

No. 11

Changes Made Following  
Consultation of the Draft  
Core Strategy

(January 2011)



**Core Strategy Background Paper No. 11**

**Changes Made Following  
Consultation on the Draft Core Strategy**

**January 2011**

## **Changes Made Following Consultation on the Draft Core Strategy**

### **Section 1 - Introduction**

- 1.1 The section has been updated to include summaries of the consultation undertaken during preparation of the Core Strategy.
- 1.2 A general explanation has been incorporated about the revocation of the Regional Spatial Strategy (see also Section 4 below) and the anticipated Decentralisation and Localism Bill from Parliament. Additional emphasis has been given to the place making agenda and spatially focussed approach.

### **Section 2 - Key Issue and Challenges**

- 2.1 A number of maps have been included to help develop the District Portrait which incorporates a more detailed analysis of the characteristics of the District and its towns and villages in response to comments received from a number of stakeholders.
- 2.2 This 'placed based' approach highlights more clearly the special characteristics of the District and the local challenges, issues and opportunities, through the vision and aims as well as the strategic policies included in the Core Strategy.

### **Section 3 - Vision, Aims and Objectives**

- 3.1 The content of this section remains relatively unchanged although the Council's aspirations are described in more positive language.
- 3.2 A number of objectives have been strengthened and an additional objective incorporated to protect and enhance the wider countryside for its landscape, amenity, biodiversity, flood management, recreation and natural resource value.

### **Section 4 - Spatial Development Strategy**

#### **General Amendments**

- 4.1 *Revocation of the Regional Spatial Strategy*
- 4.1.1 At the time of 'Publication' of the Submission Draft Core Strategy, the Development Plan for Selby District comprises the Regional Spatial Strategy (the Yorkshire and Humber Plan), and 'Saved' Local Plan policies, namely Selby District Local Plan, North Yorkshire Minerals Local Plan and North Yorkshire Waste Local Plan.

- 4.1.2 On 6<sup>th</sup> July 2010 the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government announced the revocation of RSS with immediate effect.
- 4.1.3 As a result of the Secretary of State's revocation decision the Council reviewed the Core Strategy and the evidence base on which it is founded, and came to the conclusion that while the policies and context provided by RSS were no longer applicable the RSS evidence base remains robust and relevant, particularly since the RSS evidence had been subject to a process of consultation and Examination (See Background Paper N0. 9 - The Local Housing Target ). The Council has therefore chosen not to review the resultant targets or introduce local variations, and the Core Strategy continues to rely on the RSS evidence, although references to RSS have been removed from the document.
- 4.1.4 Following a successful legal challenge the revocation decision has subsequently been quashed and RSS has been reinstated as part of the Development Plan.
- 4.1.5 The Governments intended abolition of RSS will consequently be delayed until autumn 2011 when the provisions of the Decentralisation and Localism Bill are given statutory effect.
- 4.1.6 As the programme for preparation of the Core Strategy envisages adoption just after enactment of the Bill specific references to RSS have not been reinstated within the Core Strategy as this would quickly date the document. However for the purposes of current legislation, and prescribed Regulations, it should be noted that the Core Strategy is compliant within RSS, and this has been acknowledged by Local Government for Yorkshire and the Humber, through formal response to consultation on the draft Core Strategy
- 4.2 *The Selby Area Action Plan*
- 4.2.1 Subsequent to consulting on the Draft Core Strategy, the Council has reviewed the Local Development Scheme and decided not to proceed with the Selby Area Action Plan. Instead a combined district-wide Site Allocations DPD is being progressed as a high priority. This does not affect the broad spatial distribution of housing.
- 4.2.2 Views on the appropriateness of the SAAP were fairly equally divided and the Council have taken the view that the limited benefits of a separate SAAP do not outweigh the benefits of concentrating resources into the Allocations DPD. This allows a comprehensive approach to development allocations to be delivered District-wide at the earliest possible date, to the benefit of all local communities and developers alike.
- 4.2.4 Amendments have therefore been made to Section 4 to reflect this revised approach. The villages formerly included in the SAAP – Barlby/Osgodby, Brayton and Thorpe Willoughby retain their status as Designated Service Villages and their continued role in complementing the focus of growth in Selby is referred to in the text.

