

Consultation Statement

Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) Supplementary Planning Document

February 2021



Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| 1 Introduction | 3 |
| 2. Preparation of the Draft Document..... | 4 |
| 3. Public Consultation | 4 |
| Appendix 1: Consultation Bodies | 6 |
| Appendix 2: RAMS Working Group members | 7 |
| Appendix 3: Consultation Poster and Twitter Post..... | 8 |
| Appendix 4: Responses to the Draft RAMS Supplementary Planning Document | 10 |

1 Introduction

1. New residential growth brings new residents to the local area, and if those residents use protected Habitat sites for recreation, this then increases the pressure on those Habitat Sites. Assessing, avoiding, and managing recreation pressure is therefore an important part of planning for growth. To address this, East Suffolk Council, Ipswich Borough Council, Mid Suffolk District Council and Babergh District Council commissioned a Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS)¹. This strategy set out a tariff based approach to mitigating the impact of recreational disturbance on Habitat Sites resulting from increased housing development across the Local Authority areas.
2. The Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy Supplementary Planning Document (RAMS SPD), summarises the requirements of Suffolk Coast RAMS, including the per-dwelling tariff, and provides a framework for implementing those provisions. The Supplementary Planning Document also includes information for developers and applicants to assist them in meeting the other requirements under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the Habitats Regulations)².
3. The RAMS SPD has been produced in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended). The SPD provides information to support the implementation of policies set out in the Councils' Local Plans, and once adopted will become a material planning consideration in the development management process.
4. The Council's approach to engagement in the preparation of a Supplementary Planning Document is set out in the Statement of Community Involvement³. While preparing the RAMS SPD East Suffolk Council has consulted with relevant organisations and members of the public. Details of this consultation process are set out below.

¹<https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Section-106/Habitat-mitigation/Suffolk-HRA-RAMS-Strategy.pdf>

² www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2017/1012/pdfs/ukxi_20171012_en.pdf

³ <https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy-and-local-plans/local-plans/statement-of-community-involvement-and-local-development-scheme/>

2. Preparation of the Draft Document

5. To reflect the approach taken by the wider RAMs project, the RAMS SPD was drafted in collaboration with the other Local Planning Authorities within the RAMS partnership (Ipswich Borough Council, Babergh District Council and Mid Suffolk District Council) although adoption of individual SPDs is being progressed separately. Ipswich Borough Council have adopted their SPD⁴, and Babergh District Council and Mid Suffolk District Council are proceeding with the implementation of RAMS without a Supplementary Planning Document, until such time as the new joint Local Plan for Babergh and Mid Suffolk is in place.
6. The approach to the implementation of the RAM Strategy, and therefore the content of the RAMS SPD, has been informed by early engagement with key local stakeholder through the RAMS Working Group. A workshop meeting of the RAMS working group was held in December 2019. A list of organisations involved in the RAMS working group is included in Appendix 2.
7. Within East Suffolk, the Planning Policy and Delivery Team worked in collaboration with the following groups and teams within the Council as part of the preparation of the RAMS SPD:
 - East Suffolk Council Development Management Team
 - East Suffolk Council Major Sites and Infrastructure Team
 - East Suffolk Council Local Plan Working Group

3. Public Consultation

8. Following the production of the Draft RAMS SPD, a seven-week public consultation took place between **19th October** and the **7th December 2020**. The draft RAMS SPD was published at the same time as consultations on the draft Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and the emerging Cycling and Walking Strategy. The RAMS SPD consultation was advertised alongside the SCI using posters, a press release and social media posts. The poster and an example Twitter post that accompanied these consultations can be found in Appendix 3. Those on the Council's planning policy consultation database were contacted directly by email or letter and the list of consultation bodies can be found in Appendix 1.

⁴ <https://www.ipswich.gov.uk/content/suffolk-coast-rams-supplementary-planning-document-spd>

9. The consultation documents were made available on the East Suffolk Council website at:

<https://eastsuffolk.inconsult.uk/consult.ti/DraftRAMSSPD2020/consultationHome>

10. Comments on the draft RAMS SPD could be made directly through the Council's website. Comments were also accepted via email and letter. A summary of the comments received and the Council's response are set out in Appendix 4.
11. Due to the social distancing restrictions and the national lockdown as the result of the Covid-19 pandemic, libraries and other public spaces were not accessible during the consultation period. Therefore, paper copies of documents could not be made available at these locations. Physical copies of documents were, however, sent out on request.
12. A total of 28 individuals and organisations responded to the consultation, making 44 individual comments.
13. Full copies of the consultation responses have been published on the Council's website at:
<https://eastsuffolk.inconsult.uk/consult.ti/DraftRAMSSPD2020/consultationHome>

Appendix 1: Consultation Bodies

Specific consultation bodies

The Coal Authority
 Environment Agency
 Historic England
 Marine Management Organisation
 Natural England
 Network Rail
 Highways Agency
 Suffolk County Council
 Parish and Town Councils within and adjoining the East Suffolk District
 Suffolk Constabulary
 Adjoining local planning authorities – Ipswich Borough Council, Babergh District Council, Mid Suffolk District Council, South Norfolk District Council, Great Yarmouth Borough Council and the Broads Authority
 NHS England and the Care Commissioning Groups
 Anglian Water
 Essex and Suffolk Water
 Homes England
 Electronic communication companies who own or control apparatus in the District
 Relevant gas and electricity companies

General consultation bodies

Voluntary bodies some or all of whose activities benefit any part of the District
 Bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the District
 Bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the District
 Bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the District
 Bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the District

Other individuals and organisations

Includes local businesses, high schools, individuals, local organisations and groups, planning agents, developers, landowners, residents and others on the Local Plan mailing list.

