

Sustainable Development Panel 23 January 2013

Item 4 Development Management Policies Plan – Errata

Members' attention is drawn to a small number of inaccuracies and omissions within the Annexes to the report, as follows.

Erratum 1 - Annex 2 should be replaced with the attached corrected Annex, to incorporate minor corrections and proposed changes for clarity previously omitted in error. Changes from the circulated Annex 2 are highlighted in grey.

- 1) Page 1: Policy **DM5**: correction to text in “Justification for proposed change” column in response to objection from Norfolk County Council re sustainable drainage.
- 2) Page 2: Policy **DM5**: additional proposed change to supporting text para 5.17, change made in response to objection from Norfolk County Council re sustainable drainage.
- 3) Page 4: Policy **DM11**: correction in Respondent and Nature of rep column; proposed change is in response to a representation by the Environment Agency rather than a change proposed independently by officers.
- 4) Page 9: Policy **DM25**: additional proposed change to Alternative Options text following paragraph 25.7, re conditions on retail warehouse floorspace. This is a clarification proposed by officers to more accurately reflect the purpose of this policy.
- 5) Page 10: Policy **DM29**. proposed additional criterion c) for the acceptance of redevelopment proposals for surface car parks identified in the Site Allocations Plan, change made in response to objection from Capital Shopping Centres.

All of these proposed changes are already reflected in the proposed submission version of the DM Policies Plan text previously circulated as Annex 3, with the exception of number 5 – see Erratum 3 below.

Erratum 2 – Annex 3 (DM policies plan text). Substitute Page 144-145 with the attached. The prospective change to the second paragraph of policy DM22 originally proposed by officers will **not** now be made in the submission version and was retained in the plan text in error.

Erratum 3 – Annex 3 (DM Policies Plan text). Substitute Page 175 with the attached. Additional criterion c) for the acceptance of redevelopment proposals affecting existing car parks is appended to policy DM29, in response to the representation from Capital Shopping Centres.

Norwich City Council
22 January 2013

Erratum 1

Annex 2 - corrected schedule of proposed minor changes to plan
(changes from previously circulated Annex 2 shown shaded grey)

Policy/Ref	Respondent	Nature of rep	Action proposed	Justification for proposed change
DM1	English Heritage	Would like to see specific reference to protection and enhancement of the city's heritage assets as a component of sustainable development.	Amend second bullet point of policy DM1 to read <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "protect and enhance the physical, <u>environmental and historic assets</u> of the city and to safeguard the special visual and environmental qualities of Norwich for all users"; Amend para 1.7 to read: " ... the quality of the built and natural environment raised, <u>environmental and heritage assets protected</u> and the wider advantages of growth made available to all sectors of the community...". Clarification.	Reinforces DM1 and makes clear that heritage should be considered as a component of sustainability
DM3	Norwich Society	Supporting text at 3.2 refers to design review of major developments but not to local design review arrangements: this is inconsistent with the NPPF.	Amend paragraph 3.2 to read "In accordance with NPPF recommendations, <u>local design review arrangements are in place to provide assessment and support to ensure high standards of design in Norwich. Formal comments on the design aspects of current planning applications have been provided on a monthly basis by the Norwich Society (the city's main local amenity society) for many years</u> . More significant development proposals may also be referred to an independent local design review panel ...". Clarification.	To acknowledge measures for design review at a local level.
DM5	Norfolk County Council	Plan should not set thresholds for requiring sustainable drainage measures in advance of national standards	Amend the second paragraph of policy headed "Sustainable drainage" as follows: Sustainable drainage measures appropriate to the scale and nature of the development shall be incorporated in all appropriate development proposals involving the erection of new buildings or the extension of existing buildings (other than householder extensions), until such time as thresholds are established by nationally applicable standards for sustainable drainage. Such measures will be required except where this is not technically feasible or where it can be demonstrated that other factors preclude their use.	It is accepted that the DM policies plan should not pre-empt national standards for sustainable drainage, however those standards are not yet in place. The policy now clarifies that the local thresholds will be an interim measure pending the introduction of national standards as part of the new drainage permission regime.

