

AGENDA FOR HEARING SESSION 11:

Matter 12 - Environment

Venue: Breckland Council, Dereham Time: 09.30 Wednesday 16 May

Participants:

Breckland Council
Chris Blow (For Saham Toney Parish Council)
Geoff Armstrong (For Orbit Homes 2020 Ltd)
Timothy Birt (For Ovington Parish Council)
Mike Jones (For RSPB)
Anthony Needham (For Dereham Town Council)

Agenda

1. Introduction by Inspector
2. Policy ENV 01 sets out that if a development will have a detrimental effect on the quantity or function of existing green infrastructure, applications will be expected to demonstrate how the green infrastructure will be enhanced? How can this be achieved in such circumstances?
3. To be positively prepared should the Plan identify a network of Green Infrastructure?
4. To be effective should Policy ENV 01 or its supporting text refer to existing local Green Infrastructure strategies?
5. Overall, is Policy ENV 01 justified, effective and consistent with national policy (namely Paragraph 114 of the NPPF)?
6. Is Policy ENV 02 justified and consistent with legislation and national policy, insofar, that it requires all development that may affect a designated site, protected species or any species or habitat of principal importance for conservation to be subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment?
7. Is Policy ENV 03 effective, to ensure that no adverse impacts would occur to the Brecks SPA/SAC through increased recreational pressure from new housing?

8. Is Policy ENV 04 based on robust and up-to-date evidence?
9. Is Policy ENV 04 justified and effective, insofar that it does not recognise the need for different types of open space?
10. In relation to open space, are the occupancy rates set out in Table 5.1 based on robust and up-to-date evidence?
11. Is Policy ENV 04 consistent with national policy and justified, insofar, that it requires all residential development to make provision for outdoor playing space?
12. Is the requirement within Policy ENV 04 for outdoor playing space at 2.56 hectares per 1,000 population justified and supported by robust evidence and a sound assessment of viability?
13. Are the Local Green Space designations identified on Page 162 of the Plan justified and based on a sound and robust selection methodology?
14. Is the approach of Policy ENV 05 consistent with national policy, most notably, Paragraphs 17, 109, 113 of the National Planning Policy Framework?
15. Is Policy ENV 06 consistent with national policy, most notably Paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework?
16. Is the approach of Policy ENV 06, in relation to the loss of protected trees justified?
17. Is Policy ENV 09 consistent with national policy?
18. Are the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2017), Sequential Test (2017) and Water Cycle Study (2017) robust and should they have considered 'villages with boundaries'?
19. With particular regard to, but not limited to wind energy development, is Policy ENV 10 consistent with national policy?
20. Is the Plan effective in terms of its consideration of potential cumulative effects on the environment?
21. Any Other Matters?