

## Appendix 2

<b>Appendix 2</b>	<b>Energetic Placemaking</b>
<b>Development plan reference:</b>	<b>Supplementary Guidance</b>
<b>Body or person(s) submitting a representation raising the issue (including reference number):</b>	
<p>1 – Belhelvie Community Council  3 – Knight Frank on behalf of various landowners and developers  4 – Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH)  5 – Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)  6 – SITA UK  7 – Historic Scotland  8 – Planning Modernisation Group Executive (PMGE)  9 – Halliday Fraser Munro on behalf of ANM Group Ltd  10 – Halliday Fraser Munro on behalf of Harper &amp; Cochrane Ltd  11 – Baxter Design  12 – Grampian Police  14 – Royal Society of the Protect of Birds (RSPB)  15 – Transportation Strategy and Programmes, Aberdeen City Council  16 – Stewart Milne Homes  17 – Environmental Policy, Aberdeen City Council  18 – Aberdeen Airport Ltd  19 – NESTRANS  20 – Colin Tawse  21 – Kirkwood Homes  22 – [Bridge of Don] Community Council  23 – Walking-the-Talk  24 – Ryden  25 – Homes for Scotland  26 – Bruce and Partners on behalf of Ellon Business Initiatives</p>	
<b>Provision of the development plan to which the issue relates:</b>	<p>Aberdeen City Local Development Plan - Directions for Growth – Bridge of Don/Grandhome and Directions for Growth – Dyce, Bucksburn and Woodside.</p> <p>Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan Policy 1: Business Development and Supplementary Guidance LSD2: Layout, siting and design of new development.</p>
<b>Summary of the representation(s):</b>	
<b>Question 2: Do you agree with the proposed area of the Energetica Framework?</b>	
<p><b>3, 4, 9, 10, 18, 19, 22</b> Agree with proposed area of the framework, subject to clarification of what Energetica is.(16)</p> <p><b>11:</b> Does not agree with proposed area of the framework, suggesting it should include Fraserburgh.</p>	
<b>Question 3: It is proposed that the supplementary guidance will not apply to householder planning applications? Are there any other types of planning applications that the Supplementary Guidance should not apply to?</b>	
<p><b>3:</b> Suggests the Supplementary Guidance should not apply to [ a wide range of development types including] business, office, agricultural, industrial, residential, signage/advertisement, mixed use, education and community developments, as it would stifle development and make doing business more difficult due to added delays and costs.</p> <p><b>9 &amp; 10:</b> Suggests the Supplementary Guidance should not apply to Signage/Advertisement because if they apply they will add an unnecessary layer to guidance and advice.</p> <p><b>11:</b> Suggests the Supplementary Guidance should not apply to Agricultural and Residential</p>	

## Appendix 2

developments as they have no direct influence.

### **Question 4: Do the Energetica Placemaking Documents meet the aims and aspirations of both Local Authorities Proposed Local Development Plans?**

**9, 10, 11, 17 and 22:** Believe the documents meet the aims and aspirations of both local authorities LDPs, but the Energetica concept, which is portrayed through the guidance and advice is not referred to in the Local Development Plans (**9 & 10**).

**3:** Believes the documents do not meet the aims and objectives. The prescriptive nature of the documents will make sites uneconomic and unviable and will hold back development thus failing to meet the aims and objectives of both LDPs. In this regard **14** believes they are very weak especially with regards to environmental protection and biodiversity conservation.

### **Question 5: Out of the six criteria, which do you think are achievable and which are unachievable?**

**3, 17 & 22:** Believe all six criteria are achievable, but question their achievability in reality (**3**).

#### Criterion 1: Innovative and experimental design

**6 & 11:** Believe the criterion will be achievable, as long as the costs involved do not deter new economic generation (**6**).

**9 & 10:** Believe the criterion is unachievable as it will be difficult to assess in terms of planning applications for the development of land allocated in the LDP.