### ***Specific Amendments***

#### 4.3 *Settlement Hierarchy*

4.3.1 A number of amendments have been made to the settlement hierarchy which affects a small number of proposed Designated Service Villages and proposed Secondary Villages, in response to additional evidence, e.g. updated flood risk data, and the consultation responses on the Draft Core Strategy.

##### *Cawood, Ulleskelf and Wistow*

4.3.2 Subsequent to the publication of the draft Core Strategy, the Environment Agency has released more up to date information on flood risk. This principally affects the River Ouse catchment and indicates that a number of settlements are now affected by a higher probability of flood risk, although the risk of flooding is reduced to a low residual risk where there are modern flood defences such as at Selby. At the same time land at reduced risk has been identified in villages such as Cawood and Ulleskelf, which were previously regarded as high flood risk.

4.3.3 As a number of changes have also been made to the District housing requirement and the planned spatial distribution of development (after consultation on the Draft Core Strategy), the Council has undertaken a review of the PPS25 Sequential Test. This has resulted in a reassessment of the growth potential and 'Service Village' status of Cawood, Ulleskelf and Wistow.

4.3.4 Designated Service Villages have been selected on the basis of sustainability criteria (location, access to services etc), and potential to accommodate additional housing development. At the time of publishing the Draft Core Strategy, while Cawood and Ulleskelf were considered to have sustainable characteristics they were not considered suitable for continued growth owing to high flood risk. The updated flood risk data suggests that there is potential for limited housing development which avoids high flood risk land in both villages. Cawood and Ulleskelf have therefore been added to the list of Designated Service Villages.

4.3.5 Conversely, Wistow which was previously identified as a designated Service Village has been reclassified as a Secondary Village as a result of a higher flood risk assessment.

##### *Byram and Brotherton*

4.3.6 Byram and Brotherton are relatively sustainable settlements which share a good range of local services and have good accessibility to services and employment in nearby Castleford and Pontefract. Neither was previously proposed as a Designated Service Village because of constraints on future growth. However, work in connection with the Site Allocations DPD has identified a number of potential development sites and both villages have been Designated as 'linked' Service Villages.

#### *Appleton Roebuck*

- 4.3.7 Information provided by Appleton Roebuck Parish Council demonstrates the role played by the village within a network of surrounding settlements. This is underpinned by the proactive approach being taken in the village to the improvement of local services, and the suggestion that modest housing development would help support this objective. As a consequence it is considered that Appleton Roebuck meets the provisions of Paragraph 4 of PPS7, (as referred to in the Background Paper) which endorses the encouragement of limited development in smaller settlements where these fulfil a valuable function within their local area. The Council supports the view that limited growth can strengthen the local role of settlements, and is satisfied that there is potential for further growth in the village. Appleton Roebuck is therefore reclassified as a Designated Service Village.

#### *Whitley*

- 4.3.8 In response to consultation on the Draft Core Strategy mixed views were received on the 'status' of Whitley and whether there should be further growth in the village. While there is insufficient evidence to justify designating Whitley as a Service Village in its own right a number of consultees suggested that because Eggborough and Whitley are located in close proximity and share a number of facilities (the local primary school is situated in Whitley) there is a case for classifying them as 'Linked' Service Villages. This view is supported by the Council particularly since it will provide a degree of flexibility when considering potential development sites through the Site Allocations DPD.

#### 4.4 *Policy CP1 Spatial Development Strategy*

- 4.4.1 Responses to the Draft Core Strategy indicated a balance of opinion against the continued restrictive approach being adopted, particularly in Secondary Villages. There was concern that the approach was unduly restrictive and that some limited development within smaller villages would be beneficial to them. Indeed there has been an undercurrent of opinion to this effect throughout the previous consultations undertaken.
- 4.4.2 Consequently Policy CP1 has been amended to permit the filling of small linear gaps in otherwise built up frontages on Greenfield land and the conversion of farmsteads, provided the development does not adversely affect the density, character and form of the local area.
- 4.4.3 For the sake of clarity for development management purposes the sections of the policy covering development in villages has been expanded slightly to provide a greater degree of detail on the types of development permitted within both categories of village.

