

“Errors and suggested minor modifications”

Policy or Section	Issue	Change	Commissioners’ Comments
<p>7.2 “Typographical and drafting errors”</p> <p>To be read in conjunction with Appendix 7 of Document BCC-DPS-ConRep</p>			
HOU4	<p>HOU4 refers to density based policy approach.</p> <p>DES3 only applies to buildings over 35 metres in height</p>	<p>Reference to “Tall Buildings within the City Centre’ is a drafting error. Replacement of text to read “Taller Buildings within the city centre”</p>	<p>No definition of what constitutes a “taller” building in this policy context.</p>
HOU7	<p>Evidence regarding accessibility of existing stock from an English Housing Survey and therefore not relevant to NI</p>	<p>The footnote reference to the English Housing Survey was a drafting error and can be removed</p>	<p>Seems to be part of evidence base for policy. Is the policy sound on the revised evidential basis?</p>
BH2	<p>Clarity between criteria J) and k) as there is potential for confusion in their interpretation</p>	<p>The test should not be optional and can be amended as follows:</p> <p>The term ‘and/or should be replaced with ‘and’</p> <p>Criterion K should be amended to –</p> <p>The design quality of the proposed redevelopment is considered to enhance the overall character</p>	<p>Arguably renders policy more onerous/stringent.</p>

“Errors and suggested minor modifications”

BH2	Highlight the erroneous reference to ‘HE2A’ within policy text	Replace HE2A with Policy RD2	As the proposed change is importing the requirements of Policy RD2 into BH2, it is arguably made more onerous.
Infrastructure General	TS should be amended to take account and refer to NI Water wastewater system capacity information	Drafting error in Appendix D Amendment to be made to delete appendix D and incorporate the table into BMAP text outlined in Appendix B	This is updating evidence in the TS in response to NIW’s representation. Is it a minor change as envisaged by paragraph 4.5 of DPPN 10?
7.3 “Minor Changes”			
Chapter 4 vision, aims and objectives (page 28)	No commitment to positive action such as demand management of the private car	Amendment to second objective	Arguably more than a minor change; going from promotion to enforcement? What are demand management measures? The answer could have significant implications - car sharing, congestion charging, banning private vehicles from certain routes (at certain times)? etc. Could potentially alter the aim in a significant manner.
Chapter 4 vision, aims and objectives (page 28)	Change in the wording from ‘suitable’ to ‘appropriate’		“Aims”, 1st para, 2nd sentence. In the absence of a definition of what constitutes “appropriate” potentially more than a minor change and alter the aim in a significant manner.

“Errors and suggested minor modifications”

Strategic Policies	George Best Belfast City Airport as an enabler of growth		Para 5.0.3 suggested additional sentence - despite what BCC says about Policy SD2 & that this is J&A text rather than policy, residents concerned about noise emanating from GBBCA, may consider the suggested change more than “minor”. On the other hand, para 3.36 of the RDS says that Belfast’s airports & seaport serve the region a gateway links to the world.
SP1	<p>George Best Belfast City Airport highlighted the role of the airport as an enabler of growth.</p> <p>George Best City Airport suggest that justification and amplification to accompany this policy should acknowledge that the Airport’s strategic role as a key gateway and driver of regional economic development. They note the importance of optimising existing airport capacity and suggest a need for reference to the potential for airport growth over the Plan period.</p> <p>Although the role of George Best Belfast City Airport is</p>	<p>The Council suggest the following text be added as a second sentence within Paragraph 5.0.3:</p> <p>“Belfast’s harbour area, via the port and Belfast City Airport, provide a gateway to Britain, Europe and the rest of the world. They will continue to act as an enabler of wider economic growth throughout the plan period”</p>	Does this elevate the status of GBBCA in the region? Not the only airport and Belfast International or City of Derry Airport may wish to comment on this.

“Errors and suggested minor modifications”

	acknowledged as part of the spatial development strategy (see Policy SD2: Settlement areas), the important ‘regional gateway’ role of the broader harbour area, including the port and airport and their support for the regional economy could be referenced more generally within the introduction to the strategic policies and at the LPP stage.		
SP2	Role of the historic and natural environment recognised in creating sustainable development. The term historic environment should be included in the definitions		Potentially more than a minor change as it arguably extends the scope of the policy albeit that there are separate provisions for protection of the historic environment in the BH policies. The rationale seems to be to render the policy sounder as opposed to sound.
Housing/HOU12	There is no explicit reference to ‘specialist housing’ in the Policy Aims (Para. 7.1.5). An additional policy aim was proposed to address this, referring to specialist housing	The addition of a policy aim in line with the wording suggested by the respondent has merit and is a minor amendment for clarity. The following text should be	Arguably adding to policy aims after public consultation.

