

Appendix 5 ISA Island Planning Strategy Workshop March 2022 Outputs

| | ISA Initial Commentary on IPS Reg 18 Consultation Version | Changes Made and Reasons Why |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Workshop 1 Outcomes: Growth Policies | | |
| G1 Our Approach Towards Sustainable Development and Growth | Suggested Improvements: Consider removing reference to specific sites and schemes and determine whether the aim could be to reduce the requirement for travel, with a focus of local active travel. Consider providing details of how all the aspects will be supported and be delivered and how these will be achieved, for example where in the plan is support for health and wellbeing and how does it support people to live long healthy active lifestyles as there is no evidence within these group of policies to support this. Consider providing more detail on preferred locations e.g. large settlements over rural, focusing on deprived areas for example, providing general areas of education and healthcare etc. Where is public open space and public realm encouraged? With respect to the natural environment there could be a much more ambitious target to enhance and improve the natural environment and one way this can be realised is via net gain. With respect to reference to the high street, focusing on retail only does not capture the huge opportunities for evolution of the high street and the potential benefits it could have to many of the ISA objectives over the plan period. | Remove all front end and leave the last two points to avoid repetition. |
| G2 Priority locations for development and growth | Suggested Improvements: Consider including that non allocated sites must be shown not have a detrimental effect on the environment. Providing more detail for non-housing related developments to ensure more consideration of commercial areas. | All settlements include the most deprived areas on the island. Ryde and Newport primary areas are located in a primary settlement and therefore covered. Council don't want to prioritise any further. No changes proposed. Environmental detriment covered in statement of delivery, so no changes proposed. |
| G3 Developer contributions | Suggested Improvements: Consider using stronger wording than 'seeks', to ensure the policy is robust. It could be stated that development that does not provide sufficient developer contributions will not be supported, this prevents contributions being optional/ challenged. Consider removing 'infrastructure' when referring to stakeholders and replace with terminology that encompasses other bodies such as NE, HE, EA and Sports England to ensure the full range of environmental benefits can be considered. Evidence of the how the dialogue with stakeholders should be provided i.e., comprise include full list of consultations with dates and names, along with specific outcomes and mitigations in the form of a consultation statement. With respect to ecology aspects, net gain should be separated out from developer contributions. Net gain should be required or expected for all developments (consider a sperate policy). This is critical to ensure ISA objective 6 (biodiversity) obtains a positive score and the opportunities during the plan period are captured and delivered. The ecology line item could be written to ensure it captures non designated sites, connectivity, species and tree planting etc. | Change the words 'seeks' to 'required' on the basis of the EPA act. Council will remove the first sentence of the last paragraph so comments re infrastructure removed now not relevant. The above contributions will be secured through.... Will be the final line. Change point three simplify and re word and focus on net gain. |
| G4 Managing viability | Suggested Improvements: Consider including specific statement that these viabilities will only be considered only in exceptional circumstances and explain when these circumstances will be considered otherwise this policy provides an avenue for developers to bring viable sites to the authority as the norm. Consider that as part of viability assessment mitigation must be provided. | Issue around including exceptional certainties and then have to define all these circumstances. Based upon the requirements of an open book viability assessment verified by the council. Allocated sites would not be expected to be unviable. Council will revise opening line to help define rarity of the use of this policy, supporting text will be amended to give a stronger starting point and set the tone to when viability can be used. |
| G5 Ensuring planning permissions are delivered | Suggested Improvements: N/A | None |
| Workshop 2 Outcomes: Housing Policies | | |
| H1 Planning for housing delivery | Suggested Improvements: Refer to comments provided for those policies referenced. | None |

| | | |
|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| H2 Sites Allocated for Housing | Suggested Improvements: Refer to specific site assessments in Appendix 2. | Remove paragraph relating to infrastructure owing to repetition, and streamlining |