**12:** Suggests it is important to encourage a range of uses to ensure places are occupied both day and night.

**14:** Expresses concern that the underlying principles lack proper environmental credibility and suggests a much more explicit meaning on the concept of “environmental sustainability” is set out in the form of a major policy on biodiversity protection and enhancement. Suggests either amending criterion 1 or an additional criterion base on pursuing the highest levels of environmental sustainability.

#### Criterion 2: Exemplary energy performance

**6:** Believes the criterion is achievable as long as the costs involved do not deter employment development.

**9, 10 & 11:** Believes the criterion is unachievable and is a matter for building control. Any involvement in the planning system will add to unnecessary administration costs (**11**).

**12:** Notes that security and the “Secured by Design” award forms part of the security criteria of BREEAM (British Research Establishments Environmental Assessment Method).

#### Criterion 3: Future-proofing buildings for extension or conversion

**6, 9, 10 & 11:** Believes the criterion will be achievable through detailed planning applications (**9 & 10**) and as long as cost does not deter development (**6**).

**12:** Agrees that future proofing should be designed into all development where practical. Suggests an example of this would be placing ducting on buildings to enable CCTV cabling in the future.

#### Criterion 4: Creation of social hubs

**6, 9, 10 & 11:** Believe the criterion will be achievable through detailed planning applications (**9 & 10**) the criterion will be achievable and as long cost does not deter development (**6**).

## Appendix 2

**12:** Suggests that achieving a “secured by design” award will help to create safe and secure environments.

### Criterion 5: Open space requirements emphasis active lifestyles

**6, 9 & 10:** Believe the criterion will be achievable where relevant and appropriate to the development type (**6**) and through the use of detailed planning applications for small areas (**9 & 10**).

**11:** Believes the criterion is unachievable due to the maintenance costs involved in the upkeep of open spaces.

**12:** Suggests active lifestyles should be encouraged as this will ensure open space is used for legitimate purposes and should avoid “dead” spaces which will attract anti social behaviour.

**4:** Notes that although the Planning Advice relates to natural heritage they are disappointed that the criteria in the Supplementary Guidance do not require a contribution to natural heritage apart from landscape, and suggests an amendment to criterion 5 to make reference to biodiversity and the conservation and enhancement of habitats. Also notes that open space should be seen as an essential part of development infrastructure in order to attain the greatest benefits.

**23:** Suggests the criterion should include specific reference to an aspiration for sustainable transport.

### Criterion 6: Landscaping contributes to a unified sense of place

**11:** Believes the criterion is achievable.

**6:** Believes the criterion will be achievable if it is appropriate to the specific development and its local area.

**9 & 10:** Believe the criterion is potentially achievable through the use of detailed planning applications for small areas.

**4:** Concerned that a unified sense of place, as described in the criterion is not appropriate if it will mean some sort of homogeneity. Landscaping should instead reflect and enhance landscape character of the local area. Suggests an amendment to the text.

**12:** Suggests the use of soft landscaping can foster a feeling of safety and security.

### **Question 10: Other comments relating to the supplementary guidance**

#### Welcome/support

**5:** The guidance is of a high standard and the promotion of energy reduction and enhanced environmental performance is welcomed.

**7:** Notes that the supplementary guidance consolidates the proposed Aberdeenshire LDP, principally Policy 1 Business Development, which historic Scotland was consulted on and responded to. Therefore they have no further comments to make on the guidance.

**26:** Supports some of the aspects of the guidance particularly those that concern the creation of interesting places and streets and the encouragement of mixing residential and work addresses.

#### Delivering Energetica

**4:** Notes the success of Energetica is dependant on the commitment to deliver its vision and how it is delivered (i.e. through masterplans and design briefs). The three Placemaking

## Appendix 2

documents will guide and assess future planning applications within the area. However, without a more specific plan led process it will be difficult for developers and decision makers to achieve a coherent identity along the corridor. The suggested four zones from the Leisure and Lifestyle meeting in August this year could be used for masterplanning zones.

**16:** Greater clarity and transparency of how the concept will be delivered is required. Concerned that no realistic targets or delivery strategies are present within the documents and without these it is likely that Energetica will remain a concept for the foreseeable future.

