

Northumberland County and National Park

Joint Structure Plan First Alteration

Schedule of Responses to the Examination in Public Panel Report

August 2004

Reference	Panel Recommendation	County Council Response/ Reason for Decision
1.1	<p>We recommend that the First Alteration should be modified by adding a new policy with explanatory text which:</p> <p>(i) indicates the underlying strategy of the First Alteration is to locate the majority of new development in settlements serving the regeneration areas of South East Northumberland, in accordance with RPG1;</p> <p>(ii) provides a definition of South East Northumberland using the Regeneration Area in the Strategy Diagram in RPG1, and</p> <p>(iii) sets out the complimentary emphasis to be given to the enhancement of the role of market towns and other main rural centres to assist rural regeneration, in accordance with RPG1</p>	<p>Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation adds weight and clarity to the Structure Plan's existing development strategy.</i></p>
2.1	<p>We recommend that Policy S4 is modified by deleting the words "is proposed" and replacing them with the words "will extend".</p>	<p>Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation is to amend the text of Policy S4 in response to a representation from Government Office. The County Council in considering representations to the Deposit Plan have agreed to make this modification.</i></p>
2.2	<p>We recommend that Policy S4 is modified by replacing the words "south of Longhorsley and road C117, and south west of Widdrington Station" with the text, "north of Longhorsley and west of Widdrington Station, excluding Stobswood Opencast site".</p>	<p>Accept recommendation. <i>The County Council accept the arguments put forward by the Panel to justify the amendments to the proposed extent of the Green Belt.</i></p>
2.3	<p>We recommend that Policy S4 is modified by:</p> <p>i) clarifying the description of the eastern extent of the boundary in the vicinity of Pegswood and the East Coast Mainline, and</p> <p>ii) changing the format of the boundary description in the Policy to create clearly defined bullet points.</p>	<p>Accept recommendation. <i>The County Council accept the need to clarify the policy as identified.</i></p>

Reference	Panel Recommendation	County Council Response/ Reason for Decision
2.4	We recommend that Policy S4 is modified by replacing the words "east of the A696, Belsay, Hartburn and Netherwitton" with the text "to the west of Netherwitton, Hartburn and Belsay"	Accept recommendation. <i>The County Council accept the arguments put forward by the Panel to justify the amendments to the proposed extent of the Green Belt.</i>
2.5	We recommend that the explanatory text to Policy S4 is modified by: i) deleting the last sentence of paragraph 4.1.11 and replacing it as follows: "The inner boundary around Morpeth should be drawn tightly leaving only such scope for growth as is essential to maintaining the role of the town in the longer term", and ii) including a new sentence that refers to the role of the Green Belt extension preventing Morpeth from coalescing with the settlements of Hepscoth and Pegswood.	Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation is consistent with the policy objective of extending the Green Belt around Morpeth to protect the countryside from encroachment and protect the character of the historic town.</i>
2.6	We recommend that Policy S4 is modified by extending the final sentence of the Policy with the words, "to the sequential approach in Policy S10."	Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation, by cross-referring to the sequential approach to development, strengthens the effectiveness of Green Belt policy.</i>
3.1	We conclude that there are no changes in circumstances or new information of such significance as to justify a recommendation to change to the figures set out in RPG1	Accept recommendation. <i>Agree with the Panel's conclusion on this matter.</i>
3.2	We recommend that, in order to reflect the reality of the inherited commitments, the housing figures in Policy H1 for 2002-2006 should be modified as follows Alnwick 120 Berwick 60 Blyth Valley 200 Castle Morpeth 155 Tynedale 170 Wansbeck 200	Accept recommendation. <i>It is considered that the Panel's total package of recommendations in relation to housing numbers, combining a pragmatic approach to existing inherited commitments in the period 2002-2006, with measures to 'manage down' housing provision to RPG1 levels represents an appropriate way forward.</i>

