

## North Norfolk Local Plan Examination Agenda for Matter 9

**Tuesday 5 March 2024 at 10 am (Please note later start time)**

### **Matter 9: Delivering Climate Resilient Sustainable Growth (CC policies)**

Issue: Whether the policies for delivering climate resilient sustainable growth are positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

1. Policy CC1
2. Policy CC2 – does the policy provide appropriate guidance for the consideration of Renewable & Low Carbon Energy projects in the district? Are areas classified as moderate-high sensitivity in the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment SPD suitable for development in principle as proposed, and is the assessment sufficiently detailed to determine this? To what extent have heritage assets been taken into account? Should moderate-high sensitivity or less be reflected in Figure 5, which appears to be solely based on AONB & Broads designations? Are the other criteria in the policy justified and would they be effective? Has potential windfarm development at the district's airfields been sufficiently assessed to justify the less restrictive policy?
3. Policy CC3 - How do the energy efficiency standards set out in section 1 of policy relate to current and potential future building regulations? Does it need updating? Are any differences from building regulations standards justified? What does 'zero carbon ready' by 2035 mean in practice? What are the implications for the cost of development? Is the policy consistent with the Ministerial Written Statement of 13 December 2023?
4. Is the requirement in section 2 of Policy CC3 for all proposals to be accompanied by a compliance statement justified? Does this include minor development or should there be a threshold?
5. Is the requirement in section 3 of Policy CC3 for non-residential development over 250 sq m floorspace to achieve BREEAM 'very good' standard justified? What are the implications for the cost of development?
6. Is the requirement in Policy CC4 for compliance with any future local water efficiency standard justified when these are not currently known?
7. Do Policies CC5 and CC6 provide appropriate guidance for the management of change and relocation of existing uses within the Coastal Change Management Area (CCMA)? Do they provide sufficient flexibility for tourist accommodation businesses operating within the CCMA? How reliable is the CCMA designation, what assumptions are made in drawing it up and when might it be reviewed? Is the vulnerable within 50 years period justified in relation to potential blight and investment decisions? Should it be more flexible or relate to the use concerned? Is the 'no net detrimental impact' test justified when the development being replaced remains temporarily?
8. Policy CC7

9. Does Policy CC8 provide appropriate guidance for the provision of electric vehicle charging points in new development? Are the proposed standards justified, how do they relate to the building regulations and what are the implications for the cost of development? Are the requirements for off-site and communal parking practical and justified? Is the text in 3.8.3 and 3.8.7 justified in requiring compliance with any future County Council electric vehicle parking standards when these are not currently known?

10. Policy CC9

11. Is Policy CC10 relating to biodiversity net gain consistent with national policy? Does it need to refer to qualifying development? Should it refer to off-site and/or credit options? Has the effect on the cost of development been properly taken into account?

12. Policy CC11

13. Policy CC12

14. Policy CC13