Appendix 2: RAMS Working Group members

- Babergh Mid Suffolk Councils
- East Suffolk Council
- Ipswich Borough Council
- ABP (Associated British Ports) Ipswich Docks
- Alde-ore Partnership
- Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB Unit
- Blyth Estuary Partnership
- Coastal Partnership East
- Deben Estuary Partnership
- Environment Agency
- Felixstowe Forward
- Port of Felixstowe
- Forestry England
- Greenways
- Harwich Haven Authority
- Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authorities
- Marine Management Organisation
- National Trust
- Natural England
- Norse
- RSPB
- Suffolk Biodiversity Information Service
- Shotley Open Spaces
- Suffolk County Council
- Suffolk Wildlife Trust
- Suffolk Yacht Harbour

Appendix 3: Consultation Poster and Twitter Post



Consultation period
19 October to 07 December 2020

HOW DO YOU WANT TO ENGAGE WITH LOCAL PLANNING?

Local planning identifies sites for new housing and employment and sets out policies to shape future development.

What are we doing?

We would like to hear your views on how we can better engage you in the planning process.

We have prepared a draft Statement of Community Involvement which sets out how we could engage with the community as we create planning documents and determine planning applications.

How can you get involved?

COMPLETE A QUESTIONNAIRE
Help us by answering seven key questions about how you think we should involve the community in planning.

COMMENT ON THE DOCUMENT
The draft 'Statement of Community Involvement' sets out our proposals for community engagement in the planning process. Let us know your thoughts on this draft.

Find out more and give your views:
www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/planningpolicy

Alternatively, please send comments to:
East Suffolk Council, Planning Policy & Delivery Team, Riverside, 4 Canning Road, Lowestoft, Suffolk NR33 0EQ

✉ planningpolicy@eastsuffolk.gov.uk
☎ 01394 444557 / 01502 523029

Other consultations

We are also seeking views on a new Supplementary Planning Document mitigating the impact of new housing development on protected habitat sites. Visit www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/planningpolicy to find out more and give your views.



The image shows a screenshot of a Twitter post. At the top left is a circular profile picture for 'East Suffolk Council Planning' featuring a landscape with a blue sky and green fields. To the right of the profile picture is the name 'East Suffolk Council Planning' and the handle '@eastsuffolkplan'. Below this is the main text of the tweet, which is a consultation notice. At the bottom of the tweet area, there is a timestamp '15:52 · 16/11/2020' and the text 'Twitter Web App'. Below the tweet text are four icons: a speech bubble, a retweet symbol, a heart, and a share symbol. At the very bottom of the screenshot is a light blue rounded rectangular button with the text 'Tweet your reply'.

East Suffolk Council Planning
@eastsuffolkplan

The consultation for the Suffolk Coast Recreation Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy Supplementary Planning Document is underway. Only 3 weeks remain to submit comments before the deadline on Monday 7th December 2020. eastsuffolk.inconsult.uk/consult.ti/Dra...

15:52 · 16/11/2020 · Twitter Web App

Tweet your reply

Appendix 4: Responses to the Draft RAMS Supplementary Planning Document

| Name/ Organisation | Comment ID/ Ref | Type of response | Comment Summary | Council Response | Action |
|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--|--|--------|
| John Milne | 1 | Observation | Tariff seems very low to compensate for such significant damage. | <p>The tariff set out in the SPD is taken from the RAMS Strategy where the approach is fully evidence. The tariff is based on a comprehensive assessment of housing delivery, the impacts of that development and the cost of mitigation measures. Full details are set out here:</p> <p>https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Section-106/Habitat-mitigation/Suffolk-HRA-RAMS-Strategy.pdf It is not considered necessary to repeat this level of detail in the SPD.</p> | None. |
| Michelle Golding | 2 | Observation | Why does Zone A avoid Beccles quay? | <p>The RAMS zones detailed in the SPD are taken from the RAMS Strategy where the approach is fully evidence.</p> <p>Zones of influence were established in response to evidence to provide an indication of the geographical extent to which recreation pressure may be relevant for each Habitat site, i.e.</p> | None. |

