



CHIPPENHAM NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN_

Chippenham Town Council

Consultation Statement: Appendix R

Summary of Key Changes Made to Policies as a
Result of Regulation 14 Consultations

Policy	Issue Identified from Regulation 14 Comments	Modification to Policy
SCC1 - Net Zero Carbon Development	Parts of the Net Zero Emissions section run counterproductive to Building Regulations. In order to ensure that the delivery of housing is not jeopardised on viability grounds in attempting to meet these targets, this policy needs to reflect national and local policy to be more flexible	Large section deleted referring to reductions in Building Regulations due to Part L Building Regulations coming into operation in June 2022, and further reductions via the Future Homes Standard in 2025. Policy reworked to rely on submission of Energy Statement which would model estimated regulated energy consumption of buildings to demonstrate how an annual operational net zero carbon emissions balance will achieve net zero carbon, both pre and post construction. Policy simplified and made more flexible as a result
	Not possible for all types of planning application to demonstrate whole life carbon assessments given that this can only be done when working drawings are produced. It is important to ensure that the chosen approach to whole life-cycle carbon is supported by relevant/up-to-date evidence and is subject to appropriate viability testing	Reference to whole life carbon assessments deleted with Policy now focusing on operational net zero carbon instead. Elements of whole life carbon assessment incorporated into Policy SCC2 (Sustainable Design and Construction) and Figure 5.2 in a more flexible manner
SCC2 - Sustainable Design & Construction	Policy refers to an array of different standards that constitute a variety of measures of building and/or environmental performance. The different measures and standards are not necessarily compatible and can cover aspects unrelated to sustainable construction materials and techniques. Policy would result in development being unviable and undeliverable. More flexibility required	Policy substantially amended to provide greater flexibility. Instead of focusing on industry standards to demonstrate sustainable design and construction, it now focuses on demonstrating sustainable design, construction materials and construction methods through submission of a Sustainability Statement
SCC3 - Standalone Renewable Energy	Policy should be comprehensive in its consideration, including cumulative impacts	Reference added to any cumulative adverse impacts from renewable energy developments
	Policy wording of Criterion c) should be amended to include wider overall scenarios and differentiate between landscape and visual effects	Criterion c) wording deleted and new wording to reference that proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated that particularly adverse/harmful landscape and/or visual effects are capable of being successfully mitigated through sensitive site selection, inherent/sensitive design measures and/or appropriate mitigating and enhancing landscaping proposals
	Policy needs to be consistent with national policy and regulation (for example, to deliver biodiversity net gain)	Reference added to requirement for minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain on land around arrays of ground mounted solar photovoltaic development

	Support should be stated for community energy project proposals	New paragraph added giving strong support for community energy project proposals
GI1 - Biodiversity	Policy wording is lengthy and could be more precise. Some elements repeat protection provided in the WCS or duplicate legal requirements for biodiversity net gain. Other elements seem to be quite detailed and prescriptive and might not be an appropriate solution in all circumstances	Policy re-written in slimmed down form. Duplication removed.
	Reference to developer contributions should be amended as not reasonable	Reference to developer contributions being used to secure enhancements to existing green spaces deleted (as likely to be achieved through CIL or BNG) but reference retained in supporting text
	Policy could refer to proposals incorporating integrated bird and bat boxes, swift bricks, bee bricks and hedgehog highways	Support for integrated bird and bat boxes, swift bricks, bee bricks and hedgehog holes added in new criteria
	Want to see more on protecting existing trees, ponds, hedges etc.	New criteria added which references protection of ancient trees and hedgerows and/or trees and hedgerows of arboricultural value, and protection and enhancement of blue infrastructure (such as ponds)
GI2 - Local Green Spaces	Issues identified have not resulted in any changes being made to Policy	
GI3 - Green Corridors	Policy should include greater reference to the flood risk purpose of the riverine corridors	Criterion i) amended to include reference to ' <i>flood protection</i> ' as a principle function of Green Corridors
	Informal recreation could be appropriate, but prioritising investment in formal sports provision within Green Corridors is more likely to conflict with wildlife/biodiversity and amenity/tranquillity interests.	Criterion iii) amended from: <i>'Prioritising investment in enhancement of open space, sport and recreation within the Green Corridors'</i> to: <i>'Prioritising investment in enhancement of open space, and informal recreation where appropriate'</i>
	Green corridors should have low lighting	New criterion v) added to minimise light pollution in Green Corridors: <i>'Avoiding the installation of new lighting where possible. Where it is deemed necessary to install new lighting it should comply with the Institute of Lighting Professionals minimum standards for Environmental Zone E2'</i>
	Reference to use of commuted sums and maintenance of street trees in criterion b) seems unnecessary, and it is also unclear as to what 'commuted sums' this refers to and who holds them	Reference to use of commuted sums and maintenance of street trees in criterion b) deleted