Reference	Panel Recommendation	County Council Response/ Reason for Decision
3.4	We further recommend that, pending the forthcoming review of RPG1, no change should be made to the total annual average figure of 810 dwellings per annum in Policy H1 during the period from 2006 - 2016.	Accept recommendation. <i>Agree that any changes shall come through the review of RPG1.</i>
3.5	We recommend that an additional sub-paragraph is included in Policy H1 to remove any doubts as to the approach to dealing with replacement dwellings, as follows: "Replacement Housing If new housing is to replace demolished dwellings which were occupied, then these new dwellings are in addition to the allocations set out in this Policy. If, however, they are to replace demolished dwellings which were vacant then the replacements are counted as part of the allocations in this Policy."	Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation provides clarity to the approach for dealing with replacement dwellings.</i>
3.6	We recommend that a common methodology for determining which dwellings are vacant and which are occupied should be developed and this intention referred to in Paragraph 4.2.13. This should be based on the principle recommended by the Government Office. Areas of low demand should be identified by District Councils and the breakdown at the time of identification should be used to determine the split between occupied and vacant dwellings for the purposes of Policy H1 as revised.	Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation is consistent with advice given by Government Office to local authorities</i>
3.7	We recommend that the First Alteration should include in the text an acknowledgement and explanation of the second/holiday homes issue and its effect on Alnwick and Berwick upon Tweed.	Accept recommendation. <i>The addition to the explanatory memorandum recommended by the Panel is necessary to justify the amended policy approach to housing provision in Alnwick and Berwick-upon-Tweed proposed through recommendation 3.8.</i>

Reference	Panel Recommendation	County Council Response/ Reason for Decision
3.8	<p>We recommend that subject to the development of a detailed and practicable system for monitoring of second and holiday homes in Alnwick and Berwick-upon-Tweed, the allocations in H1 should be increased to make allowance for such dwellings. Policy H1 should be modified by adding the following sub-paragraph:</p> <p>"Second and Holiday Homes Subject to the agreement of a practical and reliable system of monitoring, an allowance for second homes and holiday homes will be permitted in Alnwick and Berwick-upon-Tweed in addition to the allocations in this Policy."</p>	<p>Accept recommendation. <i>The County Council accepts the case put forward to justify the development of second/holiday homes in Alnwick and Berwick-upon-Tweed being treated as additional to the net figures for housing provision in these districts in Policy H1. It also agrees with the Panel's concern that there is a need to justify any additional provision and that more research is needed into monitoring and management of both phenomena so as to ensure that such additional provision is strictly controlled.</i></p> <p>Do not accept second recommendation. <i>The County Council considers that any reassessment of its role should be undertaken through the current review of RPG1 and not by the County Council considering this issue in isolation.</i></p>
3.10	<p>We recommend that Policy H3 and the supporting text should be strengthened. The Policy currently indicates that all Local Planning Authorities should address the need to provide an element of affordable housing. Alnwick, Berwick-upon-Tweed, Castle Morpeth and Tynedale however would benefit from stronger and more robust affordable housing policies. Policy H3 should include additional sentences relating to these four Districts as follows:</p> <p>"In Alnwick, Berwick-upon-Tweed, Castle Morpeth and Tynedale policies should be designed to maximise the provision of affordable housing, by all means which are available, consistent with National policy. These policies should be backed by up to date Housing Needs Survey."</p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.16 should be strengthened accordingly.</p>	<p>Accept recommendation. <i>The County Council accepts the case made by the Panel for strengthening the policy approach on affordable housing.</i></p>