| | | | | | |
|----------------|---|-------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p>the geographical zone around each Habitat site, within which new housing may pose a risk in terms of additional recreation pressure.</p> <p>Full details are set out here: https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Section-106/Habitat-mitigation/Suffolk-HRA-RAMS-Strategy.pdf</p> | |
| Karrie Langdon | 3 | Observation | <p>When reviewing the impact on the environment the overall effect should reflect the impact on the whole area to ensure the habitats are not fragmented. Natural corridors for wildlife are an essential part to maintain a healthy eco-system.</p> | Noted. | None. |
| Sally Batten | 4 | Objection | <p>I would like to see a much more generous amount of land allocated to SANGS per development.</p> | <p>A number of site allocations within the Local Plans include a requirement to deliver SANG. Where green infrastructure requirements are identified through the development management process, the Council will apply Natural England's advice which is set out in annex 1 of the Habitat Regulation Assessment Record template:</p> | <p>Link added at paragraph 14 to HRA record and associated Natural England advice.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|-------------|--|---|--|
| | | | | <p>Suffolk-Coast-RAMS-HRA-Record.pdf (eastsuffolk.gov.uk)</p> <p>As set out in the SPD this would need to be assessed through a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) and the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with Natural England, will advise on these cases.</p> | |
| Ubbeston Parish Council | 5 | | <p>Ubbeston Parish Council are aware that housing developments need to happen, but not at the expense of our local habitat and area. Various developments have recently happened in small villages that has caused noise pollution during the year, in what should be a very peaceful area. Council feels that noise assessments need to be looked at in depth not to spoil the tranquility of the area.</p> | <p>Noted, but not relevant to SPD.</p> | <p>None.</p> |
| Norfolk County Council | 6 | Observation | <p>1) It should be made clear how new camping and caravan sites will fit into the strategy as they also contribute to increased recreational impacts but are not covered in the document;</p> | <p>1) The SPD is clear that the RAMS tariff does apply to new tourist accommodation and applicants are advised to contact the Council to discuss if necessary. Mitigation requirements may need to be</p> | <p>Link added at paragraph 14 to HRA record and associated Natural England advice.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>2) Development sites should provide facilities for on-site recreation (for example, for the morning and evening dog walk) for multiple user groups.</p> <p>3) It is recommended that East Suffolk provide guidance (draft template) as to the content of any Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA) as there can be wide variability in quality/validity of evidence provided by applicants.</p> | <p>identified through a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA).</p> <p>2) Where green infrastructure requirements are identified, the Council will apply Natural England’s advice which is set out in annex 1 of the Habitat Regulation Assessment Record template: Suffolk-Coast-RAMS-HRA-Record.pdf (east.suffolk.gov.uk) As set out in the SPD, this would need to be assessed through a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA).</p> <p>3) The Council has produced a Habitat Regulation Assessment Record template: Suffolk-Coast-RAMS-HRA-Record.pdf (east.suffolk.gov.uk) This does not form part of the SPD to allow it be updated to reflect current best practice as needed. However, agree that including a link to the HRA record template would be useful.</p> | |
| Levington & Stratton Hall Parish Council | 7 | Objection | Although there is reference to a tariff-based application to housing developments within a | The RAMS zones detailed in the SPD are taken from the RAMS Strategy where the approach is | Link added at paragraph 14 to HRA record and |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | | <p>Zone of Influence of 13km, should this be more like 20km.</p> <p>It is essential that alternatives to crowding protected sites are provided, such as Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space [SANGS] and other suggested alternatives. Without additional residential developments, the area is already well visited and any detrimental impact should be mitigated by ensuring there is no additional car parking in the area and narrow rural lanes are retained and protected.</p> | <p>fully evidence. Zones of influence were established in response to evidence to provide an indication of the geographical extent to which recreation pressure may be relevant for each Habitat site, i.e. the geographical zone around each Habitat site, within which new housing may pose a risk in terms of additional recreation pressure. Full details are set out here: https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Section-106/Habitat-mitigation/Suffolk-HRA-RAMS-Strategy.pdf</p> <p>A number of site allocations within the Local Plans include a requirement to deliver SANG. Where green infrastructure requirements are identified through the development management process, the Council will apply Natural England’s advice which is set out in annex 1 of the Habitat Regulation Assessment Record template: Suffolk-Coast-RAMS-HRA-Record.pdf (eastsuffolk.gov.uk)</p> | <p>associated Natural England advice.</p> |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|-----------|---|--|-------|
| | | | | As set out in the SPD this would need to be assessed through a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) and the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with Natural England, will advise on these cases. | |
| Woodbridge Town Council | 8 | Objection | The RAMS report indicates that in many places the boundary between the two zones is an arbitrary one, and not one based on data. Woodbridge Town Council would like the boundary of the northern zone to reach down to the Deben estuary to more properly reflect the impact on the areas in the northern zone. | The RAMS zones detailed in the SPD are taken from the RAMS Strategy where the approach is fully evidence. Zones of influence were established in response to evidence to provide an indication of the geographical extent to which recreation pressure may be relevant for each Habitat site, i.e. the geographical zone around each Habitat site, within which new housing may pose a risk in terms of additional recreation pressure. Full details are set out here: https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Section-106/Habitat-mitigation/Suffolk-HRA-RAMS-Strategy.pdf However, for the purposes of implementation, it is necessary to define a simple and pragmatic | None. |

| | | | | | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|--|-------|
| | | | | approach which can be applied without unnecessary complications for administration and therefore, in places, the zone boundaries have been adjusted. | |
| Karrie Langdon | 9 | Objection | As the council has declared an environment emergency and the pressing need to support biodiversity within residential areas and funding actions to increase biodiversity, then new housing developments must include designs to promote these values. If a housing development will pay this tariff to mitigate the impact on a habitat. The development should be required to add to the biodiversity of the area to promote wildlife. For example to plant more hedges rather than putting up a fence. The hedge must be supporting of local endangered species of moths and butterflies. The gardens should be landscaped with plants that support insects and wildlife. If there are specific species that can be supported then the plants to be used within the landscape should be | The purpose of the RAMS strategy and SPD is to provide a strategic mitigation scheme to address the impacts of increased recreational disturbance at Habitat Sites arising as the result of new residential development. The Local Plans include policy requirements relating to broader biodiversity measures (see Policy SCLP10.1 of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan and Policy WLP8.34 of the Waveney Local Plan). | None. |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----|-------------------------|--|---|-------|
| | | | stipulated as part of the development. | | |
| Boyton Parish Council | 10 | Support/ Observation | We support a system of mitigation funding to address small-scale, cumulative recreational impacts on sensitive areas, induced by new home development. This is a pragmatic approach, with lower transaction costs than full impact assessment. The proposed tariffs do not, however, appear sufficiently high to counter potential impacts, given that the tariffs appear to be one-off payments yet the impacts will recur year-on-year (thus effectively in perpetuity). | Support noted. The tariff set out in the SPD is taken from the RAMS Strategy where the approach is fully evidence. The tariff is based on a comprehensive assessment of housing delivery, the impacts of that development and the cost of mitigation measures. Where appropriate, the ongoing costs of mitigation measures are taken into account as part of the tariff calculation (up to 15 years of funding). Full details are set out here (see table 6): https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Section-106/Habitat-mitigation/Suffolk-HRA-RAMS-Strategy.pdf It is not considered necessary to repeat this level of detail in the SPD. | None. |
| Boyton Parish Council | 11 | Objection | We do not support the proposed system applying to all new homes within a 13km boundary. New homes very near to sensitive areas (e.g., within 5km) may have genuinely significant impacts which will continue to need | The zones of influence were established in response to evidence to provide an indication of the geographical extent to which recreation pressure may be relevant for each Habitat site, i.e. the geographical zone around | None. |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>specific consideration of appropriate mitigation and appropriate funding to support that mitigation (which is likely in many cases to be considerably more than the small-scale tariffs suggested here).</p> | <p>each Habitat site, within which new housing may pose a risk in terms of additional recreation pressure.</p> <p>The approach, as set out in the SPD, does take into account that some development, by virtue of its proximity to a Habitat site, may require additional mitigation measures beyond the RAMS contribution. This would need to be assessed through a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) (including Appropriate Assessment). Where appropriate, the ongoing costs of some mitigation measures are taken into account as part of the tariff calculation (up to 15 years of funding). Full details are set out here (see table 6):</p> <p>https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Section-106/Habitat-mitigation/Suffolk-HRA-RAMS-Strategy.pdf It is not considered necessary to repeat this level of detail in the SPD.</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------|----|-------------|--|---|-------|
| Westerfield Parish Council | 12 | Support | Westerfield Parish Council support the policies of the District Council in protecting habitats and consider that this Supplementary Planning Document should be adopted. | Support noted. | None. |
| Martlesham Parish Council | 13 | Objection | Is the Ramsar site on the Deben in Zone A or B? It seems to fit both definitions and the map at App 2 shows it in Zone B. | As shown on the map in Appendix 2 of the SPD, the Deben sites fall within tariff Zone B. However, the wording in the SPD reflects the fact that zone of influence specific to the Deben does extend into Zone A. Further detail on how the Zones of Influence have been established is set out in section 6 of the Strategy (https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Section-106/Habitat-mitigation/Suffolk-HRA-RAMS-Strategy.pdf) | None. |
| Martlesham Parish Council | 14 | Observation | How would the measures be financed and maintained over time, especially ongoing services such as wardens? | Where appropriate, the ongoing costs of mitigation measures (including wardens) are taken into account as part of the tariff calculation (up to 15 years of funding). Full details are set out here (see table 6): https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/a | None. |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|-------------|--|--|-------|
| | | | | 106/Habitat-mitigation/Suffolk-HRA-RAMS-Strategy.pdf | |
| Cllr Rachel Smith-Lyte, East Suffolk Council | 15 | Observation | All of these sites and wonderful species are already at risk from recreational disturbance and no amount of money paid to the Council can mitigate for their loss. We need better public information and better enforcement to actually stop this behaviour. | A key measure within the strategy is the funding of a small, mobile team of wardens to provide an on-site presence, talk to visitors, and influence visitor behaviour. Further detail on the role of wardens can be found in Section 8 of the Strategy: https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Section-106/Habitat-mitigation/Suffolk-HRA-RAMS-Strategy.pdf As the SPD is focused on the mechanisms for the collection of the tariff, is not considered necessary to repeat this level of detail in the SPD. | None. |
| Cllr Rachel Smith-Lyte, East Suffolk Council | 16 | Observation | Section 106's offer little protection from those sites being developed later on - they can be overturned after a period of time and development takes place anyway. | Habitat sites are protected from development under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). | None. |
| Cllr Rachel Smith-Lyte, East Suffolk Council | 17 | Objection | These sites and species stand to be decimated if Sizewell C and/or 'Freeport' at Felixstowe and Harwich gets the go ahead. Ergo the very thing/reason that people | The purpose of the RAMS strategy and SPD is to mitigate for the impact of increased recreational disturbance arising as the result of new residential | None. |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|-------------|---|---|-------|
| | | | want to live here will be no more, the golden goose killed. Once the habitats are gone so would the wildlife be. | development. It does not seek to address impacts arising from other development such as major infrastructure projects. Development outside the remit of RAMS will need to address any likely significant effects through bespoke mitigation measures. | |
| Cllr Rachel Smith-Lyte, East Suffolk Council | 18 | Objection | We don't need ALL the new housing we're being told we have to take. Our council should be pushing back harder to Westminster etc. on this and the onus should be on them to justify the need, not the other way around. We need to join the dots better and complain, loudly! Our fragile and precious coast and heaths and associated species need us. | The purpose of the RAMS strategy and SPD is to provide a strategic mitigation scheme to address the impact of increased recreational disturbance at Habitat sites arising as the result of new residential development. The SPD cannot be used to challenge housing figures which are established through the Local Plan process. | None. |
| Joanna Barfield | 19 | Observation | The existence of these internationally recognised sites in Suffolk underlines the problem of over-development for housing. | Comment noted. | None. |
| Beccles Town Council | 20 | Observation | Could the boundary be extended to include Beccles, particularly as the town has close links with those areas of the protected habit sites as they are on our doorstep to visit. | The RAMS zones detailed in the SPD are taken from the RAMS Strategy where the approach is fully evidence. Zones of influence were established in response to evidence to provide an indication | None |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------|----|-----------|---|---|-------|