| H3 General Requirements | <p>Suggested Improvements: Consider net gain being standalone and mixed with and open space and buffers which are not net gain. Important to ensure policy is future proof for the plan period and this area is always evolving so although the white paper current recommends 10% important to ensure there is flexibility for the policy to evolve by considering including a statement regarding or as per reflected in in government guidance or similar.</p> <p>Refer to standards or policies for items like vehicle and pedestrian safety to ensure its robust and define and explain what improved access to public transport might look like. Provide more specific detail around tree loss and what developers need to show in this regard. To ensure this issue is adequately address consider the requirement for arboriculture statement where the applicant must demonstrate how trees and hedgerows have been protected, retained, or mitigated for.</p> <p>Consider either removing or providing more detail regarding how the council will work with the developer on phasing. Clearly define what ‘sustainable’, ‘high quality’, ‘appropriate’, ‘taking account of setting’, ‘appropriate buffers’, ‘improved access to public transport’ would look like and how it will be achieved.</p> <p>With respect to the SANG, it states that developments will be ‘expected to provide’ which leaves it open to interpretation, consider expected with required.</p> <p>Should this policy be the main location to capture environmental aspects consider the inclusion of climate change resilience, health, education etc as at the moment it focused on , biodiversity and trees rather than the full range of topics.</p> | Council to consider benefit of this policy and what’s repeated elsewhere. Some points re phasing are important, but could they be included elsewhere (e.g. in H2) and overall policy removed? Too much specific content to be added to other policies, therefore justifies separate policy on general requirements for housing development. |
| H4 Infilling outside settlements | Suggested Improvements: Consider stating only considered as exception when infilling. Consider including details of exactly what is required to be demonstrated to ensure the policy is robust and defensible and what is an important open space? | What is an important open space? Council have policies to protect open space already, so repetition. Agreed to remove referencing re open spaces. |
| H5 Affordable Housing | Suggested Improvements: There is need to clarify the AONB. Consider whether there could be any potential opportunities to encourage development and regeneration in deprived areas. | Policy doesn’t encourage development in the AONB but exists to cover such circumstances e.g. windfall etc, so no conflict with the designation. No change. |
| H6 Housing in the countryside | Suggested Improvements: Clarify size of developments (isolated or over 9 dwellings) with the policy H5 as there is currently conflict. Consider including reference to minimising light, noise to protect dark skies and tranquillity. | Policy renamed to clarify purpose re. <i>New homes in the countryside outside of the settlement boundaries</i> . Opening para now clarifies position on new homes in the countryside with, “ <i>New homes in the countryside outside of the settlement boundaries that are not infill development (policy H4) will only be supported where they meet at least one of the follow criteria...</i> ” |
| H7 Rural and First Homes | Suggested Improvements: Clarify if rural exception sites are allowed in AONB, recommend stating ‘rural exception sites and first homes sites will not be allowed in any designated areas including the AONB. Consider defining adjacent to minimise challenges and the potential for sprawl. Consider including details that application will need to be include the assessment of environmental impacts and will need to assess and show no significant impacts that cannot be mitigated. | <p>Rural exception site can be in AONB, first homes are not, set out in main policy text.</p> <p>How do you define adjacent, some don’t have a formal boundary, adjacent? IOW have made a decision to remove reference to adjacent (in terms of a defined boundary relationship) and leave just exceptions only.</p> |
| H8 Ensuring Right Mix | Suggested Improvements: Consider changing the word ‘should’ to ‘must’ to ensure the policy is robust. | Change ‘should’ to ‘must’ agreed. |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| H9 New housing on developed land | Suggested Improvements: Consider tangible ways to support brownfield development, for example allowing exception to other policies (i.e., affordable housing). Consider other ways these sites can be brought forward for example not requiring gardens with accessible soil but other amenity value. Consider other uses from housing which may be more suitable for Part 1 sites for example commercial or SANGs. Reference should be made to the need for applications to be supported by a conceptual model and where applicable remedial action plans. If practical, consider other benefits such as consultations with the CLO regarding the conceptual model and remedial action plans. | Caution to change owing to opening to using brownfield as a excuse to no comply with polices, but making the distinction of part 2a sites. Or sites on contaminated register. Way to incentives those sites that need to be brought forward. Do not want to provide free pre app advice for those on the register. |
