

Appendix 2

Redeposit Responses **Green Belt**

Redeposit Responses
Green Belt

Policy/ Par 5.4a	Respondent Reference 0333 / Siraj Karbhari
Representation 00516R	Agent Reference -
Representation Fully supports the Redeposit and particularly supports this paragraph - to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	
Officer Response Noted.	
Officer Recommendation No change	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par 5.13a	Respondent Reference 0333 / Siraj Karbhari
Representation 00517R	Agent Reference -
Representation Supports District Council's approach, as set out in paragraph 5.13a and the three bullet points it contains.	
Officer Response Noted.	
Officer Recommendation No change	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par 5.14a	Respondent Reference 0315 / Martin Grant Homes, Persimmon Homes, George Wimpey
Representation 00425R	Agent Reference 0047 / Pegasus Planning Group
Representation Reiterate previous objections to the Local Plan Alterations, particularly that comprehensive review of the Green Belt boundaries in the District does not form part of the Alterations. It will not be possible to protect the Green Belt against future development requirements of the East of England Plan.	
Officer Response It has been made clear throughout the Local Plan Alterations process that housing land allocations will not be made until after the East of England Plan has been adopted, now expected to be at the beginning of 2007. Following the finalisation the East of England Plan, the Council will begin work on the Local Development Framework to take into account its requirements. This will include a Green Belt boundary review and land allocations. This approach is as set out within the Epping Forest District Local Development Scheme 2005 and supported by Go East.	
Officer Recommendation No change	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par GB1	Respondent Reference 0246 / Epping Forest Primary Care Trust
Representation 00340R	Agent Reference 0041 / Lawson Planning Partnership
Representation It is requested that the Green Belt designation is removed from land identified on the southern side of Honey Lane, to enable its development for health care purposes to proceed.	
Officer Response A Green Belt boundary review (except for glasshouse allocations) does not form part of the Alterations for the reasons set out in the First Deposit, but information will be used in a future GB review under the new LDF system. This does not negate the right to make a formal planning application, which would be determined upon its individual merits.	
Officer Recommendation No change	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par GB1/ 5.15	Respondent Reference 0095 / North Weald Bassett Parish Council
Representation 00438R	Agent Reference -
Representation Calls for the reinstatement of the former paragraph 5.15 on page 33 of the Redeposit copy. This is essential for preservation of the Green Belt.	
Officer Response Not accepted - this paragraph was deleted as it is no longer needed because it refers to the rationale behind the changes to the Green Belt boundary for the 1998 Local Plan.	
Officer Recommendation No change	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par 5.16 - 5.22	Respondent Reference 0100 / GO East
Representation 00094R	Agent Reference -
Representation Deletion of text will effectively include four sites in the Green Belt unless they have already been removed, and the provisions of the paras are no longer relevant.	
Officer Response Sites were removed from Green Belt by Adopted Local Plan and are shown as excluded on Proposals Map. (GO-East confirmed on 19/09/05) that this objection is withdrawn.)	
Officer Recommendation No change	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par GB6	Respondent Reference 0003 / Mr C F Gibbons
Representation 00495R & 00496R	Agent Reference -

<p>Representation</p> <p>The statements about garden centres and farm shops are feebly worded and do not reflect the true position locally or in many other places in the country. Therefore I am objecting to the statements and insist they should be strengthened. At the same time they should be grouped under one heading which I have called rural retail outlets. (see paragraph 3 [representation reference 00497R] below). Garden centres, farm shops and PYO (pick your own) establishments are basically retail outlets in a rural setting. Not only do they attract large delivery trucks, but when successful they attract hundreds of motorists visiting to look around, purchase goods or maybe have refreshments in the almost obligatory refreshment room.</p>
<p>Officer Response</p> <p>Not accepted. The policy approach taken in GB6 (Garden Centres) is clear, and it is not felt that further clarification is required. In any event this policy remains unaltered from the Adopted Plan, and so cannot be altered at this stage. Specific policy for farm shops is being deleted because this issue is addressed by other policies within the plan, particularly policy GB2A (Development in the Green Belt), policy GB8A (Change of Use or Adaptation of Buildings), and policies within the Town Centres chapter.</p>
<p>Officer Recommendation</p> <p>No change</p>
<p>Member Decision</p>