| | | | | <p>of the geographical extent to which recreation pressure may be relevant for each Habitat site, i.e. the geographical zone around each Habitat site, within which new housing may pose a risk in terms of additional recreation pressure. Full details are set out here: https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Section-106/Habitat-mitigation/Suffolk-HRA-RAMS-Strategy.pdf Any change to zone boundaries would need to be informed by a review of the evidence underpinning the Strategy.</p> | |
| Bourne Leisure Ltd | 21 | Objection | <p>We question the principle of simply cross applying the tariff to tourist accommodation– this should not be a ‘one-size-fits-all’ strategy and needs to acknowledge that a more nuanced, proportionate approach is required to ensure a reasonable share of the mitigation cost if impacts on European wildlife sites are likely.</p> | <p>The SPD is clear that RAMS tariff does apply to new tourist accommodation and applicants are advised to contact the Council to discuss the relevance of the RAMS to their proposed development. Mitigation requirements may need to be identified through a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) and this is set out in the SPD.</p> | None. |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>The 13km zone of influence around each of the European wildlife seems 'generous', particularly when compared to the examples of other zones of influence applied at other European sites by local authorities elsewhere,</p> <p>The zone north of the River Blyth is even larger than 13km; this is justified in the Technical Paper on the basis of needing to address movements of Little Terns along the coast outside the European sites. This represents a deviation from the strategy applied to the other locations in the Technical Paper where the focus is on the designated European sites, not the activities of individual species beyond these sites. This will have a compound effect on tourist accommodation sites north of Lowestoft.</p> <p>Any tariff required to mitigate the impacts of new tourist accommodation should fairly and reasonably relate to the</p> | <p>The RAMS zones detailed in the SPD are taken from the RAMS Strategy where the approach is fully evidence. Zones of influence were established in response to evidence to provide an indication of the geographical extent to which recreation pressure may be relevant for each Habitat site, i.e. the geographical zone around each Habitat site, within which new housing may pose a risk in terms of additional recreation pressure. Full details are set out here: https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Section-106/Habitat-mitigation/Suffolk-HRA-RAMS-Strategy.pdf</p> <p>As detailed in the strategy, north of the River Blyth, the key concern from recreation pressure is Little Terns. Evidence has shown that these are mobile along the coast, nesting directly on the beaches and have nested at locations such as Kessingland that are outside the Habitat sites. It is therefore appropriate to</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|------------------|----|-----------|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>accommodation type and usage proposed and thus should be pro-rata that of the residential rate. Where it can be demonstrated by evidence included with planning applications that any net additional tourist accommodation will not result in additional recreational visits to protected European Sites, a RAMS payment should not be required if the Council accepts the evidence.</p> | <p>respond to this evidence by extending the zone along the coast to encompass the whole northern part of Waveney District. This makes a pragmatic and logical boundary around Lowestoft. This also provides a zone of influence up to the northern boundary of Suffolk, where the Norfolk strategic mitigation commences for Great Yarmouth Borough.</p> | |
| Broads Authority | 22 | Objection | <p>Paragraph underneath the table – are additional measures required as well as the tariff? It is not clear as written.</p> | <p>This wording highlights that some development may require additional mitigation measures in addition to payment of the tariff. It would not be possible, or appropriate, to define all the circumstances in which this might be necessary within the SPD.</p> <p>Some guidance is included in the advice from Natural England which is set out in annex 1 of the Habitat Regulation Assessment Record template: Suffolk-Coast-RAMS-HRA-Record.pdf (eastsuffolk.gov.uk) Agree to add a link to this advice to paragraph 14 of the SPD.</p> | <p>Link added at paragraph 14 to HRA record and associated Natural England advice.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------|--------------------|---|---|--|
| <p>Broads Authority</p> | <p>23</p> | <p>Observation</p> | <p>Regarding extensions and annexes not being charged the tariff, if more people will be inhabiting a changed dwelling, why does this not count? It seems that the tariff relates to dwellings and not people. Why is that?</p> <p>What about residential moorings and gypsy and traveller sites? Do they pay the tariff?</p> | <p>The tariff has been calculated on the basis of a net increase in dwellings and this approach is detailed in the Strategy https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Section-106/Habitat-mitigation/Suffolk-HRA-RAMS-Strategy.pdf</p> <p>Annexes and extension are not included as they do not constitute a net increase in dwellings.</p> <p>As set out in the SPD, other uses that might result in increased recreational pressure on Habitat sites, will need to be assessed through a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) and the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with Natural England, will advise on these cases.</p> | |
| <p>Broads Authority</p> | <p>24</p> | <p>Observation</p> | <p>What about permission in principle? That may become more of a prominent way of gaining permission if the Changes to the Current Planning System consultation ideas are taken forward.</p> | <p>Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017) (as amended) requires that the council, as a competent authority, must undertake an Appropriate Assessment before giving any</p> | <p>Amend paragraph 26, section 3.2 to read: "...The Suffolk Coast RAMS tariff applies to all full applications,</p> |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|----|-------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | <p>consent, permission or other authorisation for a plan or project which is likely to have a significant effect on a Habitat site. Therefore, the measures in the SPD will apply equally to a permission in principle application as it would a standard application.</p> <p>Agree to add refence into section 3.2 of the SPD to clarify that permission in principle applications are RAMS liable.</p> | <p>outline applications, permitted development, <u>permission in principle</u>, variation of condition applications and reserved matters applications...”</p> |
| Broads Authority | 25 | Objection | <p>What is the strategy document referred to? It is not clear.</p> | <p>Agree, references to the Strategy to made clearer.</p> | <p>Links to RAMS strategy added to paragraph 4 and paragraph 38.</p> |
| Felixstowe Town Council | 26 | Observation | <p>The SPD should provide a quick reference to the main delivery elements of the Strategy that developers and decision makers need to have regard for within development proposals and determinations. Such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is RAMS? • How is it calculated? • Who pays and how much, and when? • Who holds the funding and how is this governed? | <p>Alongside the Strategy and SPD, the Council produced a list of answers to frequently asked questions and this is available on the Council’s website at: https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Section-106/Habitat-mitigation/Suffolk-Coast-Recreational-Disturbance-Avoidance-Mitigation-Strategy-FAQ.pdf</p> | <p>None.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----|-----------|--|---|-------|
| | | | | These do not form part of SPD in order that they can be updated in response to any issues arising. | |
| Gladman Developments Ltd | 27 | Objection | <p>Should sites provide mitigation through other means (i.e. SANG) we would query whether the measures proposed would lead to 'double dipping' for essentially the same form of green infrastructure. The CIL regulations seek to avoid 'double dipping'</p> <p>Flexibility should be provided to ensure sustainable development opportunities are delivered without pressure from development viability. This may include the phasing of payments/ infrastructure alignment with the delivery of housing on a site rather than requiring upfront payment.</p> <p>The SPD should cross reference to viability. Specifically, the Council should not seek to jeopardise housing delivery and seek to negotiate an appropriate level of financial contribution that can reasonably be provided without</p> | <p>As set out in section 3.6 of the SPD under the Habitats Regulations, a development which is assessed as having a likely significant effect on the integrity of a Habitat site, either alone or in-combination must provide mitigation or otherwise must satisfy the tests of demonstrating 'no alternatives' and 'reasons of overriding public interest'. The SPD is clear that payment of the RAMS tariff is one option for providing that mitigation. The alternative would be for the developer to gather their own evidence for a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) and then to secure the necessary bespoke mitigation measures for delivery in perpetuity.</p> <p>The SPD sets out a number of options for securing the RAMS tariff. Upfront payment is not the only option.</p> | None. |