#### 4.5 *Previously Developed Land (PDL)*

- 4.5.1 In a rural District such as Selby opportunities to use Previously Developed Land provide a less consistent supply than in larger urban areas. Over the

last 10 years, approximately 10% of housing completions have been on previously developed land from within residential curtilages. The deletion of residential curtilages from the PPS3 definition (July 2010) of 'previously developed land', coupled with the decision to allow limited greenfield development in Secondary Villages, has led to a reduction in the target for the proportion of development occurring on PDL over the period 2010 to 2026, from 50% to 40%. This figure is slightly lower than the 45% originally proposed in early drafts of RSS for Selby District, prior to specific figures for individual authorities being omitted in the final document. However, the text associated with Policy CP1 continues to emphasise that priority will be given to achieving the highest possible percentage.

4.5.2 The Previously Developed Land trajectory in Appendix 1 has been amended to include and the new target. In addition, the anticipated revocation of the Regional Spatial Strategy means that there will be development plan context for the previous years of the trajectory since 2004 and therefore reference to them is omitted.

#### 4.6 *Development Limits*

4.6.1 In response to concerns raised in the Draft Core Strategy consultation amendments are made to the note on Development Limits within the Section 4 text, to clarify that the Development Limits of all three towns and Designated Service Villages will be reviewed as part of the Site Allocations DPD process. A more comprehensive reference is included in Section 5.

#### 4.7 *Other Minor Amendments*

4.7.1 The following amendments have been made to the text associated with Policy CP1 in direct response to individual representations:

- 1) A reference to encouraging rail and water for uses generating large freight movements has been included in the paragraph Other Locational Principles - c) Accessibility;
- 2) A reference to protecting and enhancing biodiversity has been included in the paragraph Other Locational Principles – d) Environment and Natural Resources
- 3) An amplification on the principles which will govern the undertaking of localised Green Belt reviews has been included within the section Other Locational Principles – e) Green Belt/Character of Individual Settlements.

#### 4.8 *Key Diagram*

4.8.1 The key diagram is amended to provide more clarity and to take on board changes to the list of Designated Service Villages. AQ number of additional plans and diagrams are also included.

## **Section 5 - Creating Sustainable Communities**

### *5.1 The Housing Requirement*

5.1.1 As referred to above in order to ensure the adopted Core Strategy remains up to date references to RSS have generally been deleted although the draft Core Strategy will remain in conformity with RSS until RSS is revoked

5.1.2 Having reviewed the general context for the local housing target (See Background Paper No. 9 - The Local Housing Target), the Council remains of the view that an annual target of 440 dwellings up to 2026 is appropriate and can be supported. An appropriate comment has been included in the 'Context' to the Section

### *5.2 The Selby Area Action Plan (SAAP)*

5.2.1 Following consultation on the draft Core Strategy, the Council has reviewed the Local Development Scheme and taken the decision not to proceed with the Selby Area Action Plan. (See commentary on Section 4 changes).

5.2.2 A number of amendments have been made to the text and Policy CP1 to accommodate this change, the main one of which is to indicate the general scale of the split in housing development between Selby and the surrounding villages which were previously included in the SAAP.

5.2.3 Policy CP2 has been amended to reflect the disaggregated housing target for the former SAAP area which has been apportioned on a 50/50 basis between Selby and the former Selby AAP villages. The precise location of housing will be determined through a Site Allocations DPD.

### *5.3 Development Limits/Strategic Countryside Gaps*

5.3.1 In response to concerns raised in the Draft Core Strategy consultation an additional paragraphs are inserted in the text amendments on Development Limits and Strategic Countryside Gaps in order to improve clarity on these issues.