Policy/Ref	Respondent	Nature of rep	Action proposed	Justification for proposed change
DM5	Norfolk County Council	Policy measures are needed to mitigate surface water flood risk where significant risk is identified outside of designated areas;	Delete the policy heading "Critical Drainage Areas" and replace with "Areas at risk from surface water flooding" Amend the following paragraph as follows: Within the critical drainage areas as identified on the Policies Map, and in other areas where the best available evidence indicates that a serious and exceptional risk of surface water flooding exists, all developments involving new buildings or extensions over 50 sq m, with the exception of householder development, will be required to be accompanied by a flood risk assessment which gives adequate and appropriate consideration to surface water flooding. ..."	Policy measures are needed to mitigate surface water flood risk where significant risk is identified outside of designated areas;
DM5	Norfolk County Council	Text in 5.18-5.21 needs to better explain the role of the county council as lead local flood authority and the operation of the drainage permission regime.	In paragraph 5.17, delete the last sentence of the paragraph and replace with the following text: Upon full commencement of this "drainage permission" regime sustainable drainage systems will become mandatory for most forms of development. Notwithstanding the emergence of the new drainage approving role of the County Council, the sustainable drainage section of this policy retains a requirement for surface water drainage issues to be addressed in planning applications, both to ensure that surface water drainage issues are considered ahead of the commencement of the new regime and to ensure that the impact of drainage measures on the form and visual appearance of developments is properly taken into account in the design of new development.	Accept the point made by the objector - clarifies that these are interim requirements pending the introduction of the new drainage permission regime.

Policy/Ref	Respondent	Nature of rep	Action proposed	Justification for proposed change
DM5	Norfolk County Council	Text in 5.18-5.21 needs to acknowledge surface water flood risk outside CDAs	In paragraph 5.21, delete the text from the end of the first sentence to the end of the paragraph and replace with the following text: Norfolk County Council had intended to commission the technical modelling necessary to define the extent of these flood paths during the 2012-13 financial year, but at the time of writing the technical evidence is not yet available to enable any additional high-risk areas to be shown in detail on the Policies Map. The intention was to define them on the map under this policy as soon as the relevant technical report is published, prior to the formal adoption of this plan. Should this not be possible, the policy allows for the emergence of more extensive technical evidence on surface water flood risk to be taken into account over the plan period, so that in areas or sites outside of the Critical Drainage Areas where there is likely to be elevated risk of surface water flooding (e.g. as a result of specific topography) the same policy requirements would apply.	Accept the point made by the objector whilst acknowledging that the extent of such risk may need to be quantified through the emergence of better evidence.
DM6	Broads Authority	Request removal of reference in supporting text to the Broads "National Park".	Accepted: Amend first sentence of policy to read "... taking particular account of the need to avoid harm to the adjoining <u>Broads Authority area</u> and other identified areas of natural environmental value ..." Factual correction.	To reflect status of the Broads as equivalent to, but not actually, a National Park.
DM9	n/a - officer change		Reinstate heading "Archaeology" before section of policy commencing "In the defined areas of archeological interest ..."	Archaeology section has a missing heading (this was inadvertently omitted at Reg25 draft stage)
DM11	Environment Agency		Add the following to the end of paragraph 2 in the 'Air and Water Quality' section of the policy. 'Any development which has the potential to pollute should demonstrate that pollution mitigation measures, protective of the water environment, have been incorporated into the development. Additional regard should be had where a site falls within a Source Protection Zone (in particular zone 1), on a Principal Aquifer or adjacent to a watercourse.	Amendments to policy clarify and explain responsibilities to developers concerning water quality .
DM11	n/a - officer change		In the bullet point list of notifiable installations in paragraph 11.3, replace "Bayer Cropscience" with "Briar Chemicals Ltd".	Factual change, to reflect sale of the site by Bayer in September 2012 and rebranding of company.

