

Author	NNDC
Subject matter	EC1, EC2 and EC8
Relates to Session No	15 January 2008 Day 11 Session 22
Library No	I34 (viii)

Council response to issues raised at hearing sessions relating to Policies EC1, EC2 and EC8

The Council has prepared this statement at the request of the Inspector, responding to issues that were raised during the public hearing sessions and a paper submitted by Bidwells on behalf of Blue Sky Leisure. This statement relates to Policy EC1, Farm diversification, Policy EC2, Reuse of buildings in the Countryside and Policy EC8, Location of tourism development.

The Council considers that the Core Strategy is sound as submitted. However, it has suggested a number of minor modifications to the submission document which can be considered by the Inspector. These changes are designed to improve the clarity and consistency of the plan. These minor modifications are listed in three Schedules of Minor Modifications [**I3 I3i and I3ii**]. The Council considers that none of these minor modifications, either individually or cumulatively affect the overall thrust of the plan's objectives or policies. They include minor editorial corrections, points of clarification, or are changes responding to points made by representors to improve the descriptive text relating to settlements.

In addition to the schedule of minor modifications, the Inspector has requested that the Council respond, without prejudice to its position that the Core Strategy is sound, to a number of further changes proposed by representors during the hearing sessions on several policy areas. Any changes resulting from these representations are not included in the Schedule of Minor Modifications at this stage.

1) Summary of representation from Bidwells on behalf of Blue Sky Leisure

Paragraph 7 of the examination hearing paper submitted by Bidwells on behalf of Blue Sky Leisure suggested various amendments to policies EC1 and EC2. This statement sets out the representors proposed change and the Council's response.

Mod No	Policy	Bidwells suggestion	Council response	Reason
HM10	EC1	i. Delete from footnote xiiv the sentence 'Proposals should be ancillary to the agricultural business.'	Agreed	Unnecessary text
HM11	EC1	ii. The final sentence of 3.4.4 is superfluous and should be deleted - any permission would automatically limit the size of the site.	Rejected	The sentence supports the last sub-bullet point of policy EC1.
HM12	EC1	iii. Delete the final sub-bullet point of EC1, which limits the floorspace of new-	Rejected	It is appropriate to first encourage the re-use of buildings. Where this is not feasible a modest

		build development to 250m ²		amount of new build is permitted. The figure of 250m ² represents a reasonable allowance given the presumption that new build in the Countryside should be strictly controlled. The approach to extensions to existing businesses is more flexible as it recognises that the use is already there. When looking at an entirely new proposal, however, the preference for new build would be in a selected settlement.
HM13	EC1	iv. Delete the words 'and holiday uses' from the second bullet point	Agreed. Propose to delete the second bullet point	This repeats other policy intentions, ie policy SS2 which restricts new-build residential outside settlement boundaries. Policy EC8 sets out the approach for new holiday accommodation.
HM14	EC2	Delete the third bullet point of EC2	Rejected	The bullet point is an additional protection to prevent the conversion of poor quality buildings. Paragraph 17 of PPS7 states that criteria for the re-use of buildings in the countryside should take account of the potential impact on the countryside and landscape and the suitability of different types of buildings for re-use. North Norfolk has a wide range of buildings that could be re-used and this additional protection is considered necessary in the local context. The criteria is consistent with policy HO9 (reuse of rural buildings as dwellings) which has the same requirement.

Clarification was also requested as to how policies EC1 and EC2 related to one another.

Mod No	Hearing query	Suggested modification	Reason
HM15	What is the relationship between policies EC1 and EC2	Insert a new sentence at the end of paragraph 3.4.4: 'Where farm diversification includes re-use of existing buildings in the Countryside, proposals should also comply with policy EC2.'	To clarify that farm diversification schemes involving the re-use of rural buildings should also comply with the criteria in policy EC2 to ensure that buildings are soundly built and suitable for their proposed use etc.

Policy EC8 Location of tourism development

Mr Davies from Bidwells also queried the last paragraph of Policy EC8 which states that proposals for new build unserviced holiday accommodation in the Countryside will be treated as though they are permanent residential dwellings and will not be permitted. The paragraph is required because new unserviced holiday accommodation could be occupied in a manner very similar to a private residential dwelling. To allow this in the Countryside would be contrary to the overall spatial strategy set out in Core Strategy policies SS1 and SS2 which prevents new residential use in the Countryside. It is important that subsequent development control policies do not undermine the aim of sustainable patterns of development.

The Council would, however, like to clarify that this paragraph only applies to new unserviced holiday accommodation proposals and not to extensions of existing caravan sites or holiday parks, which are covered by policy EC11. Therefore an amendment is proposed to paragraph 3.4.28 to clarify this.

Mod No	Bidwells suggestion	Council response	Reason
HM16	Reword the final sentence of policy EC8 to say: 'Proposals for new build unserviced holiday accommodation in the Countryside will only be permitted subject to the consideration of other policies in this plan.'	Rejected. Insert a new penultimate sentence into paragraph 3.4.28: 'Extensions to existing caravan sites and holiday parks may be permitted under policy EC11.'	Allowing holiday accommodation that could be used as a private residential dwelling would be contrary to the spatial strategy. However, the text should clarify that extensions to existing sites may be permitted and they are not necessarily prohibited by the last paragraph of policy EC8.