### *5.4 Strategic Sites*

5.4.1 Following consideration of views submitted, further research has been undertaken into a range of issues including flood risk, traffic impacts, and viability issues.

#### *Olympia Park*

5.4.2 North Yorkshire County Council confirm that an acceptable level of mitigation can be provided to offset traffic impacts on town centre junctions arising from the development of both strategic sites and that the proposed works are feasible. Independent commercial advice also confirms that Olympia Park, which is accompanied by a 'delivery framework document' is a commercially viable site and it is confirmed as a deliverable strategic allocation. An additional policy which sets out the Councils requirements for the development of the site (with defined site boundaries) as a comprehensive mixed use scheme is included in the Core Strategy. The



housing yield has been increased to 1,000 dwellings, and the employment land take (including B1, B8, and higher value uses) has been reduced to 23 hectares in the period up to 2026.

#### *Cross Hills*

5.4.3 Following publication of updated EA Flood Risk maps for the Selby area the Level 2 SFRA for Cross Hills Lane has been updated to reflect a higher level of flood risk. This was accompanied by a revised PPS25 Sequential Test. These demonstrates that the site remains appropriate from a flood risk point of view and that the flood risk can be adequately mitigated, although the yield is reduced to about 800 dwellings. The site has however been removed from the Core Strategy on the basis that there is insufficient evidence available at the present time to demonstrate its commercial viability and deliverability.

5.4.3 The Council is satisfied that the Selby housing target of about 2,300 dwellings can be accommodated on Olympia Park plus a number of alternative sites to be identified through a Site Allocations DPD. This may include the Cross Hills Lane site depending on whether viability and deliverability can be demonstrated in time for inclusion in Preferred Options of the Site Allocations DPD.

#### 5.5 *Updated Housing Distribution Figures - Policy CP2*

5.5.1 The table in Policy CP2 has been updated to a 2010 base date. The general distribution of future new housing (commitments +allocations) across the District is broadly the same as in the Draft Core Strategy subject to minor changes resulting from updating the base date, including the March 2010 figure for commitments and amending the SAAP category to Selby only. An allowance of 500 dwellings is included in the Designated Service Villages category for the inclusion of the villages formerly within the SAAP.

#### 5.6 *Phasing*

5.6.1 Additional text is included to provide greater clarity on the issue of phasing of future development. The Core strategy is a strategic document and can only provide a broad prospective. The Site Allocations DPD will provide much greater detail on this issue.

#### 5.7 *Housing Trajectory*

5.7.1 The anticipated revocation of the Regional Spatial Strategy means that there will be no development plan context covering the previous years of the trajectory since 2004 and reference to them is therefore omitted. This means the below target delivery forecast up to 2013, resulting from the poor economic conditions, is compensated by slightly higher targets in later years.

#### 5.8 *Maintaining a Five Year Land Supply*

5.8.1 Draft Core Strategy Policy CP2 indicates that should there be a need to top up the Five Year Supply in the intervening period between the

adoption of the Core Strategy and adoption of the Allocations DPD, sites will be drawn from the pool of sites in Phase 2 of Policy H2 of the Selby District Local Plan. The policy indicated that a Supplementary Planning Document may be necessary to aide the selection process. However, further work on this topic suggests that by using a single criterion that sites must 'not prejudice decisions better made through the Site Allocations DPD' the number of sites is reduced to a level which it is appropriate to release 'en bloc' and a more sophisticated selection mechanism becomes unnecessary. In the interests of reacting quickly to any shortfall reference to the use of a Supplementary Planning Document is removed.

#### 5.9 *Housing Mix*

- 5.9.1 The section has been updated to remove references to RSS and revised to provide a more local focus rather than reliance on national policy.
- 5.9.2 In the light of comments received, more emphasis has been given to the need to provide for specialist housing for example the disabled, as well as meeting the needs of older people.
- 5.9.3 There are no suggested changes to Policy CP4 itself.