“Errors and suggested minor modifications”

	needs, shared housing, student accommodation and traveller accommodation.	inserted at the end of the bullet point list under Paragraph 7.1.5: “Ensure an appropriate supply of housing to provide for those with specialist housing needs including specialist residential accommodation and care - related facilities, specific accommodation for travellers, shared forms of housing and purpose built student accommodation.	
HOU13	Define close proximity		The suggested amendment potentially doesn't address the “problem” that it intended to. What constitutes “walking distance”? Will not be the same for any two people.
DES2	Justification text should replace policy criterion (J)		Need to clarify what it is BCC are seeking. At first it appears they are suggesting the deletion of criterion (j) but upon reflection they seem to be asking that the wording be amended to reflect para 7.2.27. This would appear to dilute the requirement.
DES2	Site hectares v units		This would arguably provide more certainty but those who read the J&A as written & decided not to comment might have done so if it had made clear that the threshold was at the suggested strategic level.

“Errors and suggested minor modifications”

DES3	Clarification sought on the locational basis		Clarify where the suggested additional wording would fall.
RD1	<p>Objection to the apparent exclusion of HMO areas (e.g Stranmillis) as residential areas and does not seek to address residential areas that are primarily HMO nature.</p>	<p>A review of the proposed definition at Appendix B has merit to help provide greater clarity. Such a minor amendment can be made with affecting the overall soundness of the plan. The first two paragraphs of Appendix B should therefore be amended</p> <p>Suggested wording</p> <p>“an established residential area is normally taken to mean residential neighbourhoods dominated by a recognisable form of housing styles with associated private amenity space or gardens...</p> <p>Within Belfast City, established residential areas often display a clear spatial structure. Building forms, plot sizes and shapes are sometimes similar with a well-defined pattern of local development. Properties may exhibit comparable design styles including common architectural detailing and treatments, and areas of both public and private amenity space can share an identifiable character. The overall spatial structure is often ...”</p>	<p>Does the amendment to this definition go further than a minor change?</p> <p>The wording of the second suggested amendment doesn't appear to make sense.</p> <p>BCC's rationale for the first amendment crystallises potential concerns that it arguably broadens the extent of the definition. Whilst this may be justified for planning purposes, it could arguably fundamentally change the scope of the definition.</p>

“Errors and suggested minor modifications”

		The remaining text within the Appendix would remain unchanged	
BH2	Two respondents have provided comments suggesting that specific amendments are required to provide further clarity and strength to the draft policy. In particular it was noted that the policy fails to explain the term ‘prior agreement’ under draft Policy BH2, and have suggested the rewording of text to provide better clarity.	<p>Whilst it is considered that the policy approach is consistent with regional policy and the draft policy adequately secures the protection of conservation areas, minor rewording to the policy and the J&A would assist its interpretation.</p> <p>The Council suggests that the final sentence under Policy BH2, subheading ‘Demolition’ be reworded as follows:</p> <p>“ Where consent is granted for demolition this will normally be conditional on prior agreement for the redevelopment of the site, and appropriate arrangements for recording the building before its demolition. ”</p> <p>Paragraph 7.4.20 should then include the following, additional point of clarification:</p> <p>“ Where consent is granted for demolition this will normally be conditional on prior agreement for the redevelopment of the site; prohibition of demolition until contracts have been signed for the approved redevelopment of the site; and,</p>	<p>Is this more onerous than originally stated?</p> <p>The suggested amendment to para 7.4.20 would arguably be more onerous than the penultimate paragraph of the policy itself & potentially go to the heart of it.</p>

“Errors and suggested minor modifications”

		where appropriate, the recording of the building prior to its demolition.	
BH2	No justification why Façade Retention not generally be permitted in conservations areas	Suggested rewording – Façade retention of a building makes a contribution... Page 458	The suggested re-wording arguably relaxes the requirements of policy & changes its emphasis.
Transportation			Need to clarify what plan BCC is referring to – Regional Strategic Transport Network Transport Plan 2015? Where is the additional text to be inserted?
ITU4			Although the proposed amendment mirrors the provisions of the SPPS, it is arguably extending the remit of the policy albeit that the issue subject of the proposed revision would be a material consideration in its own right regardless of policy.
ENV1			There are two paras 9.5.20 Is the suggested amendment is in line with the Water Framework Directive. If so, it is still extending the remit of the policy albeit that the issue subject of the proposed revision would be a material consideration.
ENV1			The suggested amendment is potentially changing the thrust of policy and watering it down.

“Errors and suggested minor modifications”

ENV3	Need to strengthen wording in line with the SPPS		Although mirroring the provisions of the SPPS, the proposed change is arguably widening the policy’s scope.
OS4	Different wording emphasis from SPPS in relation to ‘appropriate activities’ and ‘appropriate locations’	Change in word from new to appropriate (page 463)	Does this change the emphasis? What is meant by appropriate?
OS5	Policy needs to accord more with the SPPS		Although mirroring the provisions of the SPPS, the proposed change is introducing an exceptional test.
LC1	Omission of precautionary approach		The proposed amendment is arguably making the policy more onerous.
DC1	Aligned with the SPPS		Although mirroring the provisions of the SPPS, the proposed change is seemingly the policy more onerous.
DC10, DC11, DC12	6 year rule omitted in all 3 policies	Minimum 6 years now inserted (page 465)	Although mirroring the provisions of the SPPS, the proposed change is arguably making the policies more stringent.