**20:** Is aware of the concept but ignorant of any delivery mechanism. Suggests that in order to progress, Energetica must be built on a strong, commercial foundation. There is nothing that provides the developer or potential user with an incentive to actively participate in the project.

**4:** Suggest it is also important to consider the longer-term aspects of place-making and hence the post-construction aspects of Energetica. Suggests this can be done through the use of service agreements or Energy Service Companies.

### Local Development Plan

**9 & 10:** Suggests the concept has to be viewed within the context of the LDP allocations and policies. There is also concern as to how far the Energetica aspirations are likely to go.

**26:** Expresses concern about the detail contained in some of the documents and their relationship with the emerging policies contained in both councils LDPs.

**26:** Anyone building along the corridor will be expected to follow both sets of policies and advice and there will inevitably be conflict. If there is no conflict then one has to ask the point of having the dual set of documents.

### Impact on developers/users

**16, 20 & 26:** The guidance will increase building costs dramatically.

**16:** Suggests that the guidance as it is currently written is likely to deter rather than encourage parties.

**20 & 21:** Suggest little reflection has been made on the views received from developers nor does it fully reflect broad commercial views or enthuse and encourage development (**21**). Suggests that the reticence of farmers to sell their land has not been acknowledged thus demonstrating a detachment from potential Energetica partners (**20**).

**21:** There is no incentive for developers and landowners. Landowners will have to take a further hit on the "Energetica Gain" – on top of planning gain, affordable housing and the Strategic/Cumulative Transport Fund. This will not only restrict the amount of land coming forward but will also affect the viability of projects.

**21:** Suggests the wrong elements of "market failure" are being addressed.

**24:** There is little in the document to encourage investment.

### Energetica Compliance Statements

**4:** Suggests more specific guidance on type and level of information in the Energetica compliance statements is required, as they will form an important part of assessing applications. Suggests masterplans and design briefs play an important role in the formulation of Compliance Statements.

**26:** Concerned that an additional supporting statement and Design and Access Statements cause an additional burden. Whilst the burden does not seem high, the requirement to read and digest the supporting documentation and then make adjustments to plans in order to comply, will be an overhead that is not applied to development in other areas.

## Appendix 2

### Justification Text

**6:** Suggests the first paragraph of the justification text should be amended to make reference to the relationship between the Strategic Growth Areas and the Energetica area, and its aims to encourage development and diversification of the economy along the A90 corridor between Aberdeen and Peterhead.

**6:** Asks whether the Energetica project team will be pro-active in meeting with developers to discuss proposals and their fit with the Energetica concept?

**15:** Notes that the text continuously refers to “we” but does not state who “we” are. On further reading this appears to be both the councils. Suggests rephrasing the text to reflect that both councils will support development in the area if the appropriate policies/standards/ objectives are met/can be satisfactorily met.

### Bureaucracy

**8:** Notes that considerable efforts have been made in the production of the documents but the combination of additional documents makes for additional effort for stakeholders. Suggests the amalgamation of the documents to simplify the requirements for development.

**24:** Supports the concept, but has reservations regarding the approach. Suggests the process needs to be simplified and speeded up. Consideration should be given to preparing a short, concise, consolidated document setting out all the planning policies applicable to the Energetica Corridor.

**16, 21 & 24:** The guidance appears as another layer of policy, is broadly a replication of the policies set out in the two Council’s LDPs (16), is too long and once adopted it will artificially drive up design standards where they are not needed (**21**). Respondent **16** does not understand the reason why this further guidance is needed when the aspirations are already provided elsewhere.

**20:** Does not view them as good documents.

**26:** Concerned with anything that might add an additional burden on businesses working in the Ellon area.

**26:** Hopes that the Energetica SPG and PAN would not constrain much of the forward thinking design work carried out in the corridor for development allocation located in Ellon in the LDP.

### Other Comments

**1:** Contents are commendable but the document only explains the vision and does not mention specifics. Requests a presentation by a member of the Energetica Team to fully explain the impact of this project.