Policy/ Par GB6	Respondent Reference 0003 / Mr C F Gibbons
Representation 00498R	Agent Reference -
<p>Representation</p> <p>Policy should be easy to formulate and the planning process and enforcement easy to apply. Why is there such a problem?</p>	
<p>Officer Response</p> <p>Policies need to be reviewed regularly as circumstances change, government guidance is changed and as a result of individual interpretation by applicants and Appeal Inspectors. Level of enforcement which can be applied is dependent on the resources which can be made available - this is a management and not a policy issue.</p>	
<p>Officer Recommendation</p> <p>No change</p>	
<p>Member Decision</p>	

Policy/ Par 5.33a	Respondent Reference 0246 / Epping Forest Primary Care Trust
Representation 00337R	Agent Reference 0041 / Lawson Planning Partnership
Representation	
<p>It is noted that the Council intends to carry out a comprehensive review of the Green Belt boundaries as part of the Local Development Framework exercise. However, in the interim a suitable policy basis is required to enable development proposals to be considered as interpreted from the related policies of the Replacement Structure Plan. With this in mind, it is noted that the bullet points set out in paragraph 5.10a allow for 'inappropriate' development in very special circumstances which include limited infilling. A related policy is the negatively worded Policy GB7A (Conspicuous Development) which does not provide specific criteria to enable acceptable development proposals to go ahead. It is requested that the text in paragraph 5.33a is supplemented with suitable wording to acknowledge that under special circumstances when limited infilling is proposed and where relevant criteria are met, suitable development proposals may be permitted.</p>	
Officer Response	
<p>Not accepted - the Adopted Local Plan was in conformity with the original Structure Plan and the Alterations have been produced to conform with the Replacement Structure Plan. Paragraph 5.33a is considered to be in accordance with the Replacement Structure Plan, as there are only minor changes from the original version, and the County Planner has not objected to the changes. It is therefore not necessary for it to be amended. Policy GB7A relates to a specific issue, but should be seen in conjunction with other policies within the Plan, particularly those in the Green Belt chapter. Proposals for development within the Green Belt, including limited infilling will continue to be assessed in accordance with all relevant policies of the development plan - ie Replacement Structure Plan, Adopted Local Plan and Alterations to the latter.</p>	
Officer Recommendation	
No change	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par 5.35a	Respondent Reference 0062 / Essex Wildlife Trust
Representation 00240R	Agent Reference -
Representation	
<p>Essex Wildlife Trust is now satisfied that the potential for protected species (such as bats and barn owls) is adequately addressed in paragraph 5.35a, together with protection under policy NC4. We now withdraw our earlier objection.</p>	
Officer Response	
Noted.	
Officer Recommendation	
No change	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par GB8A	Respondent Reference 0062 / Essex Wildlife Trust
Representation 00241R	Agent Reference -
Representation	
<p>Essex Wildlife Trust is now satisfied that the potential for protected species (such as bats and barn owls) is adequately addressed in paragraph 5.35a, together with protection under policy NC4. We now withdraw our objection to GB8A (registered at the First Deposit Stage). We also support inclusion of the word "significant" in criterion (iii).</p>	
Officer Response	
Noted.	

