APPENDIX 2

North East Derbyshire District Council
ASHOVER NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Decision Statement:
Ashover Neighbourhood Plan Proceeding to Referendum

1 Summary

1.1 In line with Regulation 18 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (NPR) North East Derbyshire District Council have produced this 'Decision Statement' in relation to the Ashover Neighbourhood Development Plan (the 'Plan') submitted to them by Ashover Parish Council.

1.2 The Plan sets out a vision for the Parish and establishes the type of development needed to help sustain the community. If made, it will become part of the development plan for land use and development proposals within the Parish until 2033.

1.3 Following an independent examination of written representations, North East Derbyshire District Council now confirms that the Plan will proceed to a neighbourhood planning referendum subject to the modifications set out in the table below.

1.4 In accordance with the examiner's recommendation, the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan will proceed to a public referendum scheduled for Thursday, 8th February 2018.

1.5 This Decision Statement, along with the independent examiners report and the plan documents can be inspected:

- At North East Derbyshire District Council's Offices at Mill Lane, Wingerworth between 9am – 4.30pm
- Online on the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan website:- http://www.ashover-pc.gov.uk/neighbourhood-plan.html
- Online via the Council's website:- http://www.ne-derbyshire.gov.uk/index.php/resident/local-plan?accid=2

2 Background

2.1 On 3 December 2014 Ashover Parish Council submitted an application to North East Derbyshire District Council for the designation of the Parish as a Neighbourhood Area. This was confirmed on 16 February 2015 for the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan.

2.2 The Parish Council subsequently prepared the Ashover Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan. Consultation on the Parish's Draft Plan was held between 22 January and 8 March 2016 and again on a revised Draft Plan between 30 January 2017 and 13 March 2017.

2.3 The Submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan for Ashover was completed and submitted to the District Council in May 2017. North East Derbyshire District Council held a 6 week consultation period on the submitted Plan from 20 July and 31 August 2017, in accordance with regulation 16 of the NPR.

2.4 An Independent Examiner was appointed in September 2017 to undertake the examination of the Submission version of the Ashover Neighbourhood Plan and this was completed with the final examination report sent to both the Parish Council and District Council on 7 November 2017.

3 Decisions and Reasons

3.1 The Examiner has concluded that, with certain modifications, the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other relevant legal requirements. The Council's Cabinet concurs with this view and has determined that the modifications set out in the table attached to this Statement are in accordance with the examiner's recommendations.

3.2 The local authority must consider each of the recommendations made in the Examiner's report and decide what action to take in response. The table attached to this statement sets out the examiner's recommended modifications and the Council's decisions in respect of each of them.

3.3 The authority is therefore satisfied that, subject to the modifications being made, the Draft Neighbourhood Plan meets the legal requirements and basic conditions as set out in legislation; thus the plan can proceed to referendum.

3.4 Therefore, to meet the requirements of the Localism Act 2011, a referendum which poses the question "Do you want North East Derbyshire District Council to use the Neighbourhood Plan for Ashover to help it decide planning applications in the neighbourhood area?" will be held in the Parish of Ashover on Thursday, 8th February 2018.