G14 - Trees, Woodlands & Hedgerows	Policy too prescriptive on tree canopy cover. 20% may not be suitable in all circumstances and in others may have the perverse effect of being a disincentive to higher levels of tree cover	First sentence of Tree Canopy Cover paragraph modified to make less prescriptive/more flexible from: <i>'Proposals are required to demonstrate a minimum future tree canopy cover of 20% of the site area...'</i> To: <i>'Proposals should demonstrate a future tree canopy cover of at least 20% of the site area...'</i>
	Policy on buffer zones negatively worded. Could be revised to flexibly support the delivery of development. It should signpost the detailed design process as the means of addressing the matter	Second paragraph shortened to avoid repetition of Paragraph 6.53 and more positively worded, with reference to the detailed design process made
G15 - Green Buffers	A strategic, and therefore inappropriate, policy which seeks to control the extent and form of the urban area. It refers to land outside of the Neighbourhood Area and does not allocate any specific sites. Not in accordance with the strategic policies of the development plan	Policy completely re-written to remove reference to any strategic requirements and the 'Green buffer principles for Chippenham'. It is now a more focused, non-strategic policy which relates to a single Green Buffer, two fields solely within the Neighbourhood Area (shown in new Figure 5.4), which have previously been allocated as part of the wider Rawlings Green Country Park in the Chippenham Site Allocations Plan (CSAP) and evidenced for their landscape value in separating Chippenham from Peckingell, Langley Burrell and Tytherton Lucas.
	In reference to Criterion C, it would be an inappropriate landscape response to require 'dense tree planting' to 'protect views from the countryside towards Chippenham during all times of the year'. Any landscape masterplans associated with new development should instead seek to integrate new development within the existing landscape using indigenous species and planting regimes that complement the local landscape character	Criterion C deleted, re-phrased and moved to more appropriate place in Section A of Chippenham Design Guide. Wording amended to better reflect that tree planting would not be expected along the entire length of the new settlement edge and breaks in the tree line would be sought in key views of Chippenham from the countryside and vice versa. New wording amended to clarify that both evergreen and deciduous tree planting would be required
	Rewording of Policy could take into consideration that green and blue infrastructure shall be strategically located along contours and the edges of development sites to help screen and filter harmful urbanising effects from new development and to avoid the creation of harsh new urban settlement edges fronting countryside	Suggested consideration incorporated into new paragraph on 'New Green Corridors' under Policy G13 (Green Corridors) instead, as considered a better fit
H1 - Housing Mix and Types	Government's First Homes product will have an effect on the tenure mix/type and size of affordable homes which will be sought on new developments. There has	Policy amended in line with Government's mandatory obligation to provide 25% of affordable housing as First Homes. Housing mix altered accordingly with 6% being

	to be a better way to assist first time buyers into the market, and that is lower cost housing	taken off shared ownership, reducing this figure from 8% to 2%
	Policy proposes 40% affordable housing on sites of 10 or more dwellings. This should be expressed as an aspiration or target recognising this will be negotiated on a site-by-site basis to take account of viability and individual site attributes	New text added: <i>'Where individual site circumstances, updated evidence of local need or development viability dictates a variation from these figures robust evidence shall be submitted to justify this variation'</i>
	Affordable housing should have adequate sized gardens	Text added to specify that the quality and size of new affordable housing shall be indistinguishable from that of market housing. Text also added to Chippenham Design Guide to require that rear gardens be of a regular shape, and a size that is at least equal to the ground floor footprint of the dwelling
	Need to be able to accommodate a larger family in affordable housing	Whilst it is not possible to specify the specific dwelling sizes for affordable rent, text added to require that a range of dwelling sizes will need to be provided as part of the affordable housing offer
	No provision or mention of self-build housing which is lacking in the overall commentary on housing	The following text has been added: <i>'Major development schemes will be expected to demonstrate that consideration has been given to Custom and Self Build plots as part of the housing mix'</i>
Policy H2 - Housing Design	Should reference and outline 'Building for a Healthy Life' which supersedes Building for Life 12	Policy amended to refer to 'Building for a Healthy Life' instead of Building for Life 12
Policy TC1 - Bath Rd Car Park/Bridge Centre Site	Zones 1-5 and Features 6-11 included in the Policy text do not tally consistently with the legend or graphics included on the Parameters Plan (Figure 8.2)	Policy amended to refer to Numbers 1-12, rather than zones or features, for consistency and clarity. Legend of Figure 8.2 amended to remove numbers and zones for consistency and clarity. Numbers '9', '10', '11' and '12' added to Parameters Plan.
	In Zone 1, four storeys is far higher than the surrounding buildings. This would dominate the area and block views through to the nearby heritage assets	Text amended to reflect outcome of the Strategic Environmental Assessment's (SEA) preferred approach, from: <i>'Built development up to 4 storeys in height'</i> To: <i>'Built development of 2-4 storeys in height and not to exceed the height of the tallest neighbouring building'</i>
	In Zone 2, three storeys on land that rises up to The Bridge would be dominant in the area. Refer to layouts and scale of Avonbridge House	Text amended to reflect the outcome of the SEA's preferred approach, from: <i>'built development up to 3 storeys in height'</i> to:

