

**SEA RECOMMENDATIONS IN MITIGATION**  
**DPNPWG RECOMMENDATIONS TO DESFOR PARISH COUNCIL**  
**SUBJECT TO REPOSSES FROM REULATION 13 CONSULTATION**

<b>SEA MITIGATION</b>	<b>PROPOSDE RECOMMENDATION TO DPC</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy H1 currently seeks to exclude small scale leisure or tourism activities and other forms of commercial/employment appropriate to the countryside outside or adjacent to the settlement boundary which is inconsistent with the provisions as set in Policy E2.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agree and amend Policy H1 accordingly</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy H2 could seek to encourage some mix of uses on site in response to identified local needs while still seek to provide the level and nature of residential growth outlined. As a site specific policy it is recommended that the policy makes it clear that proposals for the site are subject to other relevant policies of the plan in particular Policy H6 including matters relating to landscape character and biodiversity</li> </ul> <p>. It is recommended for Policy H2 criteria (I) <i>Other financial contributions</i> ...Delete <i>at full planning application stage</i> as financial contributions requirements are not limited to full planning applications</p>	<p><b>Noted: include in narrative, as some examiners have excluded such wording in the policies themselves.</b></p> <p><b>Agreed: the words will be deleted.</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the inclusion of policy which seeks to encourage renewable energy infrastructure</li> </ul>	<p><b>No sites came forward in the call-for-sites exercise and it is difficult to see such sites arising in Desford, but a statement of support for any suitable site will be included in the narrative.</b></p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy H5/supporting text - It is recommended that it may be beneficial to identify the likely amount of anticipated windfall development that is anticipated to come forward during the plan period.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agreed: we will make such a statement in the supporting narrative.</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy ENV 5: Consider an amendment that replaces <i>building or structure</i> to heritage asset in recognition that such assets can include landscape.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agreed: the change will be made</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For clarity the table of heritages assets provided at page 40 could identify those assets which are designated heritage assets and those which are non-designated heritage assts.</li> <li>• Policy ENV 6: Consider the inclusion of the following <i>development shall be designed to sustain significant views that contribute to the character and appearance of the area.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Every listed asset is a non-designated heritage asset</b></p> <p><b>Agreed. The recommended change will be made.</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy ENV 7: For Wind Turbine and Large-scale solar energy generation development developments seek to clarify that such proposals are subject to considerations of the rest of ENV 7 and other relevant policies in the plan.</li> </ul>	<p><b>We will address this in the supporting narrative, because of previous experience of examinations and Examiners’ decisions</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy ENV 3: Consider the inclusion of <i>Work constructively with other organisations to seek to consider the possibility of installing major solar facilities.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>This is more of a community Action than a policy, and we will address it in the supporting narrative.</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy E2: Consider the inclusion of <i>or on areas of previously developed land in sustainable locations.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Agreed. The recommended change will be made.</b></p>