Section in Examined Document	Examiner's Recommendation	Examiner's Reasons	Local Authority's decision and reason	Action to be taken
Policy AP1: Development within Limits to Development. Pg. 16	Reword the first part of Policy AP1 to read "Within the existing Limits to Development for Ashover, Kelstedge and Littlemoor shown on the Proposals Map, or, if these are superseded, those in the up to date Local Plan, sustainable development proposals will be supported where it can be demonstrated that it:" Delete criterion d) Reword criterion j) to read "will not increase the likelihood of crime or anti-social behaviour."	The first part of the policy refers to "small scale sustainable development". However, it does not define small scale or justify the need to restrict development to small scale. The criteria which follow provide much clearer and less arbitrary guidance on what should be regarded as "small scale" and the recommended modification deletes the words "small scale". The criteria applied to development with Settlement Development Limits are more detailed than those in Policy GS5 of the NEDLP 2001-2011. They are consistent with the basic conditions for the most part, but in some cases there is limited capacity to enforce them and in others they are not sufficiently justified. In criterion d) there is no indication of what are important views. As worded it is not clear how the distinction between an important view and other views can be drawn. Criterion g) provides a framework for addressing this issue. Criterion j) requires development to contribute to reducing crime and anti-social behaviour. Although this is qualified by "where relevant", it may well not be reasonable to expect new development to resolve existing issues. The focus should be on development not creating conditions which may cause crime or anti-social behaviour.	-Accept rewording of the first part -Accept deletion of criterion d) -Accept rewording of criterion j)	-Reword policy -Delete d) -Reword j)
Policy AP1: Development within Limits to Development. Pg. 16	Move the Proposal Map from its positive as Appendix E and insert it after page 53 before the Appendices and not labelled as an Appendix. On the Proposals Map, delete the section of solid red line that show the suggested extensions to the Settlement Development Limits and make the areas of dotted red line solid. Extend the map to include Littlemoor and show the existing Settlement Development Limit. In the key show the solid red line as "Existing Settlement Development Limit" and delete the red dotted line and its definition.	Ambiguity between the intentions of the Policy as described in the supporting text and the wording of the Policy. The "proposed Settlement Development Limit" cannot be applied through Policy AP1 as there is insufficient justification to explain why this boundary, as opposed to any other, has been chosen. There is no purpose in showing the suggested changes to the Limits to Development on the proposal Map as it serves only to confuse. The recommended modifications to the policy, supporting text and Proposal Map will help to clarify the policy to be applied in terms of Settlement Development Limits and the map showing the suggested changes could be attached as an Appendix with a clarification that it carried no weight. The Proposal Map is different in nature to the other Appendices as it is part of the Plan and the policies that relate to it do not make sense without it. It should therefore fall within the main body of the Plan before the appendices.	-Accept the change of location of the Proposal Map -Accept the changes to the Proposal Map	-Move the Proposal Map -Alter the Proposal Map

	In the supporting text modify the fourth paragraph to read "Work on the Neighbourhood Plan has included consideration of possible changes to the existing Settlement Development Limits for Ashover and Kelstedge, based on consultation with the local community and other stakeholders and using best practice and guidance provided by North East Derbyshire. These possible changes are shown on the map at Appendix E. It is hoped that these proposals will be considered as a key input in determining the final boundaries of the North East Derbyshire Local Plan, but until then they carry no weight". Insert a map showing the suggested amendments to the Settlement Development Limits as Appendix E. This Map should not show the Local Green Space allocation to avoid confusion with the Proposal Map. In the first line of the fifth paragraph of the supporting text delete "small scale"			
Policy AP2: Development proposals outside the limits to development. Pg. 17	In the first sentence of Policy AP2 after "...Ashover" replace "and" with a comma and after "Kelstedge" add "and Littlemoor". Reword the second sentence to read: "In the countryside, development proposals will be carefully controlled and limited to those which: a) Support the rural economy and need to be in the countryside	The intentions of the second part of the policy are not sufficiently explicit to be clearly interpreted or consistently applied. The policy's overall approach could be seen as more restrictive than the NPPF or quite permissive depending on what is encompassed within the rather vague phrase "or supports thriving communities within it". The recommended modifications will provide more flexibility to the potential for affordable housing to come forward through planning obligations. The supporting text refers to development which supports the rural economy but the policy makes no direct reference to the economy.	-Accept wording alterations -Accept rewording and introduction of list	-Alter wording highlighted -Reword second sentence