**12:** Suggests specific reference needs to be made to designing out crime.

**25:** Is unable to assist in consultation as no feedback has been received from the Grampian Housebuilders Committee.

### **Modifications sought by those submitting representations:**

#### **Question 2: Do you agree with the proposed area of the Energetica Framework?**

**11:** Amend the framework area to Fraserburgh.

**Question 3: It is proposed that the supplementary guidance will not apply to householder planning applications? Are there any other types of planning applications that the Supplementary Guidance should not apply to?**

## Appendix 2

**3:** The Supplementary Guidance should not apply to business, office, agricultural, industrial, residential, signage/advertisement, mixed use, education and community developments.

**9 & 10:** The Supplementary Guidance should not apply to Signage/Advertisement.

**11:** The Supplementary Guidance should not apply to Agriculture and Residential developments.

### **Question 4: Do the Energetica Placemaking Documents meet the aims and aspirations of both Local Authorities Proposed Local Development Plans?**

**9 & 10:** Reference needs to be made to the Energetica concept in both of the Councils' Local Development Plans.

### **Question 5: Out of the six criteria, which do you think are achievable and which are unachievable?**

#### Criterion 1

**12:** Amend criterion 1 to include a "through a range of mixes and uses..."

**14:** Expand criterion 1 or create a new criterion "...and, it is demonstrated that full account has been taken of potential adverse impacts on wildlife habitats, species and protected areas, particular those national priorities, and measures have been incorporated that not only protect them but enhance them, so increasing environmental sustainability and contributing to the quality of life."

#### Criterion 5

**4:** Amend criterion 5 to "It is demonstrated that open space forms part of an integrated network for people and nature, and is designed to be multi-functional to cater for all aspects of a community's life".

**23:** Include specific reference to an aspiration for sustainable transport within this point.

#### Criterion 6

**4:** Amend criterion 6 to "There is a commitment to the provision of appropriate and high quality landscape design which enhances the sense of place and landscape character within the framework area."

### **Question 10: Other comments relating to the supplementary guidance**

#### Delivering Energetica

**16 & 20:** Set out clear information on the delivery mechanism to accompany the Planning Advice that gives clear and realistic targets to enable development to be truly meaningful (**16**).

**4:** Add additional text on the need for masterplans and design briefs to translate Energetica's aspirations into developments for specific parts of the corridor.

**4:** Identify masterplanning zones based on the four zones from the Leisure and Lifestyle meeting in August this year.

#### Energetica Compliance Statements

**4:** Add text to provide specific guidance on the type and level of information required in the Energetica compliance statements, highlighting the use of masterplans and design briefs to play an important role in the formulation of Compliance Statements.

## Appendix 2

### Justification Text

**6:** Amend the first paragraph of the justification text to make reference to the relationship between the Strategic Growth Areas and the Energetica area.

**15:** Replace the words “we” with Aberdeen City Council and Aberdeenshire Council.

### Bureaucracy

**8, 24:** Amalgamate the three documents.

**24:** Prepare a short, concise, consolidated document setting out all the planning policies applicable to the Energetica Corridor.

**16, 21 & 24:** Delete the supplementary guidance and associated documents.

### Other Comments

**12:** Include in the supplementary guidance specific reference to designing out crime.

### **Summary of responses (including reasons) by Planning Authority:**

#### **Question 2: Do you agree with the proposed area of the Energetica Framework?**

The support for the proposed area of the Framework is welcomed. Clarification on what the Energetica Framework is provided in the first paragraph of the supplementary guidance, with further information provided in the Overview document. In light of this, no further change is required.