| H10 Self and custom build | Suggested Improvements: Could this be included in policy H8 instead of a standalone policy. | None |
| H11 Gypsy traveller and show people | Suggested Improvements: Provide further details on what and where the council will be providing to ensure needs can be meet as there are no allocated sites for this purpose therefore no guarantee that needs of gypsy, travellers and travelling show people can be meet. Allocated sites would need to be subject to ISA assessment. | A separate DPD will be provided to provide this additional detail. |
| Notes | | New inclusions of two sites. Effectively moved from appendices into main body HA39, HA44Are now in these polices and have been assessed herein |
| Workshop 3 Outcomes: Economy Policies | | |
| E1 Supporting and growing our economy | Improvements: Consider including a statement regarding general principles of employment, explaining if employment will be allowed outside of these allocations. | Other polices within the employment section that deal with outside of allocations E2 and rural. |
| E2 Sustainable economic development | Suggested Improvements: Remove repetition regarding water access. Include a statement regarding the need to show no negative aspects to the natural environment. | Water specific policy is more focused on medina in E5, so keen to keep reference to waterside in here. Council want to avoid cross-referencing and repetition of policies. Policy EV2 protects the environment and requires improvement (net gain). Separate paragraph (1.8) at the front of the plan on making sure any user of the local plan considers all relevant policies. |
| E3 Upskilling the island | Suggested Improvements: Consider including an additional line stating must be in line with other policies that protect the environment or similar. | Council want to avoid cross referencing so no action. Council will include a text in the intro to the polices section about using the plan as whole. |
| E4 Supporting the rural economy | Suggested Improvements: It is essential the policy goes further to explicitly state both what is allowed and what is not allowed with regards to development in rural areas. Further details are required to ensure that such development does not have negative impacts on other aspects of the environment. | Council want to avoid cross-referencing and repetition of policies. Include an additional statement in the transport paragraph to include improving public access to the countryside, seeking opportunities to connect with existing public access network. |
| E5 Maintaining employment sites with water access | Suggested Improvements: Consider including a statement regarding support of water based activities. | Expand the title to be clear this relates to the Medina Valley only. Spatially this is meant to be very specific. Comfortable that there is no requirement for reference to ancillary in here, as E2 would support that business. |
| E6 Digital Infrastructure | Suggested Improvements: Change wording from 'expect' to 'require' ensuring its robust. Clarify what type of development is this just commercial, if so what size/ type, does it apply to housing? | Council happy to change wording. |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| E7 Supporting and Improving our Town Centres | Suggested Improvements: Town centres are evolving, and the policy does not reflect this as it does not include other uses for town centres and open spaces, social spaces. Consider amending the policy to provide a clear vision for the town centre which can evolve during the plan period. | Included reference to ‘public realm’ within policy. Other uses covered by amended Class E. |
| E8 Supporting the Evening Economy | Suggested Improvements: N/A | Potentially to look at combining E8 and E7 into a single policy, but ensure references to antisocial behaviour and crime are included. |
| E9 Supporting High Quality Tourism | Suggested Improvements: N/A | No change. |
| E10 The Bay Tourism Opportunity Area | Suggested Improvements: Consider combining policies regarding tourism. | Initial view is to keep them separate |
| E11 Ryde Tourism Opportunity Zones | Suggested Improvements: Consider combining policies regarding tourism. | Initial view is to keep them separate. |
| Workshop 4 Outcomes: Transport Policies | | |
| T1 Better connected Island | <p>Improvements: Consider re visiting the overriding purpose of this objective to support connectivity whilst avoiding negative impacts and seeking environmental opportunities. Consider changing the policy to say it is supporting certain types of schemes, to avoid conflicts with the emerging LTP and potentially exclude other schemes which could have positive impacts on the SA objectives. It is critical to strengthen the requirement of environmental opportunities and with respect to all SA objectives and in particular biodiversity and net gain.</p> <p>Consider if this is the best place for the reference to airports and consider other places elsewhere in the plan (as it isn’t considered sustainable transport), also provide additional details in regards to how airports will be supported as this potentially has an impact on the SA objectives.</p> <p>The statement ‘The creation of new sustainable transport routes will be supported’ is repetitive and there is no definition.</p> <p>With regards to the statement ‘should not cause a significantly adverse impact to local or strategic road network that cannot be managed or mitigated’. This seems like an important point which needs defining as could lead to negative impacts of a number of the SA objectives.</p> | There is need to check refencing LTP of RDP, key infrastructure delivery plan which more flexible and more resilient source of transport infrastructure improvements throughout the life of plan. |