	b) Provide affordable housing to meet a demonstrable need on a rural exception site that is adjacent to the most up to date Settlement Development Limits. These developments may include an element of market housing where it can be demonstrated that it is necessary to make the affordable housing viable. c) Re-use redundant or underused buildings. In all cases development will not be seriously intrusive in the countryside and will respect the character of existing settlements and their setting".			
Policy AP3: Windfall housing sites. Pg. 20.	In Policy AP3 delete "(normally 5 or less)". In the second line of the policy replace "and" with a comma and after "Kelstedge" add "and Littlemoor".	The development that this policy envisages would fall within the scope of Policy AP1, however, the policy is not superfluous as it relates specifically to the scale and form of housing development. It does not refer to the settlement boundary of Littlemoor. Recommendation to the deletion of the limitation to small scale development and there is no justification for the limitation to "normally 5 or less" in this policy. The number of these is likely to be limited, but they do have to potential to deliver some affordable housing. The criteria in Policy AP1 provides a good framework for assessing the sustainability of proposals without the need to impose an arbitrary limit on the scale of development.	-Accept deletion -Accept wording alterations	-Delete wording -Alter wording
Policy AP4: New housing mix. Pg. 21	At the end of the second sentence of the supporting text insert "(see Appendix B)" Change the title Page of Appendix B to read "Supporting Evidence: Household size, dwelling size and occupancy". Reword the first sentence of Policy AP4 to read "Development proposals for housing will be required to demonstrate that they take account of the most up	Policies like this should be supported by clear evidence and applied with some flexibility. Appendix B provides evidence that the proportion of larger dwellings is substantially higher than in North East Derbyshire as a whole, the East Midlands or England. It provides clear evidence in support of a policy to encourage smaller dwellings, but there is no up to date evidence on specific housing needs in Ashover. This Appendix is not referred to in either the supporting text or the policy, and the reader could thus be unaware of its existence. The modifications will provide clearer guidance for the decision maker and thus meet the basic conditions.	-Accept mention of Appendix B -Accept changes to Appendix B -Accept rewording of the first sentence	-Include mention of Appendix B -Alter title page of Appendix B -Reword policy

	to date published evidence of housing needs in Ashover and North East Derbyshire, having regard to other site and market considerations."			
Policy AP5: Affordable housing. Pg. 22	In Policy AP5 delete the first paragraph Reword the first part of the second paragraph to read: "On developments of over ten dwellings, where it can be demonstrated to the North East Derbyshire District Council that it is not possible or appropriate to build affordable homes on the site in accordance with Policy H7 or the Local Plan or a relevant replacement policy, the development should provide a financial contribution towards...provided on site".	The allocation of affordable housing is the responsibility of the housing authority. The intention to give priority to residents of the Parish in allocations is not an enforceable planning policy except in relation to rural exception sites where evidence of local need is required to justify the permission. The second part of the policy does not indicated the circumstances in which on site affordable housing would be required and therefore does not provide clear guidance on its own. The relevant Local Plan policy is Policy H7 of the NEDLP 2001-2011 which requires the provision of affordable housing in Rural areas on developments of more than 0.1ha. However, due to a recent ruling which precludes requirements for the provision of affordable housing in rural areas on developments of 10 dwellings or less except in designated rural areas, hence Policy H7 could only apply on developments of more than 10 dwellings. Policy H8 of the NEDLP 2001-2011 makes provision for contributions to off-site provision of affordable housing elsewhere in the district and the second part of Policy AP5 would require the application of this contribution in the Parish. The requirement for any conclusion that it would not be possible or appropriate to provide affordable housing on site to be reached in consultation with the Parish Council is unnecessary and inappropriate.	-Accept deletion of the first paragraph -Accept rewording of the second paragraph	-Delete first paragraph -Reword the second paragraph
Policy AP6: Existing employment uses. Pg. 23	In Policy E1 after "...supported unless" reword the policy to read "the use is ancillary to a residential use, or it has been demonstrated that the current use is not viable and that all reasonable steps have been taken to let or sell the site or building for employment purposes for a period of at least 12 months."	The District Council comment that the policy goes beyond the protection proposed in policies WC2 and WC3 of the emerging plan. These policies are liable to change and the test of general conformity is with the adopted development plan. The protection of smaller local sites does not undermine this policy and it is appropriate for a neighbourhood plan to contain non-strategic policies to be applied locally. Concerns of NEDDC that the policy as phrased may be unreasonably restrictive in relation to business uses linked to domestic properties and there is a recommended modification to reflect this. The minimum period of 6 months for marketing is not sufficiently long to demonstrate an absence of demand and 12 months is the period normally applied in policies of this sort.	-Accept rewording of policy	-Reword policy