Policy/Ref	Respondent	Nature of rep	Action proposed	Justification for proposed change
DM11	n/a - officer change		In paragraph 11.18, replace "the council has agreed to declare a single AQMA..." with "the council has now declared a single AQMA..."	Factual update. The order for the enlarged city centre AQMA was confirmed and came into force on 1 November 2012.
DM11	Environment Agency	Amendments to text needed to clarify and explain responsibilities to developers concerning water quality.	Amend first sentence of paragraph 11.21 to read: 'Developers must be mindful that the pollution of the water environment is an offence under the Environmental Permitting Regulations (England and Wales) 2010. Also, the Water Framework Directive requires there to be no deterioration in water status and for good status to be achieved in the long term. The proximity of the Norfolk and Suffolk Broads...'	Amendments to text to clarify and explain responsibilities to developers concerning water quality .
DM11	Environment Agency	Amendments to text needed to clarify and explain responsibilities to developers concerning water quality.	Add the following wording at the end of paragraph 11.22: 'Source Protection Zone 1 is particularly vulnerable to contamination, therefore a risk assessment will be required before anything other than clean roof water is discharged to ground in those areas.'	Amendments to text to clarify and explain responsibilities to developers concerning water quality .
DM14	n/a - officer change		In paragraph 14.4 (with reference to the Gypsies and Traveller Accommodation Assessment): (1) Line 1, delete "draft"; (2) Line 2, replace "2011" with "(published August 2012)"; (3) Line 8, delete "The final assessment report is expected to be published later in 2012." In the bulleted reference to the Gypsies and Traveller Accommodation Assessment at the end of the policy, delete "2011".	Factual update. The Greater Norwich Gypsies and Travellers Accommodation Assessment was agreed and published in August 2012.
DM16	n/a - officer change		In paragraph 16.2, replace "Bayer Cropscience" with "Briar Chemicals Ltd. (formerly Bayer Cropscience).	Factual change, see DM11.

Policy/Ref	Respondent	Nature of rep	Action proposed	Justification for proposed change
DM18	NLP for Capital Shopping Centres	Reasoned justification for prohibition of main town centres uses on employment areas is unclear, also not clear if this refers to employment areas in centres or to all employment areas.	<p>Accepted: Insert additional paragraph 18.11a, as follows:</p> <p>"18.11a As noted in paragraph 16.5 above, the Greater Norwich Employment Growth and Sites and Premises Study 2008 (the Arup Study) identifies a need to ensure adequate provision of employment land and premises to support strategic employment growth in Greater Norwich. Accordingly, JCS Policy 5 requires employment areas identified in local plans to be protected for their designated purpose. Thus, when considering proposals for main town centre uses on the employment areas identified under policy DM16 of this plan, it will be necessary to ensure that the proposed development would not only be appropriate in terms of its sequential suitability and impact, but also would not compromise the function of the employment area concerned or undermine prospects for its regeneration or improvement."</p> <p>Add "Greater Norwich Employment Growth and Sites and Premises Study (Arup/Oxford Economics 2008)" to the list of references at the end of the policy.</p> <p>Clarification of the reasoning for the policy approach.</p>	Clarification of the relationship of this policy with DM16.
DM20	NLP for Capital Shopping Centres	Qualified support, subject to minor amendment to remove the word "already" in that section of policy covering circumstances where proportion of retail frontage is "already below" the applicable percentage threshold.	<p>Accepted: Delete the word "already" from fifth paragraph of policy. To now read:</p> <p><i>"Within defined retail frontages, where the proportion of retail uses at ground floor level is below the minimum proportion specified, proposals will be considered on a case by case basis and accepted where the proposal ..."</i>. Corresponding change proposed in DM21.</p> <p>Clarification through removal of unnecessary wording.</p>	Objectors point accepted.

Policy/Ref	Respondent	Nature of rep	Action proposed	Justification for proposed change
DM20	NLP for Capital Shopping Centres	Re explanatory text 20.15 – support flexibility demonstrated through encouragement of alternative uses in long-term vacant premises and reduction of applicable marketing period for vacant shops from a year to nine months. Suggest it would be reasonable to grant temporary pp for alternative community uses for longer than a year.	Amend the last sentence of paragraph 20.15 to read: <u>Such temporary permission would typically be granted for an initial period of one year although there will be scope to agree longer periods in individual circumstances where it is appropriate and beneficial to do so. During this time the premises should still be actively marketed for retail purposes.</u> Clarification that there may be scope for flexibility in the application of the policy.	It is accepted that a longer period for temporary permissions may be appropriate in a difficult economic climate - responds to NPPF re flexible and positive policies.
DM21	n/a - officer change		Amend policy clause d) to read "the proposal would not result in a harmful impact on the vitality, viability and diversity of services in the centre, <u>in particular by not adding to the number of services or facilities which would not generally be available to the public during the normal working day;</u> and"	Responds to concerns of DM staff that a proliferation of evening only services, especially takeaways, could impact unacceptably on the vitality of local parades. Can be justified in terms of "Parades to be Proud of" and improves effectiveness of policy in clarifying what constitutes a harmful impact.
DM21	n/a - officer change		In policy clause f) replace "unacceptable environmental effects" with " <u>unacceptable impacts on residential amenity or other effects on traffic or the environment</u> ".	Improves effectiveness of policy in clarifying the impacts which are most relevant to protecting district and local centres.
DM21	n/a - officer change		In paragraph 21.11, after "large format retailers", add the following text: <i>"It will be particularly important to ensure that the range and choice of services in any one centre contributes to diversity and vitality across the whole of the working day and evening. Consequently the council would normally seek to achieve a balance of uses which is not disproportionately weighted towards evening-only services such as hot food takeaways, which often contribute very little to local and district centres if they are closed during the day. Conversely, uses such as cafés can offer significant benefits to the vitality and viability of local centres in both the daytime and evening through their role as community hubs and meeting places."</i>	New commentary to explain the reasoning for the changes to policy DM21 (d).