| T 2 Sustainable transport | Suggested Improvements: Consider widening the breath statement regarding ‘safer routes to school and other significant destination’ to include ‘sensitive locations’. To ensure that the policy doesn’t have the potential negative environmental impacts consider including statement in this regard. | More generic link to the transport plan, liaison with transport planners to ensure these are in alignment. |
| T3 Cross Solent Transport | Suggested Improvements: The statement regarding the need to demonstrate environmental and economic benefits is unnecessary as new terminals would be subject to the EIA. Consider simplifying. | <p>Considered that some could be outside EIA and therefore it’s important to retain in the policy.</p> <p>Ensure includes benefits and not just impacts and adverse effects.</p> |
| T 4 Supporting Rail network | Suggested Improvements: Consider including a statement which protects these aspects of the environment. | Enabling development around hub, should be in the local plan, but some of these items might be better placed in the LTP i.e. timetabling, connections etc. Need to discuss with LTP plan makers on rail provision and that the plans are aligned. Still important to include info on movement sustainable around the island. |
| T 5 Electric charging vehicles | Suggested Improvements: Consider change in wording from should include provision to must to ensure statement is robust. Currently states major, why cannot this be for all developments. Use of the term major developments leaves flexibility and uncertainty and is not capturing the opportunity for positive effects on air quality and emissions. Consider specifying the speed of charging points. | Agreed this needs to be more explicit and expand, very fast moving area, must require, not just in principle support. To include tourism, commercial not just residential. Support for future charging hubs. Alternatives for off site charging where on site charging not viable. |

| | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| T 6 Parking provision | Suggested Improvements: Use of the term ‘well designed’ is ambiguous. Consider changing wording. Use of the word ‘adequate’ weakens the policy. Consider amending the wording to state that applications must be supported by statement justifying the number of private parking provided. With respect to bicycle parking, consider including set number that is required per unit as again the ‘adequate’ can be interpreted. | Detail is in SPD, have a think about setting out in the policy what factors the SPD will cover, what factors the policy will cover. |
| Workshop 5 Outcomes: Communities Policies | | |
| C1 High Quality Design for New Development | Suggested Improvements: This policy has the potential to support biodiversity through enhancing the ecological value of new development, through wildlife corridors and hedgerows/trees. Remove wording of ‘where possible’ with regards to protecting and improving land, water quality to ensure not optional. | Inclusion of wildlife corridors and hedgerow. IOW agreed to remove where possible to required to make not optional. |
| C2 Improving our Public Realm | Suggested Improvements: The overarching aim of the policy is unclear; there are benefits for ISA15 and ISA4 which could be more clearly demonstrated. The policy would benefit from a definition of <i>high quality public spaces</i> , with an inclusion of other aspects of these quality spaces i.e., preserve tranquillity/minimise light spill. Consideration of impacts to Local Character Areas and/or light spill should be mentioned (through the implementation of a lighting strategy). The policy could be strengthened by adding in commentary on conserving and enhancing the local landscape setting and local identity of settlements to support ISA5. The relationship between soft landscaping and biodiversity net gain could be emphasised to allow a positive score for ISA6, provided that adverse effects to designated sites are not caused through the development. | It was agreed that the ISA comments are not relevant and that HCC misunderstood the policy. |
| C3 Improving our Health and Wellbeing | Suggested Improvements: Consider include wording to ensure the HIA include assessment outcomes must demonstrate clear benefits to the overall health and wellbeing impact of the development. | No point in doing the health impact assessment, but not including the outcomes as mitigation in the application. Make changes to make sure the policy is easier to follow. |