Policy AP7: New small scale employment. Pg. 24.	In Policy AP7: In the second line after "...will be supported where" delete "it" and insert "they" and change "fumes and smells" to "fumes or smells"; After "...require to comply with" in the penultimate line, reword to read "the provisions of Policy AP1 or AP2, as appropriate". After "local character and uses" reword the last two lines to read: "and would not be harmful to the living conditions of neighbouring residents, or cause serious harm in terms of road safety or the free flow of traffic."	"Fumes or smells" would more clearly express what is intended. Also, to grammatically agree with "uses", "it" on the second line of the policy should be replaced by "they". Policy AP7 is open ended in terms of potential development in the countryside and is potentially in conflict with the paragraph 109 of the NPPF and saved policy GS6 of the NEDLP. A cross reference to Policies AP1 and AP2 of the Plan would address this. The reference in the last sentence to possible adverse effects on residential and environmental amenity and the transport network is vague and does not define the nature of any harm, therefore a modification has been recommended.	-Accept wording changes -Accept rewording of policy in both sections	-Change wording -Reword policy
Policy AP8: Protection and enhancement of shopping provision. Pg. 25.	Reword Policy AP8 to read: "Development proposals that result in the loss of an existing shopping use and require planning permission will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that there is no demand for a shop use as evidenced through unsuccessful marketing of the premises for a period of 12 months."	The wording suggested by the local planning authority would provide clearer guidance, but a period of two years is unnecessary long to demonstrate a lack of demand for retail premises.	-Accept policy rewording	-Reword policy
Policy AP9: Protection and enhancement of community facilities. Pg. 26.	In the first part of Policy AP9 after "...no longer required by the community" insert "and there is adequate alternative provision within the same settlement..." Divide the list into two: a) Commercial Facilities • Peak Edge Hotel • The Famous Red Lion • Old Pets Corner • The Crispin Inn • The Miners Arms • The Black Swan	For a village which acts as a focal point for a large area, more than one public house may be expected, and it is legitimate to seek to retain them if possible. At the same time the existence of others may mean that it would not be consistent with the presumption in favour of sustainable development to resist other sustainable uses. Therefore a modification has been recommended to reflect this on the lines of the saved Local Plan policy. The list of facilities contained in the policy includes both commercial premises and public or community buildings. The requirement to demonstrate an identified local need is likely to be an unreasonable restraint of legitimate competition for commercial premises and this part of the policy can only be applied to the community buildings. It is therefore necessary to divide the list into two and make it clear that this part of the policy only applies to the list of community buildings.	-Accept added wording -Accept changes to the list	-Add the extra wording -Change the existing list into two lists

	• The Kelstedge Inn • The Post Office • Ashover Medical Centre/Pharmacy b) Community Buildings • Ashover toilets • Basset Rooms • Ashover Parish Hall • Uppertown Social Centre • Ashover Parish Church • Spitewinter Chapel Make it clear that the final section of the policy only applies to part b) and in this section of the policy delete "in consultation with Ashover Parish Council".	Policies cannot single out the Parish Council for consultation on a particular issue.		
Policy AP10: Assets of community value. Pg. 27.	In policy AP10 delete the first sentence.	The first part of the policy is not related to the development and use of land. Instead it establishes the right of the Parish Council to seek to purchase the facility if its continued existence is in doubt. It does not limit the use that the owner can make of the building. No buildings or facilities have yet been designated as Assets of Community Value and so the policy is hypothetical.	-Accept deletion of the first sentence	-Delete the first sentence
Policy AP11: Design. Pg. 30.	In Policy AP11 a) insert "scale" after "...character," and replace "fit in with the 'grain'" with "respond positively to the characteristics of the site and its surroundings" and delete "of the surrounding area". Delete AP11 B) and C) and re-number remaining sub-paragraphs	Policy is repetitious in that it says the same thing in several ways. E.g. "the characteristics of the site and its surroundings" include "the grain of the surrounding area" and thus points a) and b) can be merged. Point c) suggests that "designs specific to a generic 'scheme' should be avoided". To preclude such designs in principle is not consistent with the presumption in favour of sustainable development.	-Accept wording changes -Accept deletion of B) and C) and renumber (letter) following points	-Change wording -Delete B) and C) and renumber (letter) following points
Policy AP12: Listed buildings. Pg. 31.	Insert a new Appendix F which lists the Listed Buildings and identifies them on a map. In the second line of the policy delete "a Listed Building" and insert "The Listed Buildings shown in Appendix F".	The policy simply offers support to development proposals that would be beneficial to the Parish. It is difficult to see how this policy will make any difference to decision making but it does not conflict with the basic conditions. The supporting text refers to the existence of 83 listed buildings in the parish but only a few are identified. PPG indicates that it is good practice to	-Accept insertion of Appendix F -Accept wording changes	-Insert an Appendix F -Change wording to include reference