Reference	Panel Recommendation	County Council Response/ Reason for Decision
3.11	We recommend that for Alnwick the annual average allocation for 2006-2016 in Policy H1 should be unchanged at 75 dwellings.	Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation is consistent with figures proposed in the Joint Structure Plan, First Alteration.</i>
3.12	We recommend that for Berwick-upon-Tweed the annual average allocation for 2006-16 in Policy H1 should be increased to 60 dwellings	Accept recommendation. <i>The County Council accepts the case made by the Panel for increasing levels of housing provision in Berwick Borough on the basis that it will not have a significant impact on the wider Joint Structure Plan strategy.</i>
3.13	We recommend that for Blyth Valley the annual average allocation for 2006-16 in Policy H1 should be unchanged at 290 dwellings.	Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation is consistent with figures proposed in the Joint Structure Plan, First Alteration.</i>
3.14	We recommend that an addition is made to paragraph 4.2.9 of the supporting text of the First Alteration referring to the importance of ensuring that emphasis is given, in the provision of housing in Castle Morpeth, to the need to revitalise the coalfield communities in the eastern part of the District.	Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation is consistent with the priority attached to the regeneration of the rural coalfield in the Joint Structure Plan.</i>
3.15	We recommend that for Castle Morpeth the annual average allocation for 2006-16 in Policy H1 should be unchanged at 125.	Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation is consistent with figures proposed in the Joint Structure Plan, First Alteration.</i>
3.16	We recommend that for Tynedale the annual average allocation for 2006-16 in Policy H1 should be reduced to 100	Accept recommendation. <i>The County Council accepts the modification to Tynedale's housing figure (and proposed by Tynedale District Council) on the grounds that it is consistent with Joint Structure Plan strategies to reduce commuting from Tynedale to the conurbation.</i>
3.17	We recommend that for Wansbeck the annual average allocation for 2006-16 in Policy H1 should be unchanged at 160	Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation is consistent with figures proposed in the Joint Structure Plan, First Alteration.</i>

Reference	Panel Recommendation	County Council Response/ Reason for Decision
3.18	We recommend that in view of the very small numbers involved no separate housing allocation for the National Park should be identified in the First Alteration, and that such development as takes place there should not be counted against the allocations for the Districts involved. This approach should be kept under review in future revisions of the Plan.	Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation is consistent with the policy approach advocated by the County Council.</i>
3.19	We recommend that Policy H1 should be modified by increasing the previously developed land target to 2008 from 35% to 40%	Accept recommendation. <i>The County Council invited the Panel to consider increasing the target to 40%.</i>
3.20	We recommend that the previously developed land target to 2016 should remain at 50%	Accept recommendation. <i>The County Council concurs with the Panel's conclusion on the previously developed land target for 2016.</i>
3.21	We recommend that part (d) of Policy H4 should be modified as follows: "require a minimum housing density of 30 dwellings per hectare and seek higher development densities in locations that are within or adjoining town centres or have a high level of accessibility to jobs and services on foot or by cycle and by public transport."	Accept recommendation. <i>The County Council accepts the case made by the Panel to the wording of Policy H4.</i>

Reference	Panel Recommendation	County Council Response/ Reason for Decision
3.22	<p>We recommend that Paragraph 4.2.22 should be modified as described in EIP Report paragraph 3.158 in order to indicate that lower densities than 30 dwellings per hectare will be justified only in very limited and demonstrable circumstances. We suggest the following wording:</p> <p>"Making efficient use of land is important and the County should be looking to deliver higher density housing development, especially on sites that are well located in relation to town centres or public transport corridors. Feedback from consultation carried out in the preparation of the Regional Housing Strategy is that better quality housing is probably important in attracting and retaining key workers and decision makers to the Region. There is evidence that good design can produce attractive housing at higher densities now required by national and regional guidance. Lower density development should be permitted only exceptionally and where a clear relationship to economic and social regeneration can be demonstrated. Where a Local Planning Authority considers there is such a need it should be justified in their Local Plan. Local Plans should also include policies which promote imaginative designs and good integration with settlements and transport links. These can be supplemented with village design statements."</p>	<p>Accept recommendation. <i>The County Council agrees that the amendment recommended by the Panel to paragraph 4.2.22 more fully reflects National and Regional policy guidance.</i></p>