Policy/Ref	Respondent	Nature of rep	Action proposed	Justification for proposed change
DM21	n/a - officer change		In paragraph 21.11, replace the second sentence commencing "Impact on diversity of services..." with the following text and commence this section as new para 21.11a as follows: <i>21.11a The policy does not seek to impose a strict quota on the number and type of non-retail A class uses and other services in centres. Rather, the impact on diversity of services of any particular proposal will be a matter of judgement on a case by case basis taking account of community needs, operators' business requirements, likely impact on neighbour amenity and considerations of how the range of services in individual centres might be changing and developing.</i>	New commentary to better explain the application of policy DM21 and the need for flexibility, whilst giving appropriate weight to the need to protect neighbour amenity.
DM22	n/a - officer change		Provision and enhancement of community facilities In the first section of the policy, replace "community facilities" with "public or community facilities"	Clarification requested by DM officers for consistency with NPPF definition.
DM22	n/a - officer change		Protection of community facilities: DELETE clause d) in this section of the policy, relating to assets of community value.	To reflect the status of Assets of Community Value and the related registration and community challenge processes as independent from, and unable to be directly influenced by, planning powers.
DM22	n/a - officer change		Subdivide paragraph 22.7, commence new para 22.7a after "... importance of the facility to its users." (sentence beginning "The Localism Act 2011...."). In this paragraph: (i) replace "permit community and voluntary bodies" with " <i>allowing duly constituted community and voluntary bodies ...</i> ". (ii) replace "enable those bodies" with " <i>enabling those bodies</i> " (iii) After "...threat of disposal." add the following sentence " <i>The Assets of Community Value (ACV) provisions are set out in Part 5 Chapter 3 of the Act, and accompanying Assets of Community Value (England) Regulations came into force in September 2012</i> ".	To reflect the status of Assets of Community Value and the related registration and community challenge processes as independent from, and unable to be directly influenced by, planning powers.

Policy/Ref	Respondent	Nature of rep	Action proposed	Justification for proposed change
DM22	n/a - officer change		DELETE first sentence of paragraph 22.8 and replace with the following text: <i>22.8 Whilst the designation of a site or building as an asset of community value is important, it cannot be regarded as a material planning consideration. The process of listing assets of community value is separate from the planning process, which should only assess the planning merits of a scheme. Inclusion on the ACV list simply confirms assets nominated by community groups which are considered by them to have some community worth; however it is not an objective assessment of community value. In addition it would be inappropriate to treat a designated asset of community value as a material planning consideration when deciding a planning application when other non-designated community assets might have greater community value but have not been recognised by formal designation.</i>	As above, and to reflect advice given to elected members in September 2012 with regard to the relative weight and materiality in planning decisions of Assets of Community Value status.
DM22	n/a - officer change		<i>22.8a For the purposes of this policy, therefore, the community value of individual assets affected by development proposals would need to be objectively assessed on a case by case basis, irrespective of whether they are included on the ACV list or not. In appropriate cases it may be necessary for intending developers to consider how the exercise of any statutory community right to buy or community right to challenge under ACV legislation might affect the timescale for the delivery of a scheme.</i>	As above, and to reflect advice given to elected members in September 2012 with regard to the relative weight and materiality in planning decisions of Assets of Community Value status.
DM22	n/a - officer change		Commence new paragraph 22.8b with sentence "As these opportunities arise, therefore..." ; delete "these".	As above
DM22	n/a - officer change		Under the Alternative Options section, replace the sentence commencing "Following the recent extension of the council's local list ..." with the following text: <i>"Following the publication of the Norwich Society's prospective local list, the council's officially endorsed list of locally identified heritage assets (the Norwich local list) will be extended to a wider area of Norwich, and additional pubs would become protected as identified assets under policy DM9".</i>	To reflect the status of the emerging Norwich Society local list.

