

EXAMINATION HEARINGS

AGENDA

THURSDAY 29 SEPTEMBER 10.00am

The questions in italics are some (but not the only) specific matters which arise from the evidence and will assist in focusing the discussion.

MATTER 7. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT, ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Transport and travel

7.1 Is the transport/travel strategy sufficiently robust and consistent with national policy in PPG13? Is the transport/travel strategy complementary to the Local Transport Plan? What approach is to be taken to setting levels of parking?

- *Does the absence of an infrastructure study (or other evidence) to assess the transport/travel implications of the CS mean that the strategy is not consistent with PPG13*
- *Are the transport/travel aspects of the CS fully supported by the highway authorities*

Sustainable development

7.2 Having regard to the other policies of the plan, are all the criteria of CP12 necessary and expressed in an appropriate manner?

- *Should the policy include specific reference to the re-use of existing grid connections for renewable energy at former mine sites*
- *Is it appropriate that the requirements of part B of policy CP12 relate to all development*

7.3 What mechanisms will the Council use to “give preference” to the re-use of buildings and the use of previously-developed land (part A (b) of policy CP12)? Should the term ‘previously-developed land’ be prefaced with “appropriately remediated”?

- *Is there scope for confusion between policy CP12 and other policies which address certain aspects more directly*
- *Is there scope for confusion between some retained policies of the SDLP and policy CP12*
- *To ensure that the policy does not have a development management role, should it be prefaced by “In preparing its Site Allocations and Development Management DPDs, to address the causes.....”*

Energy efficiency

7.4 Is the requirement for all developments above a minimum size to derive 10% of their energy needs from renewable, low carbon or decentralised sources in policy CP13(a) justified by the evidence base?

- *Is the proposed amendment to policy CP13 sufficient to ensure that viability is properly taken into account and that the policy is consistent with RSS policy ENV5*

7.5 Is the requirement for strategic and key development sites to derive the majority of their energy needs from renewable, low carbon or decentralised sources in policy CP13(b) justified by the evidence base? Is there sufficient clarity to the phrase “key sites identified in future DPDs”? Have the implications for scheme viability been adequately tested?

- *In the absence of evidence that the policy is achievable on the strategic development site or any other site, how can part (b) of policy CP13 be regarded as robust and/or deliverable*
- *Without any guidance in the CS as to what is a “key” site, how is this element of the policy capable of meaningful interpretation*
- *Is there sufficient flexibility in part (b) to allow for new technologies which might emerge*

7.6 How will the “highest viable level” of the respective standards in policy CP13(c) be assessed?

- *Is there robust evidence which demonstrates that CSH/BREEAM standards above those of national requirements are justified and viable*
- *Is it necessary or reasonable to require a viability appraisal for almost every development to which CSH/BREEAM applies simply to demonstrate what is the appropriate level*

Low carbon/renewable energy

7.7 Is the first section of policy CP14 capable of meaningful implementation (in terms of the relationship between part (i) and parts (ii) and (iii)) and is it consistent with national policy in PPS22? Is it clear what is meant by “local amenity”?

- *Should the full range of available technologies specifically include reference to the re-use of existing grid connections for renewable energy at former mine sites*
- *As part (ii) of the policy allows for the possibility that the benefits of a scheme can outweigh harm to the environment and local amenity, in these circumstances how could compliance with part (i) of the policy be secured*

7.8 Is it appropriate to express the renewable energy target in terms of installed capacity rather than (i) energy produced or (ii) CO2 emission reductions? Does the 32 megawatt target remain current?

Protecting the environment

7.9 Is policy CP15 consistent with national policy in PPS5 in relation to the protection of heritage assets?

- *Do the proposed changes satisfactorily address English Heritage's concerns and secure compliance with PPS5*

7.10 Is section 3 of policy CP15 capable of meaningful implementation (in terms of the relationship between parts (b) and (c)) and is the approach to biodiversity consistent with national policy in PPS9?

- *As part 3(c) of the policy allows for the possibility that the impacts of a scheme on biodiversity can be mitigated and compensated, in these circumstances how could compliance with part 3(b) of the policy be secured*

Design

7.11 Is policy CP16 sufficiently robust in seeking locally distinctive development? Why is "appearance" not included in the criteria in part (a)?

7.12 Is the reference to "off-site" landscaping for large schemes in policy CP16(d) appropriate and capable of implementation?

- *Would the addition of "where possible" make this part of policy CP16 meaningful*

7.13 Is it realistic to expect all new housing development to achieve the standards set out in policy CP16 (i) to (iii)? Have the viability implications of achieving these standards been tested? How will any demonstration that such standards are not practicable or viable be implemented, particularly for small schemes?

- *As the standards sought are above those of national requirements, is there robust local evidence which demonstrates that they are justified and viable*
- *Could the policy threaten the recovery of the housing market in Selby*
- *Should the policy say that schemes which proposes these standards will (where appropriate) be supported*