Reference	Panel Recommendation	County Council Response/ Reason for Decision
4.1	<p>We recommend that the Employment Chapter of the First Alteration is modified by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) clarifying how Policies ED1, ED5 and ED6 interact and that the ED1 figure is not additional to existing allocations in Local Plans ii) adding an appendix to summarise and clarify the current provision of land under these policies, and iii) updating Policy ED6 and its explanatory text to reflect any relevant findings of the Blyth Estuary Study 	<p>Accept recommendation. <i>The County Council accepts that the Panel's recommendation will clarify intention in respect of employment land provision, and in respect of 4.1 (iii) ensure the policy framework remains up to date and relevant.</i></p>
4.2	<p>We recommend that Policy ED1 is modified to increase the minimum area of land to 195 hectares</p>	<p>Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation reflects the increase in the employment land figure for Alnwick proposed under recommendation 4.3.</i></p>
4.3	<p>We recommend that the figure in Policy ED1 for Alnwick is increased to 25ha.</p>	<p>Accept recommendation. <i>The County Council accepts the case made by Alnwick District for an increase in employment land, as reflected in the Panel's recommendation.</i></p>
4.4	<p>We recommend no modification to the figure for Berwick-upon-Tweed in Policy ED1</p>	<p>Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation is consistent with the figure proposed in the Joint Structure Plan, First Alteration.</i></p>
4.5	<p>We recommend no modification to the figure for Blyth Valley in Policy ED1</p>	<p>Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation is consistent with the figure proposed in the Joint Structure Plan, First Alteration.</i></p>
4.6	<p>We recommend no modification to the figure for Castle Morpeth in Policy ED1</p>	<p>Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation is consistent with the figure proposed in the Joint Structure Plan, First Alteration.</i></p>
4.7	<p>We recommend no modification to the figure for Tynedale in Policy ED1</p>	<p>Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation is consistent with the figure proposed in the Joint Structure Plan, First Alteration.</i></p>

Reference	Panel Recommendation	County Council Response/ Reason for Decision
4.8	We recommend no modification to the figure for Wansbeck in Policy ED1	Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation is consistent with the figure proposed in the Joint Structure Plan, First Alteration.</i>
4.9	We recommend no modification to Policy ED2	Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation supports the current policy ED2 in the Joint Structure Plan, First Alteration.</i>
4.10	We recommend that the First Alteration is modified by: i) amplifying the explanatory text in section 4.3 to express more clearly the importance of market towns and other rural service centres in addressing the priority of rural regeneration, and ii) inclusion within the above amplification of cross-references to the main relevant policies of the Plan that address the economic development of market towns.	Accept recommendation. <i>The County Council accepts that the Panel's recommendation better reflects regional policy in respect of the role of market towns in rural regeneration.</i>
5.1	We recommend that Policy M3 in the Pre EIP Changes is modified as follows: "To help minimise energy use, Local Plans should include policies to guide the location, design and layout of development and emphasise the need for energy efficiency and energy conservation. Consideration should be given to the need for supplementary planning guidance on these matters."	Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation clarifies and strengthens the policy approach to energy.</i>
5.2	We recommend that the First Alteration is modified by including in the new policy M5 (see 5.6), the clarification that renewable energy can only be harnessed where it occurs and that Policy S10 will not therefore apply to this form of development.	Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation clarifies and strengthens the policy approach to renewable energy.</i>

Reference	Panel Recommendation	County Council Response/ Reason for Decision
5.3	<p>We recommend that the First Alteration is modified by adding to the explanatory text at 4.6.19 of the Pre EIP Changes:</p> <p>"Single wind turbines may be permitted in areas designated as of international and national importance, where they are to supply domestic and other small users not connected to mains power. They will be permitted elsewhere where their visual impact has been minimised and other important interests will not be seriously harmed. The criteria for assessing single wind turbines and other non-major renewable energy proposals will be set out in Local Plans and will include many of those matters listed in Policy M5. As a general indication, single wind turbines may currently be considered "major development" where they exceed 100KW, though this may change as technology evolves. Further guidance on when a proposal may be considered "major development" is found at paragraph 4.6.1."</p>	<p>Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation clarifies and strengthens the policy approach to renewable energy.</i></p>
5.4	<p>We recommend that the First Alteration is modified at the Glossary by deletion of "domestic scale wind turbines" and substitution of "domestic and other small scale wind turbines" and deletion of "80KW" and substitution of "100KW".</p>	<p>Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation clarifies and strengthens the policy approach to renewable energy.</i></p>