Policy/Ref	Respondent	Nature of rep	Action proposed	Justification for proposed change
DM22	n/a - officer change		In te list of references at the end of the policy, add <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Assets of Community Value (England) Regulations 2012. 	Factual update.
DM23	NLP for Capital Shopping Centres	Reference to leisure uses in the policy should be clarified as applying to D2 uses and not A3, A4 and A5: also requirement that such uses “will be restricted to” upper floors and basements in shopping frontages too onerous: should be changed to “will be encouraged in” to allow flexibility and permit some leisure operator presence at ground floor level.	Accepted: Amend paragraph 23.7 to read: "23.7 <i>Leisure uses</i> are defined as D2 uses <u>which may either be focused on active indoor sport (e.g. gymnasiums and health clubs) or on passive public entertainment, such as cinemas and concert halls. The definition of leisure uses would also include theatres (which are sui generis uses and thus always require planning permission). The expectation of this policy is that in order to protect retail function, vitality and viability it will not usually be appropriate to locate these larger format leisure uses at ground floor level within the primary retail area, nor would it be practical in most circumstances to do so. There may however be scope to make use of underused upper floor or basement space and provide a dedicated entrance from street level, and this would not preclude proposals providing a mix of leisure and hospitality uses, for example including a ground floor café or shop in association with the upper floor use.</u> "	Clarification re the practical application and interpretation of the policy.
DM25	n/a - officer change		Amend the first paragraph of the Alternative options section at end of policy following paragraph 25.7, as follows: An alternative approach is not to have a policy on <u>planning conditions for retail warehouse floorspace</u> and rely solely on policy DM18. A lack of a strong policy may result in <u>new forms of retail warehousing becoming established</u> in unsuitable locations and the removal of appropriate and necessary conditions on existing retail warehouses. This is likely to have a harmful impact on the vitality of the city centre and increase dependency on the private car and high emission vehicles.	To more properly reflect the purpose of redrafted policy DM25 as relating to controls over the use of existing retail floorspace rather than the development of new retail warehousing.

Policy/Ref	Respondent	Nature of rep	Action proposed	Justification for proposed change
DM26	Bidwells for UEA	General support subject to minor textual change re Earlham Hall (a "historic building" rather than "house")	Accepted: Amend para 26.10 to read: 26.10 Earlham Hall is a grade II star listed <u>historic building</u> which adjoins, but does not lie within the existing or proposed university campus. Factual correction.	Objectors point accepted.
DM29	NLP for Capital Shopping Centres	Additional policy criterion required accepting development in cases where a car park site is specifically allocated for development in the site allocations plan.	Add further criterion at the end of the policy: c) <u>specifically allocated for development</u> in the Site Allocations Plan	Objectors point accepted. The policy would be inconsistent with Site Allocation Plan proposals to redevelop Chantry Car Park (and others) unless this change is made.
DM33	Thomas Eggar LLP for Asda Stores Ltd	Support in general terms but suggested that policy may result in developers paying twice for infrastructure both through CIL charges and planning obligations: city council urged to avoid this situation. Supporting text at 33.7 suggests that purpose of Regulation 123 list is to specify s106 funded items: this is not the case as s106 funding for items on the list is expressly prohibited by legislation.	Accepted: Amend first sentence of paragraph 33.7 to read: <i>33.7 The city council's published "regulation 123 list" specifies the infrastructure items and projects which it intends to fund through CIL receipts. It is also intended (for the avoidance of doubt) to separately itemise those matters which remain appropriate to cover by means of a planning obligation.</i> NB: It is not the intention that developers would be in a situation where they would be expected to pay twice for the same infrastructure: paragraph 33.6 states this clearly and unequivocally.	Clarification of the purpose of the regulation 123 list.
DM33	Indigo Planning for Schroder UK Property Fund	Welcome flexibility in policy but consider that clause (a) should recognise cases where viability can be impacted by additional obligation requirements and development costs in isolation as well as in combination.	Accepted: Under "Viability Considerations", amend clause (a) to read: <i>a) the impact of CIL contributions, planning obligations and abnormal development costs <u>either individually or in combination</u> would result in a proposed development becoming economically unviable; and .."</i> Clarification: it is acknowledged that in some circumstances scheme viability might be significantly impacted by a single obligation.	Objectors point accepted.