Officer Recommendation No change
Member Decision

Policy/ Par GB8A	Respondent Reference 0149 / Sworders
Representation 00333R	Agent Reference 0039 / Sworders
Representation Paragraph 27 (v) of PPS 1 is not reflected in the drafting. This indicates that whilst local authorities should seek to provide improved access to jobs and services they should recognise that "this may be more difficult in rural areas." The original construction of the final paragraph of GB8A is clearly intended to control the visual intrusion of development and its side effects (i.e. in the form of vehicle parking and open storage). By inserting the words "commuting (especially by car)" a sustainability judgement is made in regard to change of use of rural buildings which is not commensurate with the reality that to achieve a living and working countryside - i.e. sustainable development - it will be necessary to admit that not all rural developments will be seen as part of achieving this end, albeit that we recognise that this has to be addressed in a balanced way. This is adequately addressed in the transport chapter. PPS7 makes no differentiation between office and storage use.	
Officer Response Not accepted - Additional text in policy adds clarity to approach taken in paragraph 5.40a to enable the Council to support a genuine need to diversify but limit the impact on the countryside and the environment by minimising traffic generation. The use of 'significant' in criterion (iii) and also within final paragraph of the policy text allows leeway in relation to this matter. This is a balanced approach to achieving sustainable development within the context of a Green Belt location.	
Officer Recommendation No change	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par GB8A	Respondent Reference 0052 / D and E Borton
Representation 00456R	Agent Reference -
Representation There is a risk that once a building has been granted change of use under this section, the owner or user will try to expand. This will lead to industry and/or commercial activities on a random basis in the Green Belt. The example of Birchwood in Hoe Lane, Nazeing is cited as an example. Suggest adding an additional criterion (vi) stating 'subsequent permissions for additions to or expansion of a building in the Green Belt or for different use of adjoining land relating to an earlier consent for change of use under this section (or earlier versions) will not be granted'.	
Officer Response The extension to Birchwood was granted under policy GB9 of the Adopted Local Plan (Extension of non-residential buildings). The Alterations delete this policy, which means that in future applications for extensions to buildings which have had a change of use will be assessed under policy GB2A of the Alterations. Officers believe this will give adequate control, but also suggest that the supporting text could be modified to indicate that consideration will be given to removal of permitted development rights in appropriate cases.	
Officer Recommendation Add new penultimate sentence to paragraph 5.42a - <u>'In appropriate cases a condition may be attached to a permission removing specific categories of permitted development rights eg extensions.'</u>	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par GB8A (iii)	Respondent Reference 0149 / Sworders
Representation 00349R	Agent Reference 0039 / Sworders
Representation	
<p>Whilst we welcome the change to criterion (iii) of the policy, we have concern in regard to changes made to criterion (iv). Under either Prior Notification or in regard to a planning application under Policy GB11 for any agricultural building the applicant must prove that the building is reasonably necessary for the purpose of agriculture. In the case of a Prior Notification building if the agricultural uses ceases within 10 years then the building must be taken down. Consequently, it is at the application stage that reasonable agricultural need is established. If the building subsequently becomes redundant this will be due to changes in farming practice rather than putting up a building with a view to securing an alternative use. For example, many grain stores have been put up during the last 10 years, however, owing to a significant reduction in the price of wheat in real terms many farmers are now selling their grain into a pool such as 'Cam Grain' whereby the grain is stored centrally rather than on farm. This also enables the farmers to opt out of having to upgrade their stores to meet ever higher hygiene standards. Since the applicant would have had to justify that there was reasonable agricultural need upon putting up the building the criteria whereby the council is satisfied that the building was not completed with a view to securing alternative use are somewhat superfluous, given that if there was agricultural need for the building (i.e. it was built purely in order to generate an alternative use) then the building should not have been given consent in the first instance.</p>	
Officer Response	
<p>Support for change to criterion (iii) noted. In respect of criterion (iv), the ten year period brings the policy into line with the GPDO as explained in the response to Representation 00087R below. This criterion gives certainty for all those involved in the development of agricultural buildings - ie it emphasises that the council's policy is simply intended to adhere closely to the General Permitted Development Order 1995.</p>	
Officer Recommendation	
No change	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par GB8A (iv)	Respondent Reference 0052 / D and E Borton
Representation 00457R	Agent Reference -
Representation	
<p>The change to the text to (iv) is an improvement but it leaves the onus of proof of intention with the Council. That may be hard. So, we suggest that the applicant be forced to justify works within the 10 years as being for agricultural purpose. Text could possibly be amended by inserting "all evidence provided by the applicant supports the fact that' between 'that' and 'works' in criterion (iv).</p>	
Officer Response	
<p>The proposed change does not strengthen or improve the policy. The statement 'The Council is satisfied that' in criterion (iv) indicates that existing records will be checked and that the Council can request additional material from the applicants, so all necessary controls are in place.</p>	
Officer Recommendation	
No change	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par GB8A (iv)	Respondent Reference 0100 / GO East
Representation 00087R	Agent Reference -
Representation	
To be consistent with PPG2, the policy GB8A (iv) should be reworded to apply to development carried out in the last four years, or alternatively, the supporting text should provide an explanation of why this longer period is justifiable within the district.	
Officer Response	
Officers believe that the longer period of ten years can be justified, but it is accepted that further explanation within the supporting text is required.	
Officer Recommendation	
Add to paragraph 5.41a - ' <u>A ten year period is used within criterion (iv) as this accords with the General Permitted Development Order 1995, Part 6 Class A2(5), in relation to agricultural buildings and operations. Where following works for the erection, significant extension or alteration of an agricultural building, the use of the building permanently ceases within ten years from the date when the works were substantially completed, the building or extension should be removed unless the planning authority has agreed otherwise in writing.</u> '	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par GB8A (iv)	Respondent Reference 0149 / Sworders
Representation 00332R	Agent Reference 0039 / Sworders
Representation	
We have significant concerns in regard to 'works done' as opposed to just buildings erected. Many traditional buildings require constant ongoing maintenance and, similar to any house, periodically require a significant overhaul such as the replacement of the roof. For listed buildings this is a legislative requirement. There are concerns that without clarification, this policy will be used to refuse planning consent for the conversion of buildings which have been repaired in the last 10 years when in fact these repairs are merely ongoing maintenance. Moreover, the Prior Notification provision in regard to removal after 10 years relates only to the erection of buildings and extensions.	
Officer Response	
Clarification of what is meant by term 'works' has now been provided as part of response to representation 000087R above. This is sufficient to address concerns expressed in the representation.	
Officer Recommendation	
No change	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par GB8A (iv) / 5.41a	Respondent Reference 0028 / Nazeing Parish Council
Representation 00466R	Agent Reference -
Representation	
The text of paragraph 5.41a is stronger than the policy GB8A (iv). The Council will not find it easy to prove alleged purpose for agricultural or horticultural was not really intended. Instead the applicant should be required to prove his lawful intention and the policy should say so, ie 'The applicant is able to prove that all works within the last ten years were completed for the purposes of agriculture or horticulture and not for any other purpose.'	
Officer Response	
As response to Representation 00457R above. The wording of criterion (iv) covers this, because the Council will still have to be satisfied by the applicant's proof.	
Officer Recommendation	
No change	