It is noted that one respondent requests that the Framework includes Fraserburgh. Although a port-town, its uses relate more to the fishing rather than to the energy sectors. The inclusion of Fraserburgh moves away from the energy anchors at Peterhead, Dyce and the Innovation Park

#### **Question 3: It is proposed that the supplementary guidance will not apply to householder planning applications? Are there any other types of planning applications that the Supplementary Guidance should not apply to?**

The Energetica framework is a placemaking document, which aims to improve the quality of life of people working and living in the area, to improve the local environment, and to develop and diversify the economy. This supplementary guidance is only one strand of a series of actions required to deliver the Energetica vision. To exclude, in effect, all types of development, as implied by one respondent, would result in the vision for Energetica not being achieved. The supplementary guidance is a design policy, which seeks to achieve the long term vision for the Energetica corridor and give it a distinct identity. Concerns about cost and delays are noted, but the guidance only requires developers to demonstrate consideration and adoption of the criteria within Energetica compliance statements. Adoption of the Energetica principles can be cost neutral, merely requiring a different approach to be taken to issues of urban design, or alternatively embrace the concepts to use as part of the marketing of the site.

It is agreed that the Supplementary Guidance should not apply to signage/advertisement and agriculture developments as they have no direct influence on the Energetica Framework. A proportionate approach to adoption of the guidance is proposed.

#### **Question 4: Do the Energetica Placemaking Documents meet the aims and aspirations of both Local Authorities Proposed Local Development Plans?**

It is very much welcomed that the majority of the respondents agree that the documents meet the aims and aspirations of both Aberdeen City and Aberdeenshire Local Development Plans. The Energetica framework is referred to in the Aberdeen City Local Development Plan in its Introduction and Direction of growth chapters. In the Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan,

## Appendix 2

it is referred to in Policy 1 *Business development*.

In relation to the concern that the documents are too prescriptive and will make developments uneconomic and unviable, this is addressed under the response to question 3 above in the first paragraph, fifth and sixth sentences. Furthermore, issues on developer finance could be discussed/resolved at the masterplanning/design stage prior to the submission of a planning application.

In relation to environmental protection and biodiversity conservation, other policies in the local development plans provide the necessary protection to habitats and species, which avoids the need to duplicate policy advice. However, to ensure this issue is not omitted, some more detail will be provided in the Planning Advice.

### **Question 5: Out of the six criteria, which do you think are achievable and which are unachievable?**

Welcomes the support given by the respondents who believe the proposed criteria are achievable. The application of these criteria would be achieved at the masterplan or planning application stage, and to ensure their use, the criteria would be applied on a proportionate scale (i.e. all criterions will apply where appropriate). Developer costs are unlikely to deter new development providing early consideration is given to factors affecting its design and layout, and as mentioned in question 4 above, applicants are only required to demonstrate compliance to the criteria.

In light of comments from Grampian Police, it is agreed that specific reference should be made in the Planning Advice to designing out crime. This could be included in the appropriate chapters of the advice or in a separate chapter.

#### Criterion 1: Innovative and experimental design

It is not agreed that the applications would be difficult to assess, as an Energetica compliance statement will be required to accompany a planning application.

It is agreed that criterion 1 should be amended to include a ranges of mixes and uses.

As mentioned above in question 4, the protection and enhancement of habitats and species are considered in other policies in the City and Shire local developments plans. However, further advice on 'environmental sustainability' could be added in the Planning Advice on this issue under the section titled '01.3 Green settlement pattern'.

#### Criterion 2: Exemplary energy performance

The current Building standards set out the requirement for new developments to achieve a Bronze active level as a means of reducing carbon dioxide emissions. The 'active' requirement falls within planning as the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 requires local development plans to include policies that require new developments to include zero or low carbon generating technologies within their proposal. Orientation and layout are key elements of the sustainability labelling system introduced by the Building control legislation. In light of this, it is completely appropriate to consider energy performance in the supplementary guidance.

However, further clarification could be provided in the planning advice to explain what is meant by "exemplary energy performance". may imply the active consideration of solar gain, orientation of development and/or increasing above the "minimum" standard the amount and type of on-site renewables. Furthermore, this could either be embracing renewable energy (or other) technologies across the whole site or providing one or more of these technologies on only part of the development. Compliance to these criteria would require to be demonstrated in an Energetica compliance statement.