Policy/Ref	Respondent	Nature of rep	Action proposed	Justification for proposed change
DM33	n/a - officer change		In paragraph 33.15, update the CIL adoption timetable as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Submission of final charging schedule with modifications: August 2012</i> • <i>Independent examination and consideration of objections: October 2012</i> • <i>Formal adoption of CIL (simultaneously by the three GNDP districts): expected early 2013.</i> 	Factual update.
DM33	n/a - officer change		In paragraph 33.16, for "see policy DM33 following" read "see policy DM33 above".	Editorial correction consequent on late reordering the CIL commentary to follow policy DM33 rather than preceding it.
Appendix 2	n/a - officer change		Following the first paragraph in the preamble, add the following text: <i>"It should be noted that Bayer Cropscience have sold their site at Sweet Briar Road as a going concern and from 1 September 2012 it trades as Briar Chemicals Limited. "</i>	See DM11 above.
Policies Map	English Heritage	Scheduled Ancient Monuments boundary data updated and inaccuracies corrected: sites affected are - Castle Mound/Castle Bailey; Norman House, Whitefriars; Carrow Priory.	Correct the policies map to incorporate these changes	Factual correction to align the Policies Map data with the latest Scheduled Monument boundary data held by English Heritage.
Policies Map	Paul Holley (Norwich City Council)	Identified errors in depiction of existing and proposed Riverside Walk routes and Open Spaces boundary data on Policies Map are corrected.	Correct the policies map to incorporate these changes	Factual correction.
Policies Map	Joy Brown (Norwich City Council)	Inadvertent omission of part of City Centre Leisure Area within Northern City Centre Area Action Plan area inset has been reinstated.	Correct the policies map to incorporate these changes	Factual correction.

Policy/Ref	Respondent	Nature of rep	Action proposed	Justification for proposed change
Policies Map	NLP for Capital Shopping Centres	Lower ground floor retail frontages of Chapelfield are shown on both the main inset map and the shopping centre thumbnail plans, suggesting there are three retail levels in Chapelfield not two. One of the thumbnail plans should be removed to eliminate duplication. Primary frontage definition unclear.	Correct the policies map to remove duplication of shopping frontages on the main part of the city centre inset where they already appear on the shopping centre inset plans for Chapelfield and Castle Mall	Amendment to remove ambiguity.

Erratum 2

Annex 3 substitute pages 144-145 – policy DM22

Planning for and safeguarding community facilities

Policy DM22

Provision and enhancement of community facilities

Development of new or enhanced public or community facilities will be permitted and encouraged where they contribute positively to the wellbeing and social cohesion of local communities, with preference being given to locations within or adjacent to the city centre or existing and proposed local and district centres in accordance with the hierarchy of centres set out in JCS policy 19. Proposals within centres will be accepted where their location is appropriate to and their scale and function is compatible with the centre in which they are proposed.

Comment [JMB1]: Consistent with NPPF definition.

The provision of new community facilities outside or not adjacent to centres will be acceptable where there is a clear community need for such a facility and:

- a) it can be demonstrated that there are no suitable premises within or adjacent to centres; or
- b) the proposal is predominately for outdoor sport or recreation activities (including recreational buildings provided in association with and ancillary or complementary to those activities) and is consistent with the requirements of policy DM8; or
- c) there are overriding community, amenity and environmental benefits deriving from an out of centre location.

Schools and other educational development

Proposals for new or replacement schools and other educational facilities, extensions to existing schools and changes of use for school or other educational and training purposes will be accepted and permitted where:

- a) they would not undermine the objectives for sustainable development set out in policy DM1, in particular by increasing the need to travel by private car.
- b) they would not give rise to significant impacts on the environment, highway safety or traffic arising from locational constraints or the particular configuration of the site or premises which could not be overcome by the imposition of conditions,
- c) appropriate and adequate provision can be made for the residential accommodation needs of students (where required).

Particular support will be given to proposals which provide for the shared use of schools facilities by the wider community.

The local community must be consulted to ensure that new and enhanced community facilities of all types best meet their needs and aspirations..

