

PLANNING POLICY

Email: jill.fisher@north-norfolk.gov.uk
Direct Line: (01263) 516304
Fax: (01263) 516309
Our Ref: 967/5/4a

4 September 2007

Mrs Beverly Hart
Programme Officer
Examination Office
North Norfolk District Council
Holt Road
Cromer
NR27 9EN

Dear Mrs Hart

North Norfolk Core Strategy Examination – Clarification Request

Thank you for your letter dated 30 August 2007 requesting clarification on a number of matters prior to the pre-Examination meeting. I would like to respond to the points as follows:

Content of the Core Strategy DPD

The Council's self assessment document is divided up by stage of document preparation, and the information provided in each section is relevant to that stage. Page 6 of the document refers to Version 2 of the LDS as this was the adopted LDS at the preferred options stage of Core Strategy preparation and at that time we were working to the timetable contained within it. The LDS was subsequently revised and as from March 2007 we were working to the timetable in the LDS third revision which built in additional delay to the Core Strategy and Site Specific Proposals DPDs (see page 10 of the self assessment document).

To clarify the points arising from this:

- a) A meeting was held with the Government Office on 17 July 2006 to discuss the proposed delay to the site Specific Proposals (SSP). A revised timetable was discussed at this meeting which involved delaying examination of the SSP to allow more time for community consultation on Gypsy and Traveller allocations and for submission of the SSP after CS examination. The Government Office were supportive of the approach and confirmed that the Planning Inspectorate had indicated that they would not wish to examine the Site Specific Proposals until after the Inspectors report on the CS had been published.

A document published by the Planning Inspectorate in June 2007 ('Lessons learnt examining Development Plan Documents') confirms that proper sequencing of document examination is important and that it is unwise to submit several DPDs for examination at the same time. (see paragraphs 1.21 to 1.23).

The Government Office has approved the Third Revision LDS (letter received from Go East dated 4 April)

- b) The timetable in the LDS third revision states that further preferred options public consultation on the Site Specific Proposals DPD is scheduled for January to March 2008 with submission in August 2008. It is anticipated however that this will be delayed due to the heavy workload surrounding the Core Strategy examination. At the present time it is therefore anticipated that further preferred options consultation on the SSP will take place in Summer 2008.
- c) The Council expects that the debate at the Core Strategy Examination about areas of growth potential, and the 'site allocation and boundary change representations' will be clearly distinct from the Site Specific Proposals DPD. The Core Strategy sets out the proposed levels of growth in various selected settlements and, except for indicating the northern edge of Fakenham, does not specify where in these settlements growth should occur. The Council considers that the suitability of each settlement for a particular level of growth can be determined without considering individual development sites, especially if the development levels are indicated as a broad range. Therefore representations putting forward individual site suggestions are not relevant to the Core Strategy examination and should not be considered in detail at this stage.

The purpose of the regulation 32 stage for the Core Strategy is to allow debate on the boundaries of Core Strategy designations (ie areas of land to which the Core Strategy and development control policies apply – such as employment land or town centre designations). In considering how this is separate from the SSP it is helpful to clarify the distinction between an allocation and a designation. The Government Office provided the following clarification when we were debating the issue ourselves:

“.....An **allocation** in effect means identifying a site and indicating through policy a particular use or mix of uses for it. **Designations** are generally areas reflecting certain common characteristics and/or values e.g. conservation areas, AONB, SSSIs etc and to which a set of policies are then applied.....

.....The identification of existing areas where a general policy that provides a framework for assessing applications for a range of uses couldbe considered as a **designation** - this is likely to be the case for town centre 'designations' as you describe them where the area identified is used to assess applications for a variety of uses through the application of generic DC policies rather than prescribing a particular use/mix of uses.“ (Extract from an email from Nick Vass-Bowen, Go East, 6 February 2007)

The Core Strategy proposals map does identify the areas to which CS and development control policies apply. The Council feels that consideration of the reg 32 representations should focus on proposed changes to CS designations, such as changes to employment land or primary shopping area designations. The majority of the 'site allocation and boundary change representations' do indeed relate to changes to designation boundaries and generally do not put forward new development allocations.

Minor Modifications Schedule

The Council is preparing a minor modifications schedule and it is anticipated that this will be sent to the inspector and published on the website by 17 September. There is

only a limited number of these minor modifications and they are strictly limited to matters of correction and clarification and do not alter the substance of policy.

Annual Monitoring Reports

An Annual Monitoring report was published in December 2006 and this is in the examination library as document G8. The Council is currently working on the 2007 AMR and expects that this will be reported to the LDF Working Party on 12 November 2007.

Your letter dated 30 August and this reply have been placed in the examination library under a new section I - Examination documents.

I hope this answers the questions raised, however if you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact me at the details at the top of the page.

Yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jill Fisher". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped initial "J".

Jill Fisher
Planning Policy Manager