant to a planning document?</p> <p>Para 2: Whilst I understand wanting to support existing community facilities, how will the NP policies be relevant to a community building continuing its existing use? You need to consider the land use implications in terms of loss of buildings and also consider whether this approach goes beyond the core strategy policy in any way.</p>	<p>There is an intention to re-furbish the village centre public toilets. Given that they are in the conservation area and the works are likely to fall outside the remit of permitted development, a policy to support the works would be relevant.</p> <p>The policy intention is to prevent community buildings being lost to other development. Eg the library site being sold off for redevelopment.</p> <p>As well as providing the justification I will rework this policy to remove to references to “subject to other policies etc” as this bit is superfluous. Otherwise I recommend we retain this policy.</p>	<p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p>
GA Intro	Para 5: What is meant by congested? Is this just at peak times, or 24 hours a day? What is the evidence of this (i.e. traffic survey and then comparing it to other village centres to demonstrate a particular problem)?	<p>Evidence (parking assessment – in hand) will prove congestion. Comparison-wise, of the 11 rural service centres, only Bembridge, Niton, Rookley and Arreton do not have village car parks. Of these, only Niton is a reasonable comparison to Bembridge in terms of a village centre and the range of shops and services it has. I can link this information into the Evidence Base.</p> <p>Justification will support the policy as worded.</p>	<p>In hand</p>

GA.1	What is the evidence that these are suitable provisions? Are they applying standards or have they been derived from surveying the existing provision?	There are no car parking policies in the CS or any guidelines produced by the IWC (although they claim to be working on them). Our policy is designed to give developers clarity of what we want to see in our community and this is linked back to the evidence of congestion in roads. I do not believe the policy content is unreasonable and I recommend we keep this policy.	Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)
GA.2	<p>Para 1: So any development that could be seen from a public right of way (including roads?) wouldn't comply with the policy? As it is phrased expected to, shouldn't there be something that sets out what happens if it can't demonstrated?</p> <p>Paras 2&3: will be supported and would be supported – should be consistent.</p>	<p>New development would not be permitted to block a public access. In terms of maintaining existing views, what we were trying to achieve was to ensure that new development would not obstruct existing open views from our footpaths and bridleways, particularly with high fencing etc. It never was about stopping development which could be seen from public roads for rights of way. On balance, it is difficult to word our intentions in a positive way (as opposed to negative (eg “no development will be permitted which...”))</p> <p>I recommend we delete first part of this part of the policy</p> <p>Corrected</p>	<p>Approved 18 Sept 13 (see update)</p> <p>Done</p>

IWC suggestion 9 August 2013 – Government has issued a Consultation Document (Greater Flexibilities for changes of Use) and may wish to check the proposals against draft policies.

Review of document indicates:

- To create a permitted development right to assist change of use and the associated physical works from an existing building used as a small shop or provider of professional/financial services (A1 and A2 uses) to residential use (C3);
- To create a permitted development right to enable retail use (A1) to change to a bank or a building society;
- To create a permitted development right to assist change of use and the associated physical works from existing buildings used for agricultural purposes to change to residential use (C3);
- To extend the permitted development rights for premises used as offices (B1), hotels (C1), residential (C2 and C2A), non-residential institutions (D1), and leisure and assembly (D2) to change use to a state funded school, to also be able to change to nurseries providing childcare; and
- To create a permitted development right to allow a building used for agricultural purposes of up to 500m² to be used as a new state funded school or nursery providing childcare.

The changes proposed in this consultation document will help make better use of existing buildings, support rural communities and high streets, provide new housing and contribute to the provision of child care for working families.

MY RECOMMENDATIONS

The above document is only a consultation document. No guarantee the proposals will be enacted and I believe it would be wrong to formulate our policies on draft proposals. However, I have looked at the policies which may be affected by these proposals and made some adjustments in the justifications to the effect of referring to schemes which do not fall outside the remit of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order (as amended).

UPDATE

At meeting of Working Group on 18 September 2013, the recommendations as above were considered and approved. The amendments have been incorporated into Version 4 of the draft plan.