Protection of community facilities

Development resulting in the loss of an existing community facility (excluding community public houses listed in Appendix 5) will only be permitted where:

- a) adequate alternative provision exists or will be provided in an equally accessible or more accessible location within 800 metres walking distance; or

ERRATUM 2

Annex 3: Correction to proposed DM policy DM22 pp 144-145

b) all reasonable efforts have been made to preserve the facility but it has been demonstrated that it would not be economically viable, feasible or practicable to retain the building or site for its existing use; and
c) evidence is provided to confirm that the property or site has been marketed for a meaningful period and that there is no realistic interest in its retention for the current use or for an alternative community use.

The involvement of the local community will be sought in identifying the importance of local facilities, including them (where appropriate) on the statutory list of assets of community value and in developing appropriate solutions for their retention and enhancement.

Development resulting in the loss of historic and community public houses listed in Appendix 5, will only be permitted where criteria b), c) and d) above are satisfied.

Where it is demonstrated that an existing community use is not viable, preference will be given to the change of use or redevelopment to alternative community uses before other uses are considered. Proposals for development which involve the unavoidable loss of community facilities for which there is a proven demand will be required to consider the scope for relocating or reproviding the facility either within the new development or on an alternative site within the locality and to make such provision where feasible and practicable.

Deleted: , and

Deleted: d) in the case of a listed asset of community value, the opportunity has been taken to consider the exercise of any statutory community right to buy or community right to challenge from a duly appointed neighbourhood or community body, where relevant.¶

Supplementary text

- 22.1 This policy also responds to the requirements of the NPPF in relation to promoting healthy communities, as detailed in the supplementary text to policy DM21. It seeks to ensure that an appropriate and accessible range and choice of community facilities and services is maintained within Norwich and to protect viable facilities so far as is practicable unless there is an overriding justification for their loss or exceptional benefits deriving from alternative forms of development.
- 22.2 Community facilities are essential to ensure and maintain a high quality of life for those that live, work and visit Norwich city centre and its suburban residential neighbourhoods. The council seeks to support and where possible, enhance, viable and necessary community facilities which play an important role in social interaction and community cohesion. The Site allocations plan makes provision for community facilities in a number of key development allocations: where need is demonstrated it is envisaged that the Community Infrastructure Levy will be the primary mechanism for funding and securing additional community facilities for which a need can be justified.

For the purpose of this policy “a community facility” should be taken to include facilities generally available to and used by the local community at large for the purposes of leisure, social interaction, health and wellbeing or

Erratum 3

Annex 3 substitute page 175 – Policy DM29

ERRATUM 3

Annex 3: Correction to proposed DM policy DM29, p175.

Managing parking demand in the city centre

Policy DM29

City centre public off-street car parking

Public off-street car parking will only be permitted within the city centre parking area as defined on the Policies Map. Within this defined area, the total number of off street public car parking spaces available at any one time will not exceed 10,000 and proposals which would result in this figure being exceeded will not be permitted.

Any new public off-street car parking, whether associated with development or not, will only be permitted where it:

- a) replaces and consolidates existing provision elsewhere within the defined area;
- b) provides efficient, high capacity parking (generally this will require in the region of 500 car parking spaces minimum, unless a lower capacity can be justified by the configuration, design constraints and location of the site);
- c) improves the balance and distribution of car parking within the city centre, to provide new parking outside the areas identified for reduced car parking;
- d) makes efficient use of land, by decking or inclusion within the built form of a wider redevelopment;
- e) operates with a tariff that encourages short and medium stay use, and which discourages all day commuter car parking;
- f) includes provision of Variable Message Signing (VMS) to advise motorists of the availability of spaces beyond the development site, as part of the citywide VMS scheme;
- g) is of high quality and secure, with level surfacing, marked spaces (including spaces for disabled drivers with appropriate level access to the surrounding area and associated facilities which will ensure safe and convenient access for and use by disabled people), and is properly lit and managed;
- h) is easily accessible by car from the inner ring road, either directly, or from a main access route;
- i) is easily accessible on foot to the retail/leisure area(s) that it serves; and
- j) makes provision for publicly accessible electric vehicle recharging points.

With the exception of multi-storey car parks, the redevelopment of existing car parks for other uses will be permitted to facilitate this consolidation (even where there is no immediate prospect of their replacement) where the existing car park is:

- a) poorly located in terms of vehicular access; or
- b) located within the area identified for reduced car parking on the Policies Map; or
- c) specifically allocated for development in the Site allocations plan.

Deleted: .