#### *Affordable Housing*

#### 5.10 *Percentage Affordable Housing Provision*

- 5.10.1 Policy C5 has been amended following consultation and further work on the viability of smaller sites at thresholds of 3, 5 and 10 dwellings. Core Strategy Policy was intended to provide a more flexible approach to changing economic circumstances by reviewing the percentage affordable requirement, through a Supplementary Planning Documents rather than the policy itself. Although a number of respondents welcomed this flexibility, others questioned the appropriateness of using Supplementary Planning Guidance in this way.
- 5.10.2 After further consideration, taking into account the fact that the viability of development can also be affected by more local considerations (including geographical location and the site characteristics) in addition to the general health of the housing market, the Council has taken the view that there will always be limitations on the applicability of any general requirement figure which offsets the value of attempting to provide regular reviews. The proposal to include interim percentage requirements within an Supplementary Planning Document has therefore been abandoned.
- 5.10.3 Consequently, the Council has chosen to adopt an approach which sets out its full aspirations for affordable housing provision given favourable circumstances, as tested in the Economic Viability Assessment. It also continues to fully acknowledge that there will be circumstances, particularly short term, when this target cannot be met and that there is a need for flexibility on an individual scheme basis. However it does provide a degree of certainty for developers in terms of an upper limit on the requirement
- 5.10.4 The Economic Viability Assessment indicated that in favourable market

conditions (as existing in early 2007) prior to the economic downturn a percentage provision of 40% would theoretically have been viable or marginally viable on 77% of the site options tested and 50% provision viable or marginally viable on 57% of sites. The Council has therefore taken the view that, 40% provision is not an unreasonable upper level target.

#### *Threshold for On-Site Provision*

- 5.10.5 The Draft Core Strategy acknowledged the fact that 60% of affordable housing need arises outside Selby and attempted to achieve the provision of affordable housing in smaller settlements and on smaller sites. A threshold of 3 dwellings was proposed in Secondary Villages in order to encourage some limited provision closest to where the need arises.
- 5.10.6 The lower thresholds were challenged at draft Core Strategy stage by a number of respondents and the Council therefore, undertook further work through its consultants, in order to test the viability of lower thresholds. The results of this indicated that thresholds of 3 and 5 units would not be sufficiently viable in even the most favourable conditions. However, 10 units were shown to have a sufficient degree of viability in favourable conditions, with two-thirds of sites tested being viable or marginally viable and 47% being viable or marginally viable at 10% provision, to at least warrant consideration for on site affordable housing provision and provide a lower threshold limit.
- 5.10.7 The Council therefore considers that in the light of the high requirement for affordable housing it is appropriate to introduce a site size threshold of 10 units (or 0.3ha) or more as basis on which negotiations will held with regard to the provision of on-site affordable housing.

#### *Commuted Sum Payments*

- 5.10.8 Draft Core Strategy Policy CP5 made provision to request a commuted sum contribution towards affordable housing, where viable, from all development sites below the proposed thresholds other than in Selby. However, because the previously anticipated yield from on-site provision on smaller sites has been found to be unviable and the threshold raised, the Council considers that it would be appropriate to negotiate a more limited commuted sum contribution on all sites below the threshold throughout the District (including the Selby area). The Council considers that the very high need for affordable housing within the District, and the reliance on private developments to meet it, justifies an approach where all developments make some contribution to affordable housing wherever this is proved to be viable. The contributions will be used to assist the provision of smaller schemes for affordable housing which are located more closely to the local sources of need, which would otherwise not be possible from the provision from larger sites located in larger settlements.