| C4 Health Hub at St Mary’s Hospital | Suggested Improvements: Access to NHS and other healthcare services on the island might also require consideration of transport routes and public transport services to achieve this. | Consideration of access is in supporting text. Very specific to the hospital, no change. |
| C 5 Facilitating Independent Living | Suggested Improvements: For the provision of 20% accessible dwellings to be beneficial, the last statement within this policy needs to be supported by detail on how this will be enforced through the planning system. | Change the word expected to required. |
| C 6 Providing Annexe Accommodation | Suggested Improvements: N/A | No change |
| C 7 Delivering Locality Hubs | Suggested Improvements: N/A | No change |
| C 8 Facilitating a Blue Light Hub | Suggested Improvements: N/A | No change |
| C 9 Education Provision | Suggested Improvements: N/A | No change |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| C 10 Supporting Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Technologies | Suggested Improvements: Consider stating that development supporting green infrastructure will be supported rather than listing the types as this does not future proof the plan or allow for innovative idea technology moving forwards in the plan period. It is recommended that changes be made not to support development in the AONB and other sensitive areas as this may have significant negative effect. Consider the need for applications to be supported full assessment of risks and details of mitigation measures. | Agreed to set out scale, rather than specific types and take out specifics. Covered in the environment policies. |
| C 11 Lowering Carbon and Energy Consumption in New Development | Suggested Improvements: Remove the term ‘wherever possible’ as this suggests its optional and allows challenge. ‘Major development’ should be defined. The policy should set clear and ambitious targets for carbon emission targets, renewable energy, and recycling to assist with achieving zero emission by 2050. It should encourage innovation and other options. In summary, the policy should be more ambitious and include clear measurable targets. | Will use ‘require’ for all new residential homes to be net zero. This policy will be re written to tie into councils’ ambitions for net zero targets. |
| C 12 Utility Infrastructure Requirements for New Development | Suggested Improvements: N/A | N/A |
| C 13 Maintaining Key Utility Infrastructure | Suggested Improvements: Consider the addition of a statement ensuring such applications would generally be supported in these areas but only where it can be demonstrated that there are no negative effects to for example landscape, biodiversity to ensure these are adequately considered and any potential impacts assessed and mitigated. | Considered to be covered in the environmental policies, no changes to be made. |
| C 14 Providing Social and Community Infrastructure | Suggested Improvements: Consider whether economic reasons are an appropriate justification for loss of community infrastructure. Consider re wording that alternative will always be required within the same community rather than ‘where appropriate’. To strengthen protection of existing facilities and ensure on going provision for the Plan period. | There is some supporting text that can be used to revised the policies. Will use the term ‘local economy’ to narrow the scope. |
| C 15 Community-led Planning | Suggested Improvements: The policy does not explain how conflict between said plans may be resolved. | Effectively got to be in accordance with all plans. In theory no conflict and should be aligned. Most recent one would take priority. Will add in some bullet points on issues neighbourhood plans might seek to address. |
| Workshop 6 Outputs: Environment Policies | | |
| EV1 Conserving and enhancing historic environment | Suggested Improvements: “Demonstrate where they have been informed by sufficient evidence, including where necessary through field work, ...”“Loss of scheduled monuments and archaeological sites of demonstrable equivalence,” | Amendment to ensure the second point requires all of b/d need to be met re substantial harm. The inclusion of ‘if not viable’ provides a loophole for assets to be harmed. Agreed that there is need to be explicit and that all points must apply and you can’t cherry pick one point i.e. not viable. |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| EV2 Ecological Assets and opportunities for enhancements | Suggested Improvements: Amend term ‘located away from’, to development must be shown not have an impact on designated site via HRA or similar. Include references net gain policy. Consider tightening the exceptions and whether permanent damage would be acceptable under any circumstances. On the three numbered points: 1) Consider adding that not providing ecological assessment must be fully justified i.e. the expectation is that all applications should include at least a Preliminary Ecological Assessment. Applicants should be pointed towards tools such as Biodiversity Checklists as a means of conduction due diligence prior to submission. May also wish to highlight the role of pre-application engagement to flush. 2) Highlight that BNG is in addition to any required mitigation/enhancement measures already needed. The policy should include reference to the mitigation hierarchy – i.e. that the expectation is that development first avoids impacts and then only compensates as a last resort. | Re write first line, to strengthen policy. Development proposals will be required to protect and enhance integrity..... Remove section about development must located away from... Change to say development shouldn’t have an impact upon.... Applications need to consider impacts and gain, agreed to re word policy to take away ambiguity that exists and recognise hierarchy relating to net gain and protection. |