## Appendix 2

### Criterion 5: Open space requirements emphasis active lifestyles

The maintenance costs involved in the upkeep of open spaces are applicable to all developments in Aberdeenshire. Furthermore, as previously mentioned, applicants are only required to demonstrate compliance with this criterion. In this instance, it is to emphasise the aspiration for active lifestyles within the corridor. If maintenance cost is an issue, this could be highlighted in the Energetica compliance statement as a means of justifying the type and/or scale of open space provision that is made.

The comments raised on enhancing biodiversity and sustainable transport are noted, but the purpose of the criterion is to promote 'active lifestyles', for example, woodland with paths through it to encourage running and cycling. It may be necessary for the Planning Advice to include further examples of this in section titled '01.3 Green settlement pattern'.

### Criterion 6: Landscaping contributes to a unified sense of place

The maintenance and enhancement of landscape character is already considered in the LDPs and supplementary guidance. The purpose of this criterion is to consider micro landscapes associated with 'Energetica' design themes and landscaping. In light of this, no change to the criterion is proposed. However, further examples on the themes of Energetica landscape designs (e.g. tree types and fence/wall design) could be included in the Planning Advice '01.1 A positive relationship with landscape'.

### **Question 10: Other comments relating to the supplementary guidance**

#### Welcome/support

Support for the document is welcomed.

#### Delivering Energetica, Relationship with the Local Development Plan and Impact on developers/users

The aim of the Energetica Framework is to create a technology lifestyle community with innovative transport links showcasing the most efficient low carbon technologies. It is an area-wide policy and will require to be met like any other policy where the proposal falls within the Energetica framework area. The Aberdeenshire Settlement Statements also identify which settlements are within the Framework area. However, at this early stage in the delivery of the Energetica Framework, developments within the corridor will only be required to demonstrate compliance with the six criteria in the supplementary guidance, unless exempt, and present this information in an Energetica compliance statement (as discussed in question 4 above). In light of this and given the purpose of the supplementary guidance, it is unlikely to conflict with other policies in the LDPs or result in dramatically increased costs for developers.

To assist in the delivery of Energetica, it is agreed that additional text should be included in the last paragraph of the justification text requiring masterplans and design briefs to translate Energetica's aspirations into new developments to ensure a coherent identity along the corridor. Therefore, a coherent identity along the corridor can be achieved through development proposals meeting the criteria in the supplementary guidance without the need for masterplanning zones within the Energetica corridor.

The use of service agreements or Energy Service Companies is a matter for the developers to promote as part of their response to the challenges the guidance sets.

Incentives available at present relate to the use of its branding and marketing potential providing long term advantages over other areas. Reference to an Energetica Charter could be included within the Planning Advice in conjunction with the Energetica compliance statements or in the Overview document.

#### Energetica Compliance Statements

It is agreed that further information on the information required in the Energetica compliance statements should be provided, this would be more appropriate in the Planning Advice

## Appendix 2

document. It is anticipated that these statements will be a concise document broadly setting out how the proposed development has demonstrated compliance with each criterion and justifying those decisions. The suggestion to include a reference (in the Planning Advice) on the role masterplans and design briefs play in the formulation of Compliance Statements is supported, as they will assist in identifying any issues such as cost and deliverability of each criterion.

### Justification Text

It is not agreed that additional text should be added to the document to set out the relationship between the Energetica corridor and the two Strategic Growth Areas (SGAs), as identified in the Structure Plan, as the SGAs are a land use allocation and Energetica Placemaking is a design tool and bears no resemblance to them.

There is no Energetica project team as such, but officers, primarily in both the Council's planning departments will be able to provide advice and meet with developers to facilitate development as they arise. Two of the key mechanisms for early engagement with the Councils are the pre-major application process and the requirement for some sites to have an agreed development framework, masterplan or design brief.

Due to the nature of the supplementary guidance falling within more than one local authority the term "we" was used. However, to avoid confusion and to be consistent with other supplementary guidance, the words "We recognise..." and "we expect..." should be replaced with "It is recognised..." and "it is expected..." in the third paragraph of the justification text. Also the first sentence of the fifth paragraph, which states "We have published planning advice separately..." should be amended accordingly.