		<i>'built development of 2-3 storeys in height'</i> in order to give the option of a 2-3 storey building in keeping with the scale of Avonbridge House but also to prevent a single storey building being built, which would be out of keeping with the prevailing height of the surrounding area
	Include plan parameter for new street trees to be incorporated along Bath Road frontage/public realm if this narrow width development block (Zone 2) allows	Not considered appropriate for Figure 8.2 to show new tree planting. However, reference made to new street trees as part of public realm improvements along Bath Road/The Bridge under Heading 6
	Essential that redevelopment of this area includes physically segregated cycleways that link to surrounding cycleways and quiet streets. The policy currently does not mention cycleways as part of the development.	Text added to reference <i>'inclusion of segregated cycleways which link in to surrounding cycleways and quiet streets'</i> under Heading 8
	Could be an opportunity to uncover Arthur's Well, which was a historically important feature of our town obliterated by the road changes in the 1960s	<i>'Opportunity to restore Arthur's Well'</i> added as new Heading 12
	Policy needs to be clearer that parameters plan is indicative and would be used as a basis to work up into a development brief or detailed masterplan for the site	First paragraph amended to give greater clarity that parameters plan would be used as a basis to work up into a development brief or detailed masterplan for the site for submission at planning application stage
Policy TC2 - River-Green Corridor Masterplan	Policy identifies ancillary and detailed aspects of any redevelopment of Emery Gate shopping area scheme (A, K, L and M), such as parking and frontage design, but a viable mix of uses needs to be considered progressing both the Neighbourhood Plan and Local Plan Review	The mix of uses for any redevelopment of Emery Gate Shopping Centre would need to continue to underpin the health of the town centre as per the findings of Wiltshire Retail and Town Centres Study 2020. Text added to Criterion A: <i>'...and with uses that continue to underpin the vitality and viability of the town centre...'</i>
	Not clear under Criterion B what justification developer contributions would be sought and in what circumstances	Criterion B amended to clarify justification for developer contributions from: <i>'Legible pedestrian and cycle routes alongside the River between the Town Bridge and Gladstone Road will be provided by adjacent new development or developer contributions'</i> To: <i>'Improved pedestrian and cycle routes alongside the River, between the Town Bridge and Gladstone Road, will be provided by adjacent major developments or developer contributions associated with these developments, in order to meet any increase in demand for active travel to/from these developments'</i>