Member Decision**Policy/ Par GB8A (v)****Respondent Reference 0039 / G. Nicastro****Representation 00396R****Agent Reference -****Representation**

GB8A (v) introduces a novel concept alien to both PPS7 and PPS2 [PPG2]. No reference to justify the inclusion of these elements in the decision process for the re-use of agricultural buildings. The prime mover in both PPS2 and PPS7 is the overriding concept of re-use of agricultural buildings as a means to check a tendency to dereliction and decay. There is little point in interjecting a preference for employment generating uses. The policy should be neutral on the type of re-use that can be permitted. Criterion (v) and concluding paragraph of policy should be deleted.

Officer Response

Not accepted - policy is in line with paragraphs 1.3 and 2.1 of PPS6: Planning for Town Centres (April 2005) which state that development should be focused in existing centres in order to strengthen or regenerate them. It is also intended to be complementary to paragraph 11.56a and policy TC6 of this plan. The policy is also in line with para 17 of PPS7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas (August 2004) which states that 'Re-use (of buildings) for economic development purposes will usually be preferable, but residential conversions may be more appropriate in some locations, and for some types of building.'

Officer Recommendation

No change

Member Decision**Policy/ Par GB9A / 5.44****Respondent Reference 0100 / GO East****Representation 00088R****Agent Reference -****Representation**

Whilst PPS7 states that planning authorities should set out the criteria where the conversion and re-use of a building in the countryside would be permitted, we are concerned that the wording of this policy to a large extent reflects PPG2. Additionally including chattels such as children's play equipment and other matters that are beyond the scope of planning in paragraph 5.44a is inappropriate. GB9A should be worded to remove duplication of PPG2 and rather indicate how national policy/guidance will be applied at the local level. Additionally, the wording 'and the associated paraphernalia of modernising living accommodation (e.g. flower gardens, garages, play equipment, lines of washing)' should be deleted from paragraph 5.44a.

Officer Response

Not accepted - policy does not 'duplicate' PPG2. The wording is intended to give guidance to potential applicants by listing a range of factors which will be taken into account when changes of use to residential are being considered. The quoted wording from para 5.44a (which is included in the Adopted Local Plan) explains why it is important to have control over such changes of use, precisely because some of the consequences, which may have adverse effects on rural locations, are outside planning control.

Officer Recommendation

No change

Member Decision**Policy/ Par GB8A & GB9A****Respondent Reference 0149 / Sworders****Representation 00345R****Agent Reference 0039 / Sworders****Representation**

There is a potential conflict between these policies and policy CP4

Officer Response

See commentary on policy CP4 (representation 00345R) in relation to these objections.

