

log 2 300

Policy RE1

SUMMARISED

View Response

Response Details

From Sarah Edwards

Date Started: 27 Dec 2018 23:07. Last modified: 28 Dec 2018 10:14

Status Complete

Response ID #675073

Visibility Response visibility: **Unknown.**

Email Address

Postal Address

Postcode

Gender

What is your age?

If you are under 16,
what is your date of
birth?

What is your ethnic
group?

Your ethnic group (if
you answered other)

Are you disabled?

Organisation Name

Job Title / Position
within the Organisation

Areas of Interest

Survey Types

1

Which part of the document do you wish to comment on? (please give the relevant paragraph or policy number below)

- Paragraph Policies Map
 Policy Number Sustainability Appraisal

Please give the relevant paragraph or policy number

RE1

300.1
1/57

2

Do you consider that the document:

Select the most applicable option in each row.

- | | Yes | No |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| (a) is legally compliant? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| (b) is sound? | <input type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| (c) complies with the duty to co-operate? | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

3

Do you consider that the document is **unsound** because it is **not**: (tick as appropriate)

(a) positively prepared?

(b) justified?

(c) effective?

(d) consistent with national policy?

4

Please tell us below why you consider the document to be unsound, not legally compliant or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. If you do believe the document is sound, legally compliant, or complies with the duty to co-operate you may use the box to explain why.

While climate change features in the draft plan, there is a very inadequate response to the recent IPCC report. The draft plan is out of date, not reflecting the severity or urgency of the climate emergency that the IPCC report has detailed.

There needs to be extensive revision to the draft plan to address the wide range of climate challenges. This affects almost every section of the plan. There also needs to be property carbon accounting and clear targets.

New development should be required to be zero carbon from the start of the plan period. This approach has been successfully demonstrated in London. The background paper on which your policy is based is out of date. The consultation response accompanying the NPPF published July 2018 confirmed that the Framework does not prevent local authorities from using their existing powers under the Planning and Energy Act 2008 or other legislation where applicable to set higher ambition. "In particular, local authorities are not restricted in their ability to require energy efficiency standards above Building Regulations".

The current plans are based on an unsustainable model of economic growth. We

need 'green' growth and growth in sectors that are genuinely sustainable, not just in terms of climate, but resource use. Current economic growth is still based on a 3 planet model. We also need to resist expansion in the south east, which is becoming overdeveloped, and seek investment in northern areas where there is far more scope for reuse of brown field sites. Green Belt and good agricultural land are being developed inappropriately.

03
300.2
1158

5

What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the document sound or legally compliant? Please explain why this change will achieve soundness or legal compliance. (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination.) It would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for the policy or text in question.

See above.

Every aspect of the plan needs to be reviewed and improved so that it enables the city and its residents to move rapidly to a zero carbon position and also enables everyone to adapt to the tougher conditions. This means everything from radical improvements to energy efficiency in homes (old and new), to ensuring there is adequate (cooling) green space close to dwellings and workplaces, closer proximity of facilities (including important recreational space) to where people live, much more ambitious water saving measures, etc.

Retail space should be curtailed in favour of facilities for repair, reuse, etc.

2 of 2

Policy M1

View Response

Response Details

From Sarah Edwards

Date Started: 27 Dec 2018 23:23. Last modified: 27 Dec 2018 23:23

Status Complete

Response ID #675076

Visibility Response visibility: **Unknown.**

Email Address

Postal Address

Postcode

Gender

What is your age?

If you are under 16,
what is your date of
birth?

What is your ethnic
group?

Your ethnic group (if
you answered other)

Are you disabled?

Organisation Name

Job Title / Position
within the Organisation

Areas of Interest

Survey Types

1

Which part of the document do you wish to comment on? (please give the relevant paragraph or policy number below)

Paragraph

Policies Map

Policy Number

Sustainability Appraisal

Please give the relevant paragraph or policy number

M1

300.3
1159

2

Do you consider that the document:

Select the most applicable option in each row.

	Yes	No
(a) is legally compliant?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
(b) is sound?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
(c) complies with the duty to co-operate?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

3

Do you consider that the document is **unsound** because it is **not**: (tick as appropriate)

(a) positively prepared?

(b) justified?

(c) effective?

(d) consistent with national policy?

4

Please tell us below why you consider the document to be unsound, not legally compliant or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. If you do believe the document is sound, legally compliant, or complies with the duty to co-operate you may use the box to explain why.

While there is a focus on walking, cycling and public transport, there are failings in the policy.

The needs of people with disabilities have not been adequately addressed.

There needs to be much greater investment in safer cycling and while the County is the transport authority, the City needs to use all opportunities to press for this. As an example, the new stations on the Cowley branch line need good cycle and pedestrian access.

5

What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the document sound or legally compliant? Please explain why this change will achieve soundness or legal compliance. (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination.) It would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for the policy or text in question.

see above