In relation to the suggested rephrasing the justification text to support development that meets other policies and standards, the last sentence in the fourth paragraph already states development will be supported subject to other policies. Therefore no further change is required.

### Bureaucracy

The amalgamation of the three documents is not supported as each serve a different function. The only policy applicant's will have to conform to are the six criteria in the supplementary guidance. The Planning Advice is not policy and only provides examples of how each of the criteria in the supplementary guidance could be met, as other means to demonstrate compliance with the policy are also acceptable. The Overview document provides an executive summary of the Energetica Framework concept and introduces it more simply than in detailed policy or advice, in order to promote familiarity with the concept.

It would be impractical to set out all the policies that would be applicable within the Energetica corridor as no two planning applications are likely to be the same.

The aspirations of the Energetica concept are noted in the LDPs and supplementary guidance, but separate guidance is required to introduce the concept and set how developers should demonstrate compliance to it. This is not provided elsewhere in the LDP.

The Energetica Framework aims to encourage forward thinking design within the corridor rather than constrain it (see response in question 3, first paragraph). How the applicant justifies compliance should be set out in an Energetica compliance statement.

### Other Comments

The specifics of how developments meet the vision are contained within the supplementary guidance's six criteria, which are further explained in the Planning Advice. Although it is too late for the respondent to provide further comment of the documents, further information on the Energetica Framework could be provided at a meeting, if requested.

As discussed above, it is agreed that specific reference should be made to designing out

## Appendix 2

crime, but that this should be provided in planning advice.
<b>Any further plan changes commended by the Planning Authority:</b>
Amend criterion 1 to include “through a range of mixes and <u>uses</u> ...”
In the third paragraph of the justification text replace “We recognise” and “we expect” with “It is recognised...” and “it is expected...”.
In the first sentence of the fifth paragraph, replace “We have published planning advice separately...” with “Planning advice has been separately...”
After the second sentence in the final paragraph of the justification text, add a new sentence, “Where documents are subject to an agreed masterplan or other design document as defined in the Councils’ Supplementary Guidance on masterplanning, these should translate Energetica’s aspirations into layout and design of new developments to ensure a coherent identity along the corridor.”
In the last sentence on the justification change the wording after It does not apply to add - ‘householder planning applications, advertisement consent or planning applications of an agricultural nature’
<u>Planning Advice</u>
Further changes to the Planning Advice will have to be discussed with the technical consultant writing the Advice. However, suggested modifications are provided below.
Include examples of active lifestyles within open space under the section titled ‘01.3 Green settlement pattern’.
Include examples on the different types of potential themes of Energetica landscape designs (e.g. tree types and fence/wall design) in section ‘01.1 A positive relationship with landscape’.
Include specific reference to designing out crime, as per the comments raised under each criterion, either within the appropriate chapters of the advice or as a separate chapter.
Provide further information on the Energy Compliance Statements, using an example to demonstrate how the development meets the Energetica Framework based on what it has or is able to achieve (e.g. for criterion 2, the development meets the Bronze/Silver/Gold level and to achieve the ‘Active’ level it includes solar panels and a district heating scheme. The role of masterplans and design briefs play in the formulation of Compliance Statements could also be highlighted. This section could also include a paragraph on how developers could sign up to an Energetica Charter, with an explanation of what it is. Alternatively reference to the Energetica Charter and how developers could sign up to it could be included as a new paragraph in the Overview, under the heading titled ‘Approach’.
Provide further clarification on what is meant by “exemplary energy performance”. For example, it may imply the active consideration of solar gain, orientation of development and/or increasing above the “minimum” standard the amount and type of on-site renewables, which could apply to the whole site or only part of the development. Compliance to these criteria would require to be demonstrated in an Energetica compliance statement.
<b>Committees’ decision:</b>
<INSERT TEXT>
<b>Committees’ recommendations:</b>
<INSERT TEXT>