<p>Officer Recommendation</p> <p>1 .That the following text be added to the end of para 5.35a... <u>" Finally, conversions can present opportunities for upgrading energy saving measures in older buildings, and introduce sustainable design and construction techniques. Many of these are inherently "low tech" or involve little alteration to the building`s fabric or character and can therefore be readily assimilated into designs as required by policy CP4"</u></p> <p>2 That sentence 4 in para 5.36a be amended to read<u>"This is to ensure that the latest Building Regulations are taken into account, and that , in line with policy CP4, sustainable design/ construction techniques are used wherever possible."</u></p> <p>3 That the following text be added to the end of poliy GB8A. <u>" Wherever possible, conversions will employ sustainable design and construction techniques as required by policy CP4"</u></p> <p>4 That the following be added to the end of para 5.45a: <u>"The requirements of policy CP4 shall apply to all conversions, but where the building is listed, only measures which can be implemented without adversely affecting its fabric, character or setting will be accepted, in accordance with policy HC10."</u></p>
<p>Member Decision</p>

Policy/ Par 5.49a	Respondent Reference 0149 / Sworders
Representation 00342R	Agent Reference 0039 / Sworders
<p>Representation</p> <p>Although the paragraph has been altered in the Redeposit, the deletion of the final paragraph of the Policy GB9A has resulted 5.49A being contradictory to the revised drafting.</p>	
<p>Officer Response</p> <p>Not accepted - paragraph 5.49a has been retained because in appropriate circumstances conversions for affordable housing may be feasible and suitable. A minor change to the fourth sentence should address the concern of the objectors - replace 'must' with 'may'.</p>	
<p>Officer Recommendation</p> <p>In fourth sentence of para 5.49a, replace 'must' with <u>'may'</u>.</p>	
<p>Member Decision</p>	

Policy/ Par GB10	Respondent Reference 0003 / C F Gibbons
Representation 00499R	Agent Reference -
<p>Representation</p> <p>The interesting point about this section is its brevity considering the number of words written about much lesser topics throughout the document.</p>	
<p>Officer Response</p> <p>This section has not been materially altered (aside from minor technical amendments) from the Adopted Local Plan and is therefore not part of the Alterations. The section is considered sufficient for its purpose.</p>	
<p>Officer Recommendation</p> <p>No change</p>	
<p>Member Decision</p>	