Reference	Panel Recommendation	County Council Response/ Reason for Decision
5.5	<p>We recommend that Policy M4 of the Pre EIP Changes is modified as follows: "Policy M4</p> <p>To assist positively in contributing to national and any regional targets to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and to increase renewable energy generation, Local Planning Authorities should take into account that the following areas have been identified as areas of least constraint for major wind energy developments:</p> <p>a) Kielder Forest has potential to become a Strategic Renewable Resource Area, including for large scale wind energy development;</p> <p>b) The following Wind Resource Areas have potential for medium scale development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * South west of Berwick-upon-Tweed * North/South Charlton * Knowesgate * Harwood Forest * Northern Coalfield, south of Druridge Bay * Kiln Pit Hill <p>The extent and boundaries of these areas should be defined in Local Plans. Local Planning Authorities should include criteria based policies in Local plans having regard to Policy M5 and where feasibility of development is known, a site may be allocated in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation to provide a more positive policy framework and to include Kielder as a strategic renewables area, and Harwood Forest, Kiln Pit Hill and the Northern Coalfield, south of Druridge Bay as Wind Resource Areas is accepted. The County Council accept the Panel's view that there were no significant reasons to depart from the conclusions of the Regional Renewable Energy Strategy on the basis that they were identified as areas of least constraint and will be subject to further testing and evaluation.</i></p>
5.7	<p>We recommend that the First Alteration is modified by adding to the explanatory text a reference to the potential of biomass in Combined Heat and Power</p>	<p>Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation seeks to clarify the policy approach to renewable energy.</i></p>

Reference	Panel Recommendation	County Council Response/ Reason for Decision
5.8	We recommend that the Key Diagram of the First Alteration is modified to reflect the multiple potential at Kielder Forest as a Strategic Renewables Resource Area	Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation seeks to clarify the role of Kielder Forest as a Strategic Renewables Resource Area.</i>
5.9	We recommend that no modification is made regarding setting a Renewable Energy generation target for Northumberland	Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation is consistent with the view of the County Council in that it would not be appropriate to set a sub-regional target in the absence of a regional target.</i>
5.10	We recommend that the First Alteration is modified by inclusion in the explanatory text of updated references to the RRES and to the potential setting of targets in the RSS	Accept recommendation. <i>The County Council accepts the need to amend and update the explanatory memorandum to reflect any amended position on the setting of regional targets through the RSS.</i>
5.11	We recommend that Policy M4a should refer to the potential for Kielder Forest to become a Strategic Renewables Resource Areas and that the supporting text in paragraph 4.6.19a should include, in addition to the present discussion about constraints, a more explicit reference to the potential importance of development in this area in order to meet Regional targets	Accept recommendation. <i>The County Council agrees that there is also potential for hydro and biomass development in the Kielder area and therefore should be designated as a Strategic Renewable Resource Area.</i>
5.12	We recommend that the area to the south and west of Berwick-upon-Tweed should be included as a WRA in the First Alteration	Accept recommendation. <i>The recommendation is consistent with the County Council's Pre-EIP changes</i>
5.13	We recommend that the Charltons site, on both sides of the A1, should be included as a WRA in the First Alteration.	Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel' recommendations are accepted on the basis of adopting a consistent approach to those Wind Resource Areas identified through the Regional Renewable Energy Strategy - at this stage all the locations are areas of least constraint and will be the subject of further testing and evaluation.</i>
5.14	We recommend that the Knowesgate area should be included as a WRA in the First Alteration.	Accept recommendation. <i>The recommendation is consistent with the County Council's Pre-EIP changes</i>

Reference	Panel Recommendation	County Council Response/ Reason for Decision
5.15	We recommend that the Harwood Forest area should be included as a WRA in the First Alteration and be shown on the Key Diagram.	Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel' recommendations are accepted on the basis of adopting a consistent approach to those Wind Resource Areas identified through the Regional Renewable Energy Strategy - at this stage all the locations are areas of least constraint and will be the subject of further testing and evaluation.</i>
5.16	We recommend that the Northern Coalfield south of Druridge Bay should be included as a WRA in the First Alteration and be shown on the Key Diagram.	Accept recommendation. <i>The County Council in conjunction with North East Assembly proposed this change during the EIP.</i>
5.17	We recommend that Kiln Pit Hill should be included as a WRA in the First Alteration and be shown on the Key Diagram.	Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel' recommendations are accepted on the basis of adopting a consistent approach to those Wind Resource Areas identified through the Regional Renewable Energy Strategy - at this stage all the locations are areas of least constraint and will be the subject of further testing and evaluation.</i>
5.18	We recommend that an addition should be made to the explanatory text in Paragraph 4.6.19 to indicate that further WRAs may emerge either as a result of technological change or as a result of revisions to the assumptions and constraints in the RRES.	Accept recommendation. <i>The Panel's recommendation acknowledges the possibility of technological change and reflects advice in draft PPS22.</i>

