

Matter 9 – Policies for the Environment

Representation by Burton & Dalby Parish Council

Reference: 155/139

1 Appendix

1. **Policy EN1** - This policy should refer to character areas not types (second line in point I) in order to be effective if a decision is challenged. There is a notable difference between this policy and EN2, the biodiversity policy, which are more positive in style. This policy is negatively written and has a defensive rather than a proactive tone. In addition to saying development should not have a (significant) adverse effect on landscape it should also positively state that any development should contribute to reinforcing positive character and creating places with a strong local identity. Cross reference should also be made to biodiversity and green infrastructure in creating distinctive places and ensuring new development is a 'good fit'.

2. **Policy EN6** - This policy could be more explicit to highlight the need to protect key views and landscape which plays an important role in defining the setting of settlement and contributing to local identity.

3. **Policy EN4** - Policy EN4 needs to give clear criteria against which a Landscape and Visual Issues Assessment can be made. The policy is informed by the Areas of Separation and Settlement Fringe Study which highlights the factors that create a sense of separation. Importantly, this requires understanding of the character of the settlements in question and a combination of visual, perceptual, distance and functional qualities should be included. The supporting text for the policy could be more explicit in defining what needs to be taken into account when assessing effects on separation. Policy EN4 should require that proposals within an Area of Separation must be landscape led so that the Area of Separation is strengthened and not weakened.

4. The Policy maps showing the borough's Areas of Separation are not as clearly defined as previously (See Appendix 1 – AOS map (2006) Local Development Framework :Thorpe Arnold and Burton Lazars). This format is explained in the accompanying text. Paragraph 7.4.3 would be more effective if it also pointed out that the extent of the areas is vaguely delineated because changes that occur outside the zig-zag lines may also have a detrimental impact on the relevant settlements and the perception of separation.

5. Paragraph 7.4.1 refers to the Areas of Separation Study and para 7.4.2 gives guidance on how the findings of the study are to be applied in order to accommodate development in the identified sensitive areas. However, the final sentence in para 7.4.2, referring to the principles set out in the study, appears incomplete. Should the sentence end..."and where appropriate landscape setting and areas of tranquillity will be protected."?

6. **Policy EN10** - Policy EN10 is not sound. It does not give clear guidance to the decision-maker as Factor 17 is too vague and could be omitted altogether. Many parishes in the borough are preparing Neighbourhood Plans which directly address the wishes of their local communities. Could

Neighbourhood Plans be left to allocate sites for wind energy should they wish to? There is no requirement for planning authorities to allocate sites for wind energy generation. Planning guidance allows for a criteria-based policy, but the concerns of the effected community must be addressed.

7. **Policy EN13** - This policy is dependent on an effective evidence base. If heritage value/significance is not articulated for conservation areas then it is less likely that development will be able to ensure there is no harm. The better and clearer the evidence base the more effective the policy. As a minimum the conservation area appraisals require mapping of character areas, built features and open spaces of interest and views.

Appendix to Matter 9.2 (EN4)

1. Area of Separation Map (2006) Local Development Framework – Thorpe Arnold and Burton Lazars