| | | | | | |
|------------------------|----|-------------|--|---|---|
| | | | having adverse effects on development viability. | As the competent authority, the Council must ensure that mitigation is secured where likely significant effects have been identified. The cost of the RAMS tariff was taken into account when considering the 'whole plan viability' of the Local Plans. | |
| Jenny Sheahan | 28 | Objection | I have no comments on this document other than to say that I found it too obtuse and unclear what 'wildlife assets' were in real terms; one or two examples of Special Areas of Conservation in East Suffolk should have been cited at the top of the doc to make it more relevant to residents who may wish to respond. | Comments noted. This is technical document dealing with the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and therefore does contain a certain amount of technical language. Agree to add some additional wording to the introduction section in order to further explain the impact of recreational pressure on wildlife. | Additional wording added to introduction at paragraph 3 to further explain the impact of recreational pressure on wildlife. |
| Lowestoft Town Council | 29 | Observation | The Town Council strongly feels that no housing should be permitted on protected habitat sites or in the vicinity if the development would have a negative impact on the protected site. The Town Council is keen that the current regulations are not diluted in favour of housing | Comments noted. The purpose of the RAMS strategy and SPD is to provide a strategic mitigation scheme to address the impact of increased recreational disturbance on Habitat Sites arising as the result of new residential development. | None. |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|----|-------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | delivery numbers and wherever possible all green spaces not just protected habitats should be preserved and not developed. | | |
| Natural England | 30 | Support/ Observation | <p>Natural England is pleased to offer our endorsement of the Suffolk Coast RAMS SPD.</p> <p>More detail within the introduction on the impact of recreational pressure on wildlife, including why and how it occurs, would be useful.</p> <p>Within section 2.2, a reference and/or link to the RAMS report should be included.</p> <p>We are pleased to note the detailing of the importance of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) and other green infrastructure measures within section 2.4 as a means of minimising predicted increases in recreational pressure on European sites, by containing the majority of daily recreational use within or around the development site's boundary. We</p> | <p>Support noted.</p> <p>The introduction to the SPD does outline the impact of recreational pressure but agree that this could be expanded.</p> <p>Agree that a link to the Strategy should be included as part of the Introduction and at section 3.7.</p> <p>Comments noted re. development of a GI strategy. The Council are planning on developing a GI strategy for the whole of the district in due course.</p> <p>Agree to amend paragraph 22, section 3, to clarify the requirements in relation to HRA.</p> <p>Agree to amend paragraph 35, section 3.6 to clarify wording.</p> | <p>Additional wording added to introduction to further explain the impact of recreational pressure on wildlife.</p> <p>Links to RAMS strategy added to paragraph 4 and paragraph 38.</p> <p>Paragraph 22, section 3, amended to read: "...Habitat Regulations Assessments (HRAs) but undertaking an HRA this does not negate the need to pay the RAMS tariff."</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>have also become aware throughout the interim period that developments within built up or more densely populated areas may not always be able to provide the recommended open space measures on site, often due to site constraints. We would therefore suggest where this is the case, that planning authorities integrate the need for such avoidance measures through strategic plans where possible, such as relevant Green Infrastructure Strategies, to allow for strategic provision of GI as an avoidance mitigation measure.</p> <p>Section 3. states “Project level Habitat Regulations Assessments (HRAs) (including Appropriate Assessments) will still be required. The Suffolk Coast RAMS streamlines these Habitat Regulations Assessments (HRAs) but this does not negate the need to pay the RAMS tariff.” This final sentence may be slightly unclear, should the sentence state that “The Suffolk Coast RAMS</p> | | <p>Para 35, section 3.6, amended to read: “....a development which is assessed as having a likely significant effect likely to have an impact on the integrity of a Habitat site...”</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|------|----|-------------------------|--|---|-------|
| | | | <p>streamlines these Habitat Regulations Assessments (HRAs) but [undertaking an HRA] does not negate the need to pay the RAMS tariff”?</p> <p>Section 3.6: the sentence should read, “a development which is assessed as having a [likely significant effect] on the integrity of a European site.”</p> <p>Within section 3.7 a reference and/or link to the strategy document should ideally be included.</p> | | |
| RSPB | 31 | Support/ Observation | <p>The RSPB, National Trust and Suffolk Wildlife Trust have been supportive of the development of the Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy and we welcome the production of the Draft RAMS SPD. We have appreciated the opportunity to feed into the process of developing the scheme.</p> <p>We welcome the statements in the SPD that the RAMS applies to</p> | <p>Support noted.</p> <p>There has been engagement with the neighbouring mitigation projects throughout the development of the RAM Strategy and this will continue as implementation of the project progresses.</p> <p>We welcome the RSPB’s commitment to continued involvement in the RAMS project.</p> | None. |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>all residential developments where there is a net increase in dwelling numbers, that project level HRA is still required for residential developments with the potential to affect SPAs, SACs and/or Ramsar sites, that the RAMS forms one option for developers to provide mitigation and that some larger projects (or those very close to a European site) may need to provide bespoke mitigation alongside a contribution to the RAMS.</p> <p>We recognise that, for practical reasons, it has been necessary to agree a defined boundary to the geographical coverage of the RAMS.</p> <p>We suggest that the proposed Executive Group creates and maintains links with the Essex Coast RAMS and the emerging strategy in Norfolk to ensure that where possible the strategies are aligned, and cross-border issues are discussed.</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|--------------|----|-------------|---|--|-------|
| | | | <p>We support the proposal to form an Executive Group to oversee the implementation of the RAMS and look forward to seeing details of the work to be carried out under the Strategy over forthcoming years. We would appreciate the opportunity for our organisations to sit on this group and feed into these discussions.</p> | | |
| Yvonne Smart | 32 | Observation | <p>If outline permission already given, will applicant not be required to pay any additional mitigation sum?</p> | <p>Because the requirements of the Habitats Regulations apply to the granting of all types of permissions, developments which were granted Outline permission prior to the existence of RAMS will need to be subject to a new Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) on the submission of Reserved Matters applications. Therefore, in order to comply with the requirements of the Habitats Regulations, financial contributions to RAMS will be requested at Reserved Matters application stage for eligible developments which did not make a contribution at the Outline stage.</p> | None. |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------|----|-------------|--|--|-------|
| Suffolk County Council | 33 | Observation | We have no comments to make on the draft document at this time. However, we request to be kept updated and engaged in the later developments of this document. | Noted. | None. |
| Walberswick Parish Council | 34 | Support | Welcome the processes / tariffs aimed at mitigating the impact of development and visitor numbers on natural habitats which are such an essential aspect of the ESC coast. The unprecedented numbers of visitors during the 2020 summer highlighted that the coastal communities do not have the necessary infrastructure and support to handle such numbers. This lack of infrastructure includes: an acute shortage of public toilets, insufficient police or civilian enforcement to stop anti-social behaviour and fly parking, illegal camping, and littering. The RAMS strategy should assure that processes are in place to provide appropriate financing and infrastructure to handle increased visitors and use associated both | Support noted. However, the purpose of the RAMS project and SPD is to provide a strategic mitigation scheme to address the impacts of increased recreational disturbance at Habitat Sites arising as the result of new residential development in the RAMs area. A number of the infrastructure requirements listed here will not be funded through the RAMs project. Full details of the measures that will be funded through the tariff are set out in table 6 of the strategy: https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Section-106/Habitat-mitigation/Suffolk-HRA-RAMS-Strategy.pdf | None. |

