

## Council Hearing Statements Update

### **Policy WE4**

RB Sport and Leisure Holdings PLC have proposed some modifications to policy WE4 in their hearing statement.

In general the Council either disagrees with these changes or considers them to be unnecessary. However the Council can agree to some changes:

#### Policy WE4

Criterion i – delete “outdoor”, but only for the policy WE4 area within the urban edge. “Outdoor” should remain for the area outside the urban edge in the countryside.

Criterion i – add leisure, but only as “leisure within the urban edge, provided it meets the centres first sequential approach and provided it enables the enhancement of the sporting facilities” (the Council would also be willing to include offices or light industry, provided the same criteria were met)

#### Policies Map

The Council’s proposed allocation is set out in the main modifications to the policies map (ED36b). RB Sport and Leisure Holdings PLC have proposed a different site boundary in their hearing statement (see attachment).

The Council can agree to some of these changes:

A – agree to exclude

B – agree to exclude

C – can agree to include provided that criterion i still restricts the site outside of the urban edge to “outdoor sport or recreational purposes” and the additional proviso that within criterion i the following is deleted: ~~“or for buildings strictly ancillary to such uses”~~

The Council does not agree to include D – as this is a designated SINC.

### **Policy BO1**

The hearing statement doesn’t fully cover the nature of the representations received. The key points range from opposition to the site or to any extension of the site, through to the developer requesting the site is extended. The Council’s reasons for selecting the site and for the site boundary are set out in HOU11 and HOU12 (site 19).

### **Policy BO2**

Paragraphs 3 and 12 of the council's hearing statement both refer to the policy requirement to provide 6,000m<sup>2</sup> of employment floorspace. However the council has accepted the principle of not providing this floorspace in the resolution to grant. The loss is factored in to the employment land trajectory (Table 2 on page 10 of ECON008) . The council will need to modify the policy to delete these references to 6,000m<sup>2</sup> (criterion v of the policy) and replace it with the text suggested by HCC in their reps (which refers to 'small scale employment generating uses compatible with a residential area' or words to that effect.

### **Policy BO3**

Paragraph 4 of the hearing statement - Agree to increase the capacity of the site from 70 dwellings to 120 dwellings as sought by the objector (HCC)

### **Policies E6, E7, E9**

Following on from the Matter 10 discussion, to propose consequent changes to DM15 – change the policy so that it refers to safeguarding “existing and allocated employment sites” rather than just “existing”.

Specific change to the second half of E9 so that it allows B1a use at the northern business park using similar wording to that agreed in respect of the SGO in terms of that being subject to the availability of land for office development in the town centre