Policy/ Par GB10	Respondent Reference 0003 / C F Gibbons
Representation 00500R,00501R,00502R & 00503R	Agent Reference -
Representation Area earmarked as a proposed water sports centre by the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority, which is just a few hundred yards from the Nazeing boundary, should be mentioned in the Redeposit. This water sports centre is a massive local project which is due to open in only four year, but has not even at this late stage featured in the planning document under consideration. It is hoped this is done before the Public Inquiry where the topic will be raised by myself if no one else elects to do so.	
Officer Response Not accepted - as the proposed centre does not lie within the boundary administered by this plan, it is neither necessary nor appropriate for this matter to be referred to. As an adjacent authority the Council should be consulted at appropriate times, such as at the application stage, and the Local Plan policies will be used to formulate a response.	
Officer Recommendation No change	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par 5.53a	Respondent Reference 0316 / Jon Whitehouse
Representation 00412R	Agent Reference -
Representation Object to deletion of entirety of original paragraph 5.53a. Measures such as these are necessary in order to control the gradual agglomeration of utilitarian buildings in rural locations. If applied sensitively the policy need not hinder reasonable farm diversification. However the reference to a Farm Plan is unnecessary and should remain removed.	
Officer Response Paragraph 5.53a was deleted in its entirety in response to a number of convincing objections at the First Deposit stage. Criterion (ii) of GB11 should help to ensure that new farm buildings are not detrimental to their setting or locality, thus at least minimising the spread of the more 'utilitarian' designs.	
Officer Recommendation No change	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par GB13	Respondent Reference 0316 / Jon Whitehouse
Representation 00413R	Agent Reference -
Representation Support objectives of policy but no reference is made to maintaining a suitable range of dwelling size and type in the area. Add new paragraph (v) "The need for an appropriate range of dwelling sizes and types in the locality to meet identified housing need."	
Officer Response Policy is not included in Alterations so therefore cannot be altered at this stage. The matter of maintaining a suitable range of dwelling size and type is, however, addressed in generic Policy H4A - Dwelling Mix.	
Officer Recommendation No change	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par 5.60a	Respondent Reference 0316 / Jon Whitehouse
Representation 00414R	Agent Reference -
Representation Support inclusion of reference to dwelling sizes and types as it is important to ensure that any locality's housing stock is not disproportionately loaded towards larger houses and bares some relation to the need identified in the Housing Needs Survey.	
Officer Response Noted.	
Officer Recommendation No change	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par GB14A	Respondent Reference 0100 / GO East
Representation 00089R	Agent Reference -
Representation We note that the percentage of additional floorspace threshold has been increased from 25% to 40%. Although paragraph 5.63a provides a rationale for the need to allow a degree of flexibility, no rationale has been provided for the increase to 40%. We consider an allowance of up to 40% may conflict with the overriding need to protect the openness of the Green Belt and that the reasonable requirements of modern living standards might, in most cases, be achieved by the previous percentage of 25% and therefore might be a better reflection of PPG2 para 3.8 (b)'s provisions to strictly control the extension of re-used buildings in the Green Belt. Council should provide a justification for the increase in the floor space threshold from 25% to 40% and demonstrate 40% is compatible with the principles and objectives of PPG2. If it cannot be demonstrated that the 40% is justifiable, then the threshold should be amended accordingly.	
Officer Response Accepted - GB14A (iii) was amended in response to objections to the First Deposit and further clarification on reasoning for the 40% figure is required. Concern about impact on openness of Green Belt is addressed by criterion (i) of policy and the various criteria of para 5.61a. The 40% figure has been derived from analysis of a number of recent permissions in the district.	
Officer Recommendation Add after last sentence of 5.63a - <i>'The figure of 40% is based on an analysis of permissions over recent years. The Council believes that, in association with the other criteria of policy GB14A, environmental and social objectives can be met.'</i>	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par GB14A	Respondent Reference 0310 / Keith Wright
Representation 00385R	Agent Reference -
Representation Policy GB14 A (iii b) should be re-instated as the general public has a right to clear and unambiguous information. Insertion of the excised policy GB14A (iii b) would clearly indicate that whatever the size of the original building no extension would exceed 40 square metres.	
Officer Response Not accepted - analysis of decisions over recent years has shown that permission has been granted for extensions in excess of 40 sq m. The Redeposit still provides transparency and consistency for all parties as potential areas of ambiguity - 'total floor space' and 'original building' are clearly explained as terms.	
Officer Recommendation No change	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par GB17A	Respondent Reference 0149 / Sworders
Representation 00344R	Agent Reference 0039 / Sworders
Representation	
Paragraph (vi) is too draconian. Whilst the reasons for controlling permitted extensions to tied houses is acceptable and understood, it is wholly unacceptable and draconian to require that control is exercised, for example to cover the painting of the exterior of the building and the provision of hard surfaces. Amend GB17A (vi) and paragraph 5.81a to clarify that only permitted development rights in regard to extensions will be removed.	
Officer Response	
Not accepted - the standard approach for removing permitted development rights is via the use of a planning condition, therefore any such condition would need to meet the tests for use of a planning condition as set out in Circular 11/95: Use of conditions in planning permission. Criterion (vi) indicates that such powers would only be used 'where appropriate' - this is most likely to be in dealing with proposed extensions, but there will be other circumstances where 'minor operations' could have a potentially significant impact on a rural setting, including the repainting of the exterior of the building.	
Officer Recommendation	