Reference	Panel Recommendation	County Council Response/ Reason for Decision
5.19	<p>We recommend replacing the second of the three paragraphs in 4.6.19 (e) with the following:</p> <p>“The impact of such development on the wider landscape is an important factor. This is particularly the case when proposals are close to the Northumberland National Park, the North Pennines and Northumberland Coast Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Hadrian’s Wall World Heritage Site. The key factor will be the effect on the natural beauty and heritage of such areas. The landscape character and capacity of the surrounding area should be assessed and development should be permitted where no significantly adverse visual impact or other serious harm would result.”</p>	<p>Accept representation. <i>The Panel's recommendation seeks to clarify the policy approach to renewable energy.</i></p>

**Northumberland County And National Park Joint Structure Plan, First Alteration 2002 to 2016
Examination In Public March To April 2004
Schedule Of Responses To The Panel Report May 2004 That Are Accepted In Part**

Reference	Panel Recommendation	County Council Response/ Reason for Decision
3.3	We recommend that Policy H2 of the Plan should be modified by the addition of a sub-paragraph to indicate that Local Planning Authorities should review outstanding planning permissions and allocations in Local Plans urgently and robustly, in a way which carefully reflects the development strategy of the First Alteration, and in particular the criteria set out in Policy S10.	Do not accept. <i>In principle, the Panel's recommendation is consistent with the objectives of managing down levels of housing provision. However, it would require the revocation of planning approvals and this is considered to be impracticable. The County Council consider this can best be achieved through the adoption of interim housing policies to manage the release of housing land for development and through the review of Local Plans.</i>
3.9	We recommend no change to the First Alteration in relation to the role of Cramlington. But we recommend that the County Council should undertake a thorough re-assessment of its role, in order to ensure that the pace and phasing of housing development fully compliments other policies in RPG and elsewhere.	Accept first recommendation. <i>The Panel's principal recommendation regarding the status of Cramlington as a sub-regional growth point is consistent with RPG1.</i> Do not accept second recommendation. <i>The County Council considers that any reassessment of its role should be undertaken through the current review of RPG1 and not by the County Council considering this issue in isolation.</i>

Reference	Panel Recommendation	County Council Response/ Reason for Decision
5.6	<p>We recommend that the First Alteration is modified by setting out in new Policy M5 the matters for consideration in assessing all renewable energy proposals (both wind energy and other resources):</p> <p>Policy M5 Local Planning Authorities will support and encourage major development for the generation of electricity from all renewable resources, except in the National Park, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Heritage Coast, the Hadrian's Wall World Heritage Site and sites of national and international for nature conservation. In those areas exceptional reasons must be shown to justify such development and proposals will be subject to Policy M1.</p> <p>Elsewhere, such major proposals will be assessed taking account of their implications for the interests set out below, including the effect of any mitigation measures proposed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) landscape character and capacity; b) visual amenity; c) archaeological and built heritage; d) nature conservation interest; e) living conditions nearby, including from noise and other emissions; f) the local economy; g) accessibility by road and public transport; h) the disposal of waste; i) agriculture and other land based industries; j) the safety of aircraft and the efficiency of radar; k) any cumulative impact with other similar developments; 	<p>Do not accept. <i>Whilst the policy is generally acceptable in that it provides a clear policy framework approach including assessment criteria it is considered that criterion j) is inappropriate. Criterion j) is concerned with the safety of aircraft and the efficiency of radar. These are technical matters covered by statutory requirements and guidance from the Civil Aviation Authority, Civil Airports and Ministry of Defence and as such duplicates consideration of matters covered under other legislation.</i></p>

l) the economic, social and environmental benefits of the development beyond the local area, and

m) any other material considerations identified in Local Plans and Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Because wind and water energy can only be harnessed where they are found, Policy S10 shall not apply to such proposals."