#### 5.11 *The Travelling Community*

- 5.11.1 The text accompanying Policy CP7 has been amended to reflect the fact that the Council has accepted the GTAA for North Yorkshire, and the

- number of pitches that it is consider that there is a demonstrable need for.
- 5.11.2 Text has also been amended to reflect the updated situation with the progress of the Site Allocations DPD in terms of the allocation of G&T sites.
- 5.11.3 An addition is also necessary to reflect the situation with evidence produced relating to the research that has been produced on the need for the accommodation needs of showpeople, and the Councils resolution that there is no need in the District currently.
- 5.11.4 Policy CP7 has been amended to reflect the need to protect wildlife areas and ensure adequate flood risk protection. These changes were made following the request of the expert bodies on the subject.
- 5.12 *Access to Services, Community Facilities and Infrastructure*
- 5.12.1 Text accompanying Policy CP8 reflects recommendations by NYCC to include supplementary details of the emerging Local Transport Plan, and text to be added to the policy strengthening the Green Infrastructure wording, following the adoption of the LCR GI Strategy.

## **Section 6 – Promoting Economic Prosperity**

- 6.1 *Scale and Distribution of Employment Growth*
- 6.2.1 This section has been updated to take account of new PPS4 (Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth) and also the results of an Employment Land Refresh carried out in 2010, to update parts of the Employment Land Study published in 2007. This assessed the growth and contraction of different employment activities, and reviewed the need for and supply of employment land, including existing deficiencies in provision. The key findings show that
- There is evidence of an upturn in the local economy with improved job increase forecasts in the period up to 2026 and recent letting of commercial/distribution premises likely to generate 900 new jobs in 2011.
  - There is over representation in older manufacturing premises. Existing B1 premises are also older with few purpose built offices within the District.
  - Financial, Business and Insurance Services are expected to experience the highest growth. Construction and Distribution, Hotels and Catering are also set to grow.
  - A significant number of employment sites (including allocated sites) are constrained in the medium term
  - There is strong market interest in Sherburn in Elmet, potential for start up business space in both Selby and Tadcaster.
- 6.1.2 In the light of these conclusions the Strategy refines the aspirational

approach adopted in the draft Core Strategy and rolls forward the employment land requirement from 2012 up to 2016. Future employment growth is targeted in all 3 main settlements, with scope for provision in rural areas, particularly at Eggborough and in the longer term in the A19 corridor north of Selby.

- 6.1.3 The section has also been reformatted to provide a more locally distinctive, place based approach; being spatially specific to the three market towns.
- 6.2 *Rural Diversification*
- Minor amendments made in response to points raised through consultation and updated to reflect PPS4.
- 6.3 *Town Centres and Local Services*
- 6.3.1 The section has been updated to take account of the new PPS4 (Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth) and consequentially, to avoid duplication, the removal from the Core Strategy of those elements covered by national policy.
- 6.3.2 The section has been reformatted to provide a more locally distinctive, place based approach; being spatially specific to the three market towns and other villages.
- 6.3.3 More up-to-date evidence from the Employment Land Refresh (2010) has been incorporated to supplement the findings of the Employment Land Study (2007).
- 6.3.4 Policy CP11 has been similarly re-focussed to set out how the Council expects the vitality and viability of the centres to be protected and enhanced over the plan period in the first part; and more strategic development management considerations in the second part. Further DPDs will provide the detailed local requirements (where not covered by PPS4).
- 6.3.5 Selby remains the principal location for new town centre development at the top of the hierarchy with the local service centres serving the local needs of their catchments. The need to diversify uses in Tadcaster, and promote expansion of services and facilities in Sherburn in Elmet are highlighted.
- 6.3.6 Other changes to the policy include additional wording to ensure better accessibility to the town centres by all user including the disabled and others with mobility needs.

## **Section 7 – Improving the Quality of Life**

- 7.1 *Tackling Climate Change and Promoting Sustainable Patterns of Development*
- 7.1.1 This section is closely related to 'improving resource efficiency' and 'renewable energy' (see next sections) which are complex over-lapping

issues.