		identify designated heritage assets. Therefore, it would be helpful to identify these assets within the Plan to assist decision makers.		to Appendix F
Policy AP13: Non designated heritage assets. Pg. 32.	Delete policy AP13.	North East Derbyshire does not currently have a list of non-designated heritage assets, so they cannot be identified at this stage. The proposed policy is too strong a test having regard to the balanced approach in the NPPF for both designated and non-designated heritage assets. While it is possible that a list of non-designated heritage assets will be compiled, the policy to be applied to them will have to be consistent with the approach in the NPPF.	-Accept the deletion of policy AP13	-Delete policy AP13
Policy AP15: Local Green Spaces. Pg. 38.	In policy AP15 reword the first paragraph of the policy to read "The sites listed below and shown on the Proposal Map are designated as Local Green Spaces, where development will only be supported in very special circumstances, unless it is consistent with the function of the Local Green Space." From the list of Local Green Spaces delete: "Tennis Ground off Malthouse Land, Ashover, Fabrick Wood" and insert "Ashover Primary School Playing Field" between "Allotment site off Marsh Green Land and Cripton Lane, Ashover" and "Land off West Edge Close, Ashover". On the map on page 78 and the Proposal Map delete areas 5 and 6 and reduce the area shown on area 2 to the area covered by the playing field and recreation ground. Also show the boundary between areas 1 and 9 clearly. Delete the sections relating to areas 5 and 6 from the Appendix and renumber	This policy identifies 11 spaces as Local Green Spaces and Appendix C provides justification in the form of an evaluation grid which assesses each site against a range of criteria. But these Local Green Spaces have been considered to be against the criteria. 2. Ashover Sports Ground and Playing Field – the area identified on the proposals map is much more extensive than the Sports Ground and Playing Field. There is no demonstrable reason for the designation of the areas beyond it which are shown on the map. 5. Tennis Court off Malthouse Lane – this single hard tennis court appears to be a private facility in extensive grounds. Therefore, it cannot be described as demonstrably special as a green space. 6. Fabrick Wood – this is a Derbyshire Local Nature Reserve and is more than local significance. There is no definition of what defines an "extensive tract of land". The size of the site is substantially more than areas which have been considered too large in other neighbourhood plan examinations. Therefore it is not an appropriate designation as a Local Green Space. 9. Ashover Primary School Playing Field – area adjoins the Cemetery considered at No1. It is not possible to see where the dividing line with the Cemetery is, the map should clearly identify them separately. The policy needs to clearly refer to the Proposal Map. The policy to be applied to any development proposals relating o the designated Local Green Spaces requires slight modification. Green Belt policy defines certain categories of development that would not be inappropriate in Green Belts. It would not be appropriate to directly apply these uses to Local Green Spaces. However, there may be some types of development that are entirely appropriate on Local Green Spaces, depending on their use.	-Accept rewording of the policy -Accept deletion of 5 and 6. -Accept insertion of "Ashover Primary School Playing Field". -Accept changes to the Proposal Map -Accept deletion of the sections relating to 5. And 6.	-Reword policy -Delete 5. And 6. -Insert a point for "Ashover Primary School Playing Field" -Update the Proposals Map -Delete sections relating to 5. And 6.