| EV3 Recreation Impact on the Solent European Sites | Suggested Improvements: Consider amending the term net gain which can be confused for biodiversity net gain. Consider whether this policy should relate to housing developments (above a certain size or dwelling number) or all development types. Consider mentioning that this is in addition to HRA. | There is strategic mitigation plan for this particular issue. The council felt this issue needed its own standalone policy. This relates to mitigation in addition to EV2. The main impacts were associated with activities around recreation and homes, which is why it relates to housing specifically. No change. All housing, regardless of size. Change to say net increase instead of net gain of housing for clarity. |
| EV4 Water Quality Impact on Solent European Sites (nitrates) | Suggested Improvements: Recommend that the statement regarding the position statement be amended to say all applications should be made in strict accordance with the current position statement therefore ensuing future proofing of the plan as these changes. | The council feel this needs a specific policy. Agreed to make the change regarding all applications must be in accordance with the position statement. |
| EV5 Trees Woodland and hedgerows | Suggested Improvements: To ensure the policy achieves its objective it is important that there is a requirement that applications must include details of trees and hedgerows on site arb and hedgerow assessments in order to allow the council to make the assessment (either surveys or statements). The policy should provide measurable targets to ensure these items are protected but also increased the show how the IOW will meet the 2060 target. Consider including reference to net gain. | Agreed that there is a need to be more ambitious, to require improvement and enhancement rather than retention and maintain. Consider re wording to tighten. Mention the role tree planting can play in BNG. The word ‘encourage’, change to ‘will require demonstrate’ compliance. This makes it much stronger. EV2 to pick up others things like meadows and ponds etc. |
| EV6 Protecting and providing green open spaces | Improvements: Consider changing the term ‘expected’ to ‘are required’ or ‘must’. Consider combining EV6 and EV7 to avoid repetition. | Agreed to change policy to state all developments will be required to provide and enhance public open space in line with the standards in the Concern that the open space assessment maybe doesn’t cover widely all open space and should include the playing fields strategy. The policy also wants to seek to encouraging recreation areas and publicly accessible greenspaces. Council to think about the bullets and ensure it encompassing the full range (e.g. playing pitch strategy). |
| EV7 Local green spaces | Suggested Improvements: Define special circumstances. Change wording consider to ‘support’ or ‘encourage’. Consider combining EV6 and EV7 to avoid repetition. | Council comfortable that special circumstances are clearly defined in NPPF, so no change required. Discussed the merging and the council feel area requires a standalone policy. |
| EV8 Protecting high grade agricultural land | Improvements: Remove reference to large sites to avoid conflict and ensure it is in line with spatial strategy and exception policies. | If in the future the council ended up in a position of presumption of sustainable development this policy would be there to protect agricultural land. So it was felt it was necessary to retain. Council in agreement that having a size threshold is a loophole for salami slicing. Agreed its essential to remove threshold. To say development full stop. |

| | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| EV9 Protecting our landscapes and seascapes | Improvements: Recommend clearly defining the aim of the policy to include the protection and enhancement of the landscape (including seascape), focusing on landscape, townscape, character, and visual aspects of the IOW. Consider removing references to biodiversity, climate change which are included in other policies. Consider moving RIGGS to policy EV8 which relates to soils and geology. Change the word 'expected' to 'required'. Include clear wording regarding how views and character areas will be protected. Are there any exceptions? and when and how exceptions will be made. the exceptions to this. Consider a statement which says any developments which have a negative impact on these aspect after mitigation will not be supported. Consider requirement for certain size of development to require landscape visual impact assessment and potentially ZVTs? Consider how these aspects are addressed in AONB in particular. | The focus of this policy is visual impact, agreed to remove the last 2 bullet points. Agreed to change the front statement from 'expect' to 'require'. Developers may include a brief statement re landscape but not be required to provide evidence base. Consider providing specific thresholds of when landscape information is required, look for some wording stating when LVIA's may be required, for example for applications with potential landscape impacts. |