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------|----|-----------|--|--|--|
| | | | with new housing as well as day visitors. | | |
| Waldringfield Parish Council | 35 | Objection | <p>We feel very strongly that this should not be the magic bullet which allows development in an inappropriate area. In all cases the first option should be to avoid harm rather than to introduce extraneous measures which try to mitigate the harm.</p> <p>We would also suggest that greater emphasis should be placed on securing developer contributions over a much longer period.</p> <p>We also feel strongly that mitigation measures do not address problems such as the pressures on popular recreational areas such as Waldringfield.</p> <p>The draft RAMS makes little or no reference to the Government Planning White Paper. The RAMS draft should be amended to take account of these proposed changes.</p> | <p>The mitigation measures are outlined in table 6 of the Strategy: https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Section-106/Habitat-mitigation/Suffolk-HRA-RAMS-Strategy.pdf These are a combination of those measures that avoid effects and those which mitigate for effects.</p> <p>Where appropriate, the ongoing costs of these mitigation measures are taken into account as part of the tariff calculation (up to 15 years of funding).</p> <p>The approach, as set out in the SPD, does take into account that some development, by virtue of it's proximity to a Habitat site, may require additional mitigation measures beyond the RAMS contribution. This would need to be assessed through a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) (including Appropriate Assessment).</p> | <p>Refences to European legislation updated through the SPD and 'European Sites' replaced with 'Habitat Sites' in accordance with the terminology used the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> |