No change	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par GB17B(iv)	Respondent Reference 0039 / G. Nicastro
Representation 00397R	Agent Reference -
Representation	
GB17B (iv) - This additional limb to the policy needs to be removed in its entirety. As it currently stands, it is far too vague, and should be deleted in its entirety.	
Officer Response	
Accepted (in part)- GB17B (iv) was added as response to Representation 00807 from the First Deposit stage. This was made by a planning consultancy which specialises in agricultural matters. It is considered that criterion (iv) adds to the purpose of the policy and as such should be retained, but that it would benefit from clarification within the supporting text.	
Officer Recommendation	
Amend first sentence of paragraph 5.89a to read - ' <u>When assessing need via the production of a survey of the agricultural community within the locality for the dwelling</u> '. Insert new third sentence: ' <u>The survey should test existing need via direct marketing of the holding but also establish any potential demand in the near future (i.e. over the next 3- 4 agricultural cycles) that could be generated via planned expansion by individual holdings.</u> '	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par GB18 & 5.95a	Respondent Reference 0095 / North Weald Bassett Parish Council
Representation 00437R	Agent Reference -
Representation	
Clarification required for word "interpretation" in line 8 of paragraph 5.95a.	
Officer Response	
This paragraph is unaltered from the Adopted Plan, and so cannot be altered at this stage. What is probably intended is some form of interpretation board explaining the function and construction of the Redoubt and linking this to other sites on the north of the Thames.	
Officer Recommendation	
No change	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par GB18 & 5.98a	Respondent Reference 0170 / D Stallan
Representation 00030R	Agent Reference -
Representation I wish to support the proposals to retain the "green wedge" from the village to North Weald Station.	
Officer Response Noted	
Officer Recommendation No change	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par GB18 & 5.98a	Respondent Reference 0170 / D Stallan
Representation 00031R	Agent Reference -
Representation Due to recreational use of the land by residents/customers of the PH, objecting to the continued proposal to take the area of land behind the Kings Head PH out of the Green Belt.	
Officer Response Apart from updating, this para is not part of the Alterations, because it is not addressing new housing land allocations, or related releases of Green Belt land. The situation and the statement in this paragraph will be reviewed under the new LDF system.	
Officer Recommendation No change	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par GB18 & 5.98a	Respondent Reference 0095 / North Weald Bassett Parish Council
Representation 00432R	Agent Reference -
Representation Re-writing of paragraph in relation to land behind the Kings Head to state must not be deleted from the Green Belt.	
Officer Response As response to Representation 00031R above.	
Officer Recommendation No change	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par GB18 & 5.98a	Respondent Reference 0095 / North Weald Bassett Parish Council
Representation 00433R	Agent Reference -
Representation Clarification required to ensure wording in this policy does not support the development of another golf course on this site. The requirement for the policy must be met by the recently completed Blakes facility.	
Officer Response Paragraph 5.97a states that planning permission was granted in 1998 for a golf course (inter alia) and that the redevelopment of the site subject to the policy is virtually complete. For clarity, the text could indicate that this includes the construction of the golf course.	
Officer Recommendation In para 5.97a add after 'complete' in the penultimate line: <u>'(including the golf course)'</u> .	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par GB18	Respondent Reference 0168 / Environment Agency
Representation 00013R	Agent Reference -
Representation The protection of hedgerows and other ecologically important features should be included in this policy to ensure that these aspects are taken into account in any future planning applications for the adjacent site.	
Officer Response This is not necessary as these issues are adequately addressed in other policies within the Adopted Plan, in particular policies NC4, LL2 and LL10.	
Officer Recommendation No change	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par 5.100a	Respondent Reference 0316 / Jon Whitehouse
Representation 00415R	Agent Reference -
Representation Support policy but current wording makes it appear as if it is a requirement for the sports pavilion and interpretation centre to be one building. Whilst this appears to be the favoured option at the moment it is not a requirement and a minor wording change would make this clearer. Suggest inserting "an" between "and" and "interpretation"	
Officer Response Accepted	
Officer Recommendation Insert ' <u>an</u> ' between 'and' and 'interpretation' in paragraph 5.100a	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par GB19	Respondent Reference 0316 / Jon Whitehouse
Representation 00416R	Agent Reference -
Representation No reference within policy to formal recreation (i.e. pitches), insert new paragraph (iii) requiring provision of sports pitches (and relevant ancillary facilities such as sports pavilion/ equipment storage)	
Officer Response The policy is unaltered from the adopted plan, and so cannot be altered at this stage. As para 5.100a makes clear, the Section 106 Agreement accompanying the permission does make provision for formal recreational facilities (pitches and a sports pavilion).	
Officer Recommendation No change	
Member Decision	

Policy/ Par 5.106a [5.103a]	Respondent Reference 0168 / Environment Agency/
Representation 00014R	Agent Reference -
Representation	
<p>The Agency suggests the addition of the following sentences to this paragraph:(xxxix) To safeguard designated sites and protected species; (xl) To safeguard and where possible enhance biodiversity habitats and species; (xli) To safeguard and where possible enhance green chains and corridors ([including river corridors); (xlii) To safeguard and where possible, enhance the wider countryside in both urban and rural areas.</p>	
Officer Response	
<p>The environmental implications section (paragraphs 5.103a - 5.106a) within the Green Belt chapter, refers to overarching objectives set out in chapter 4 of the Adopted Local Plan. As neither chapter 4, nor this section of the Green Belt chapter were included in the Alterations, it is not possible to amend these objectives now. In any event objectives set out in paragraph 5.103a are sufficiently generic to cover the points raised in the representation.</p>	
Officer Recommendation	
<p>No change</p>	
Member Decision	
<p></p>	