- 7.1.2 The text has been amended to provide more clarity on the various facets of climate change issues (reducing carbon emissions, mitigation and adaptation of the effects of rising temperatures and increased flooding) and promoting sustainable development.
- 7.1.3 The section has been reformatted to provide a more locally distinctive focus; highlighting the specific issues for Selby District which are: energy generation, protection of groundwater, flood risk management and minimising travel growth.
- 7.1.4 The existence of the fossil-fuelled power stations as part of the local economy, their contribution to carbon emissions and potential to lead on low-carbon and renewable energy generation in the future is given more prominence as a special local issue for the District.
- 7.1.5 Policy CP12 has been split into two parts: the first addressing what the Council will do to promote sustainable development; and the second to set out in overall terms, how developers should design and layout developments to meet Core Strategy objectives for reducing carbon emissions and ensuring schemes are resilient to the effects of climate change.
- 7.1.6 More details are provided on flood risk/management issues, protection of water resources, tree planting, and sustainable transport including cycle facilities. A cross reference to Policies CP13 and CP14 is also incorporated.
- 7.2 *Improving Resource Efficiency*
  - 7.2.1 The text has been rationalised to remove reference to RSS policies but to retain the link with the regional and sub-regional evidence base which is still valid (as well as the emerging up-to-date study which is ongoing). The evidence underpins the retention of the local target for 10% of energy requirement on new development to be derived from decentralised, low carbon and decentralised sources.
  - 7.2.2 Additional reference to the County Council Waste Local Plan/LDF is included with regard to determining proposals for energy from waste.
  - 7.2.3 Some respondents submitting comments as part of the Draft Core Strategy consultation wanted the requirements for developments to meet Code for Sustainable Homes/BREEAM standards removed in the light of impending Government mandatory requirements and lack of local evidence. Others considered the Core Strategy CP13 hadn't gone far enough and wanted more stringent requirements. On balance, without further viability studies it is considered difficult to include specific targets and requirements at this stage. Instead, in the interim, the policy retains the requirement that developers employ the highest viable level.
- 7.3 *Low Carbon and Renewable Energy*
  - 7.3.1 The text has been rationalised to remove reference to RSS policies but to

retain the link with the regional and sub-regional evidence base which is still valid (as well as the emerging up-to-date study which is ongoing). The evidence underpins the retention of the local target in Policy CP14 for 32 MW by 2021 of renewable energy in stand-alone schemes (from the full range of technologies, not just wind turbines). It also highlights that this is a minimum target and it may change in the light of up-to-date evidence.

- 7.3.2 The policy is reformatted into two sections dealing with general development management issues and what types of scheme fall within the scope of the policy.
- 7.3.3 Additional reference is made to the County Council Minerals Local Plan/LDF with regard to consideration of proposals for coal bed methane extraction, clean coal technologies and carbon capture and storage (CCS). Further text explains that CCS is a developing technology and any proposed schemes are likely to be dealt with at national level.
- 7.3.4. A more positive protection of the environment and local amenity is incorporated.
- 7.3.5 The policy is expanded to refer to low-carbon energy as well as renewable energy. Further, the policy now supports improvements at existing fossil fuel energy generating plants to reduce carbon emissions, within the national energy strategy for a balanced mix of energy sources to meet demands.

#### 7.4 *Protecting and Enhancing the Environment*

- 7.4.1 Details have been added to the accompanying text to Policy CP15 to explain the situation relating to Conservation Area Character Assessments, and the programme of updating that has commenced. A further reference to heritage at risk, at the request of English Heritage.
- 7.4.2 Reference has also been made to waste management and the re-use of secondary aggregates such as ash, stemming from recommendations that are appropriate to the chapter.
- 7.4.3 Additions are also made to the Policy itself to strengthen the reference to the importance of historic assets and update the Green Infrastructure text due to the adoption of the LCR GI Strategy.

#### 7.5 *Design Quality*

- 7.5.1 The text is changed little. The policy is amended to add cross references to Policies CP12 and CP13 concerning adopting sustainable construction principles.
- 7.5.2 The latter part of the policy has been reformatted to emphasise the Council's commitment to ensuring new homes are designed to meet recognised high quality design standards, and meet the needs of the community in the longer term. That is, developers are encouraged to build all new residential development to Lifetime Homes and Building for Life Standards unless it can be demonstrated that it is not practicable or viable.

This reflects the lack of local evidence on viability at this stage. Future DPDs may tackle this issue.