	Policy should include reference to improving flood risk, which will be part of the reason for removing/replacing the radial gate	Criterion E amended to add reference to <i>'reduces flood risk'</i>
	Need to be more specific under Criterion G about uses, and design for any replacement building, at Olympiad site, which must be sympathetic to the parkland surroundings	Criterion G amended to provide greater specificity, from: <i>'The Olympiad site will be retained and regenerated for leisure and community uses'</i> To: <i>'The Olympiad site will be retained for public indoor sport, recreation or fitness uses. The demolition of the existing building and redevelopment of the site to retain these uses will be supported, providing that any new building frontages on to Monkton Park are designed to be sympathetic to the parkland setting and enhance the significance of Chippenham Conservation Area'</i>
	Some efforts should be made to restore or protect parts of the old bridge as it gave the heart of Chippenham a lot of character	Whilst the current Town Bridge is a modern structure that does not contain any remnants of the old Town Bridge, text added to Criterion H to support its replacement with a new bridge that would enhance the significance of Chippenham Conservation Area
	The term 'generic design' in the context of Criterion J is not clear	Criterion J amended to give greater clarity, from: <i>'Generic design on frontages facing the river corridor will not be tolerated. Design and Access Statements should demonstrate how the scheme will provide a pleasing backdrop for the River Avon when viewed from the opposite bank'</i> To: <i>'Design and Access Statements shall demonstrate, through photo-visuals, that the frontages of development proposals facing the River are of the highest quality design, and will provide a pleasing backdrop for the River when viewed from the opposite bank.'</i>
	It should be made clear under Criterion K that any new public houses facing Monkton Park would be located at a distance from it, and not accessible from and to, the Park.	Reference to public houses deleted from Criterion K
	Loose wording of Criterion N seems to allow room for potential development within Monkton Park	Criterion N deleted. Monkton Park is adequately protected from inappropriate development by Policies G12 and G13. Notwithstanding, Figure 8.3 amended to also refer to River Avon Strategic Green Corridor.

Policy TC3 - Public Realm Improvements to Upper Market Place	Policy needs to be clearer that parameters plan is indicative and would be used as a basis to work up into a development brief or detailed masterplan for the site	First paragraph amended to give greater clarity that parameters plan would be used as a basis to work up into a development brief or detailed masterplan for the site for submission at <u>planning application stage</u>
	Do not believe that 'shared space' is fully understood. It is not some poor quality 'enhanced street' which is still vehicle dominated, and also will not work with two sperate short sections. The scheme needs to be connected and extended to connect with High Street which would need to be permanently closed to through traffic and allow cycle access. A segregated cycle path would defeat the object of shared space, as it not 'shared'.	Figure 8.4 amended to increase extent of shared space (Area 1) so that this covers the whole of the Upper Market Place and roundabout junction. Text for Area 1 amended to refer to ' <i>downgrading of highway</i> '. Reference to introduction of a segregated cycle path under 7. of Policy deleted and text amended to: <i>'Improved cycle route as part of a wider cycle loop connecting the Market Place with The Causeway, Burlands Road, Wood Lane and Timber Street. Improvements will depend on the type of shared space proposed and options for implementing segregated cycle paths outside of the shared space and linking these to existing or future cycle paths will be explored'</i> It is not considered feasible or viable for the Neighbourhood Plan to extend public realm improvements beyond the Upper Market Place to connect to the High Street
	Due to building layout in Area 1, there is little intervisibility between the upper and lower Market Place	Text of Area 1 amended to better explain visual connection through use of common surface material
	Need to ensure disabled parking spaces are not reduced in this part of town	Text added to description of Area 3 to clarify that the number of disabled car parking spaces would need to remain as existing
	Reduction in vehicles and removal of vehicular access conflicts with recent permission granted for improved parking outside St Andrew's Church	Reference to removal of vehicular access deleted under Area 4 to allow for access to parking area immediately located in front of St. Andrews Church
	Street tree planting should consider the location of existing underground infrastructure as water mains and sewers can be damaged by tree roots. There is an existing water main where new tree planting is proposed.	Figure 8.4 is intended to show the location of indicative tree planting only. The exact location will be dependent on location of existing underground infrastructure. Text added to end of first sentence of 6. ' <i>...subject to the location of existing underground infrastructure</i> '
Policy TC4 - Development within Chippenham Conservation Area	The precise wording of this Policy may need to be reviewed in order to reflect legislation governing historic buildings and conservation areas	New criterion a) added in third paragraph to use wording in Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990:

		<i>'a) preserves or enhances the special character or appearance of the Conservation Area'</i>
Policy TC5 - Buildings of Local Merit	The wording to the final paragraph might be clearer to the decision-maker, substitute 'harm' for 'conflict' and delete the remainder of the sentence	Policy wording revised in accordance with comment.
Policy TC6 - Design of Shopfronts and Advertisements	The wording of the Policy should reflect the intrinsic nature of guidance and ask designers and architects to 'have regard' to it	Policy wording revised in accordance with comment.
Policy T1 - Provision and Enhancement of Cycle Paths	Suggest removing 'where appropriate' to remove wriggle room for developers. All major developments need cycle schemes as standard	May be unreasonable and unviable for a major development scheme at the smaller scale end to be required to produce a cycling scheme that is LTN 1/20 compliant. However, wording of first sentence amended to be clearer: <i>'Cycling schemes shall be prepared for all large scale major development proposals, and the majority of major development proposals...'</i>
	Inappropriate to make reference to design schemes in line with 'Making Space for Cycling' rather than LTN 1/20, which is recommended to the Highway Authority by the Department for Transport	First paragraph amended to refer to LTN 1/20 for cycle design rather than Making Space for Cycling
	'Should link to the existing town cycle network' ought to say 'must link to' to remove wriggle room for developers	Wording in second paragraph strengthened from <i>'should'</i> to <i>'need to'</i> in line with comment
	Policy states that developer contributions will be sought towards the high priority cycle routes. It needs to be ensured that these routes connect to development and are necessary for planning permission to go ahead	It is not considered necessary for the Policy to demonstrate that the high priority improvements to the existing cycle network connect to future development sites as these future development sites are not known. However, text added to third paragraph <i>'major development proposals which generate increased use of the existing cycle network to access the site (directly or indirectly)'</i> This makes it clear that a financial contribution will be sought towards the cost of a relevant high priority improvement link identified in Figure 9.1 where this connects to the development and is therefore <i>'directly related to the development'</i>
Policy T2 - Access to the Bus Network	Policy will need to be aligned with Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations where contributions are sought through S106	Text amended in second paragraph in line with comment, to make reference to financial contributions having to be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development

	Would like to see green roofs on the network of bus stops to provide habitat for pollinator species	Fifth bullet point added: <i>'Incorporating 'living roofs' for pollinator species on new or upgraded bus shelters'</i>
	Reference to maintaining bus stops (public and private) does not seem to be a land-use matter and it is questioned whether this is relevant to planning	Fourth paragraph deleted and text relocated to 'Sustainable Transport' section of Chippenham Design Guide and summarised in Paragraph 9.21 instead
	In new development 400m is too far for many disabled people to walk to a bus stop	New text added to final paragraph <i>'...or where regular usage by people with mobility impairments may be anticipated the maximum walking distance should be reduced to 150m'.</i>
Policy T3 - Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure	With reference to the second paragraph, in line with the latest government guidance, this should state 'residential buildings undergoing a major renovation which will have more than 10 parking spaces must have at least one EV charge point, per dwelling with associated parking along with cable routes in all spaces without charge points'	Second paragraph amended in line with suggested wording in comment
	In the third paragraph, based on government guidance this should state that 'All new non-residential buildings and all non-residential buildings undergoing a major renovation, with more than 10 parking spaces must have a minimum of one charge point and cable routes for one in five (20%) of the total number of spaces'	Third paragraph amended in line with suggested wording in comment
	Provision of ducting for on-street parking in development that has housing without off-street charging being possible should be specified in Policy. Need to ensure that on-street cabling infrastructure does not cause obstruction or hazards to pedestrians or cyclists	New paragraph added to give support to cable routes being laid in new development where off-street parking provision is not possible: <i>'Where it is not possible to provide off-street parking in new development the provision of cable routes, to allow for electric vehicle charging on-street, will be encouraged. Such charging infrastructure should be placed in the road/carriageway, and not on footways where it could create obstructions or trip hazards for people walking or cycling'</i>
	Taxi rank provision should specify rapid chargers as dwell times are short	<i>'Rapid'</i> electric vehicle charge points added to beginning of fifth paragraph
Policy T4 - Access for Disabled People and Those With Reduced Mobility	Certain policies do not seem to cover areas of development within planning control and should be reviewed because they largely discuss matters relating to management or some other aspect of transport	Policy has been substantially amended to cover areas of development within planning control. First sentence deleted and replaced with new paragraph which requires developers to have full regard to the best practice