	the references in the Appendix and on the maps accordingly.			
Policy AP16: Biodiversity. Pg. 41.	Delete policy AP16 and replace it with an additional paragraph in the supporting text to read "Planning applications with implications for biodiversity and geodiversity will be determined in accordance with policies in the NPPF, which supersedes the NEDLP, and, when it is adopted the emerging Local Plan."	The policy itself effectively summaries but does not add anything to the more detail policies set out in the NPPF for biodiversity. It therefore does not meet the requirement to be locally distinct.	-Accept deletion of policy AP16 and insertion of extra paragraph	-Delete policy AP16 and insert new paragraph in supporting text
Policy AP17: Important trees and hedgerows. Pg. 42.	At the beginning of policy AP17 insert "Wherever it is practical,". After "...of historic importance, insert "Where it is not practical to retain significant trees, and the benefits of the development justify their loss, replacement planting, preferably on site should be provided."	It is evident that trees make an important contribution to the character of the parish and development that is not softened by trees is likely to be intrusive. There may be circumstances where the benefits associated with a development cannot be realised if the trees are saved. In these circumstances the replacement of any trees lost either on or off-site may be a satisfactory substitute. Therefore, a modification has been made to meet the basic conditions.	-Accept insertion of extra wording -Accept extra wording	-Insert extra wording -Include extra wording
Policy AP19: Renewable energy and low carbon technologies. Pg. 46.	In policy AP19 in the third line after "...permitted where" insert "they" and delete "following consultation with local residents, the Parish Council and North East Derbyshire District Council, it can be demonstrated that the individual and cumulative impacts have been fully addressed. Proposals will be supported that". Re-order criterion d) to read "would not, in the case of wind turbines, result in an unacceptably adverse effect on...biodiversity value:"	The first paragraph of the policy requires full consultation with local residents, the Parish Council and NEDDC and demonstration that all individual and cumulative impacts have been addressed. It is not normally possible to require pre-application consultation. The requirement does not apply to other forms of renewable energy and the consultation necessary for wind farms will be required anyway. There are several instances where there is not a grammatical read through from the introductory paragraph (either in its original or amended form) to the criteria and minor modifications have been recommended to correct this.	-Accept wording changes -Accept rewording of d), e) and f)	-Update wording of policy and criterion g) -Reword criterion d), e) and f)

	Reword criterion e) to read ”provide an appropriate minimum.....properties”[1]			
	Reorder criterion f) to read “do not, in the case of ground mounted solar panels, result in the loss of good quality agricultural land;”			
	In criterion g) replace “measures are included” with “include measures”.			
Policy AP20: Noisy sports. Pg. 48.	In policy AP20 a) replace “its” with “their”.	The NPPF supports the provision of recreational activities but for these uses to be sustainable their environmental effects need to be taken into account. The wording of the policy does not flow entirely grammatically as the plural nature of proposals does not agree with the singular introduction to the criteria.	-Accept wording changes in criterions a)- e)	-Update wording for a) - e)
	In b) replace “it” with “they”.			
	In c) insert “they” at the beginning and remove the “s” from “incorporates” and “commits”			
	In d) and e) insert “they” at the beginning and replace “does” with “do”.			
Policies AP23 and AP24: Traffic management. Pg. 52.	Delete policies AP23 and AP24 and include their content either in the supporting text or in an Appendix.	The measures set out in these policies are entirely legitimate aspirations but they are not policies for the development and use of land and therefore cannot become statutory development plan policies. Aspiration policies are often included in neighbourhood plans in an Appendix and numbered in a different format from the policies of the Plan. Alternatively, they can simply be changed to form additional paragraphs of supporting text.	-Accept deletion of policies AP23 and AP24 and suggested amendment to text.	-Delete policy AP23 and AP24 Amend supporting text.
Policy AP25: Footpaths, cycleways and bridleways. Pg. 53.	In the first sentence of Policy AP25 after “...and bridleways will” delete “not be supported” and insert “only be supported where it can be demonstrated that the public benefit of the development clearly outweighs the harm.”	There is no doubt that Ashover has a remarkably extensive network of footpaths and the importance of footpaths and cycleways is emphasised in the NPPF (paragraphs 35 ad 69). However, it is one of many considerations in the determination of any planning application. It may include the need to divert a footpath and there may be circumstances where the public benefits of a development proposal would outweigh the harm to footpaths or bridleways. Therefore, a modification has been recommended which recognises the balance that needs to be struck. This policy is largely aspirational in the same way as the previous two policies and only action that is related to the development and use of land	-Accept wording changes -Accept modification to the second part of the policy	-Update wording -Modify the second part of the policy
	Modify the second part of Policy AP25 to read:			

[1] This wording differs slightly from the Examiner’s report which had missing word which made its intention ambiguous: the amended text has been agreed with the Examiner.

	"Where appropriate having regard to the scale and location of the proposals, new developments will be required to take advantage of opportunities to incorporate improvements to the network of footpaths and cycleways into their proposals or may be required to contribute to such improvements through a planning obligation, where the legal requirements are met."	can be included in a planning policy. The policy refers to development contributions as one appropriate way of achieving this, but it is unclear from the wording of the first part of the policy what other considerations would influence the way in which planning applications are determined. Therefore a modification has been recommended which relates the policy more clearly to land use planning.		