| EV10 Preserving settlement identity | Improvements: Consider whether the policy is needed with the existing spatial strategy. | Agreed that higher tiered policies do address this issue. But retained should housing policies become out of date. No change. |
| EV11 IOW AONB | Improvements: It is imperative that all references to the AONB within all policies are in full agreement with regards to what is allowed and what is not allowed and the exceptions explicitly stated so no ambiguity remains. They should also be in line with the spatial strategy as the AONB is outside of the settlement boundaries. Provide clarity regarding whether this refers only to exception sites, or green infrastructure. Amendments are required across all groups of policies to ensure the AONB is sufficiently protected. | Remove the wording 'carefully assessed'. Amend opening paragraph and remove. Include a bullet with cumulative effects taken into account. |
| EV12 Dark Skies | Improvements: Clarify what development would be allowed in the dark skies and how this fits in with the spatial strategy. For example, does this only apply to exception sites or sites of certain size or type? Consider no outside lighting and / or mitigation measures. | Outside of planning lighting is largely out of control. Acceptance of recognition that it is a step in the right direction. No change. |
| EV13: management water resources | Improvements: Consider combining with EV15. | No change. |
| EV14 Managing Flood risk | Improvements: Consider change of terminology regarding 'be safe from flooding'. Clarify whether this is applied to all sites regardless of size. | The words 'be safe from flooding' are defined 'as dry, flood zone 1. Add required for all new development regardless of size for clarity. |
| EV15: Monkmead Catchment | Improvements: Consider removing the refer to a particular location and including a policy reading the water environment of the Island (see EV15). | The council want to retain as this is a locationally specific (to Monktonmead catchment) issue. |
| EV16 Managing our coasts | Improvements: Clarify what is meant by sustainable and practical approach, is this in addition to a vulnerability assessment. | Remove first sentence in the context of this policy re 'practical sustainable'. |
| EV17 Facilitating relocation from coastal change management areas | Improvements: Consider a requirement that applications must include consideration of exceptions to any aspect contrary to policy and include full assessment of impacts and mitigation measures. | Be clear whether such applications are considered exceptions and whether all policies will be applied as it is currently ambiguous. |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>EV18</p> <p>Improving resilience from coastal flood and risk</p> | <p>Improvements: Recommend removal of first paragraph as it not a policy. Clarify when these requirements be applied and what definition will be applied (is this for all developments on the island, in hold the line areas or on the coast)? Clarify whether development in hold the line will need to 'provide' new coastal defences or just contribute to existing defences? Clarify when developer contributions will be required as opposed to the defence works themselves, what would be the scale? With respect to new coastal defences, it is noted that there will always be material environmental impact and, in this regard, has the council considered occasions where positive impacts may out way negatives and mitigation can be provided as this is not currently allowed in this policy. Pre apps are voluntary, consider re wording to state pre app are highly recommended to ensure applicants are fully aware of the requirements at the earliest stages.</p> | <p>Agreed first paragraph is unnecessary and can be removed.</p> <p>Shoreline Management Plan sets out the effective areas so no change.</p> <p>Need to clarify size, type, location of development re contributions. Think about wording of contributions paragraphs.</p> <p>Removal of the last line re no material adverse effects. Recognising there may be some effects re coastal defence schemes.</p> <p>Re word to state pre apps recommended rather than required as they are optional.</p> |
| <p>EV19 Managing Ground Instability in new development</p> | <p>Improvements: The policy could be combined with EV18 and EV16.</p> | <p>The council feel this specific policy is required as this issue may become more acute in specific areas on the Island, which has the largest urban landslide complex in Europe.</p> |