	services (e.g. Policies T4 and T5). Policy T4 is too prescriptive, should be in line with government guidelines.	guidance in Inclusive Mobility: A Guide to Best Practice on Access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure (2001) by the Department of Transport. This better covers the elements set out in bullet points 1, 2 and 9 and these have been deleted. The text for bullet points 1 and 2 has been incorporated into Paragraph 9.34 which refers to pavement design. Bullet point 6 deleted and text relocated to 'Parking' Section of Chippenham Design Guide where it is considered more appropriately located. Bullet point 8 deleted as road signage does not require planning permission. Bullet point 10 deleted as too site specific and works have subsequently been undertaken to substantially remodel the crossings in the vicinity of the Brunel Viaduct. Text amended to bullet points 3, 4 and 5.
	Too many cycleway and walkways are too narrow for mobility vehicles. Too many pavements do not have suitable dropped curbs and many paths surfaces are not adequately maintained	First sentence deleted and replaced with new paragraph which requires developers to have full regard to the best practice guidance in Inclusive Mobility: A Guide to Best Practice on Access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure (2001) by the Department of Transport
	Whilst pedestrian mobility is important, the provision of a requirement that 'footways and pavements should be constructed of durable materials that are not subject to cracking or splitting' is difficult to measure, monitor and quantify	Bullet point 1 deleted. It is considered that this is better covered by best practice guidance in Inclusive Mobility: A Guide to Best Practice on Access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure (2001) by the Department of Transport, to which the opening sentence now refers. Text has been relocated and incorporated into Paragraph 9.34 instead, which refers to pavement design.
	Under bullet point 9, it is not appropriate to include 'traffic signals for pedestrians [that will] have audible warnings and will consider the least able when setting crossing intervals' as this is too prescriptive.	Bullet point 9 deleted. It is considered that this is better covered by best practice guidance in Inclusive Mobility: A Guide to Best Practice on Access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure (2001) by the Department of Transport, to which the opening sentence now refers.
Policy T5 - Waymarking Signage on the Footpath and Cycle Network	Wayfinding signage also needs to be provided on the cycle network	Policy title amended to ' <i>...Footpath and Cycle Network</i> '. Appropriate amendments made to Policy text and Paragraphs 9.39 and 9.40 accordingly
	The specification of the signage should be changed to be the same as the Highway Authority. Generic signage can be provided if appropriate or proofs and sign off of any specific projects will be required.	Criterion 2 amended to delete reference to signage being ' <i>of a durable material, preferably metal, with an anti-graffiti finish, and will be clearly legible</i> ' and replacement text added to reference signage being ' <i>produced to the latest signage specifications of the local highway authority, unless there are specific projects</i>

		<p><i>which require bespoke signage, which should be agreed with the local highway authority.'</i></p> <p>Criterion 3 amended to delete reference to signage being <i>'mounted on either a 6 foot pole or securely on another structure such as a wall or fence'</i> as this may not correspond to the latest signage specifications of the local highways authority</p>
Policy CI1 - Community Infrastructure	The role and purpose of this policy needs to be reviewed to ensure it meets legal tests and does not place unreasonable burdens on applicants and/or new developments. As currently drafted, this relates to all proposals for development (minor and major)	First sentence deleted which referred to all development having to demonstrate need for community infrastructure. Replaced with new wording which clarifies that major residential developments only shall submit a Community Infrastructure Statement which demonstrates how the community infrastructure needs of new residents, generated as a result of the scheme, can be fully met on site or nearby
	The final paragraph suggests a new charge on development over and above what is usually acceptable (some comments consider the 1% contribution too low and some consider too high)	<p>Final paragraph of Policy CI1, which referred to 1% of development cost to fund new community infrastructure, deleted as no evidence to demonstrate that this figure is viable. Replaced with the following wording in new Paragraph 3 which allows greater flexibility and potentially a larger contribution than 1% to be secured where appropriate:</p> <p><i>'Largescale major residential development will be expected to provide new community infrastructure on site. Where major residential development cannot accommodate on-site community infrastructure an appropriate financial contribution, based on individual site circumstances, will be provided towards off-site community infrastructure or public art provision.'</i></p> <p>This does not represent a new charge on development, rather giving greater weight to securing financial contributions towards new community infrastructure than current development plan policy does (which it considers not to be essential infrastructure)</p>
Policy E1 - Circular Economy	Policy needs to be revised to address the circular economy in relation to farmland around the town - which could include encouraging agro-ecological methods and regenerating natural systems but also encouraging the use of locally produced food	Reference to support for development proposals which seek to create circular economy benefits for 'agricultural' processes added to first paragraph

	Third paragraph difficult to understand and should be written in simpler language	Wording of Criteria b) and c) amended to make easier to understand/interpret. First sentence of third paragraph also simplified for these reasons
Policy E2 - Business Incubator Units	In seeking to require business incubator units on all allocated sites and influence at reserved matters stage, Policy could be too prescriptive and undermine delivery of allocations in the Local Plan	Text of first paragraph amended to ensure that business incubator units are required to be built on the wider allocated employment land but are not required to be built as part of a single reserved matters submission for example. Outline permission alone will not guarantee that business incubator units are delivered on employment land, as masterplans are indicative only and the needs/demands of the market can change in the time period between an outline and reserved matters submission