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------|----|-----------|--|---|-------|
| | | | <p>There is little or no reference to the end of the Brexit transition period.</p> | <p>At this stage the Council is still required to the deliver against the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). Future reviews of the Strategy and SPD will take account of any new legislative framework in place at the time.</p> <p>As confirmed by the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019, SAC, SPAs, and Ramsar sites continued to be protected in the same way post Brexit. However, agree that references to European legislation within the SPD should be updated.</p> | |
| Pigeon Investment Management | 36 | Objection | <p>It is recommended that greater emphasis is given to potential impacts of schemes in isolation. As phrased within the Suffolk Coast RAMS SPD, it is not necessarily clear that the tariff relates to in combination impacts and that in isolation there may be a need for project-specific</p> | <p>The wording at paragraph 19 highlights that some schemes may require additional mitigation measures in addition to payment of the tariff. It would not possible, or appropriate to define all the circumstances in which this might be necessary within the SPD.</p> | None. |

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------|----|-----------|---|---|---|
| | | | mitigation. Further clarification should be provided on this point including when a project may be required to provide mitigation for in isolation impacts. | Some guidance is included in the advice from Natural England which is set out in annex 1 of the Habitat Regulation Assessment Record template: Suffolk-Coast-RAMS-HRA-Record.pdf (eastsoffolk.gov.uk) Agree to add a link to this advice to paragraph 14 of the SPD. | |
| Pigeon Investment Management | 37 | Objection | Periodic review is proposed for the amount of per-dwelling tariff, but without any clarification over the review intervals or the future factors likely to influence the tariff. It is proposed that greater clarity is provided over the intervals and the information that will feed into the review process. As well as reviewing the mitigation required in relation to European sites, it is also recommended that the review process is 'future proofed' with respect to future policy changes. | As outlined in Section 10 of the Strategy, monitoring and review is essential for the successful future delivery of the RAMS project. The Strategy is clear that review will be needed once new monitoring evidence is available. Table 6 of the Strategy highlights the monitoring projects that should be prioritised for funding in the early stages of implementation. Once these have been delivered, then an assessment of review requirements can be undertaken. | None. |
| Pigeon Investment Management | 38 | Objection | The requirement for some schemes to provide Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGs) or green infrastructure measures. Some schemes should | As set out in section 3.6 of the SPD, under the Habitats Regulations, a development which is assessed as having a likely significant effect on the | Link added at paragraph 14 to HRA record and associated Natural England advice. |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>not need to pay the tariff where adequate mitigation is provided.</p> <p>It is not clear which schemes would require these additional mitigation measures, in terms of proximity or size of scheme. It would be useful to provide guidance here to clarify this issue at the outset. While it is appreciated that a project level HRA would need to demonstrate the likely effectiveness of mitigation if the tariff is not required to be paid, but this point could be elaborated upon in terms of the likely mitigation measures required.</p> | <p>integrity of a Habitat site, either alone or in-combination must provide mitigation or otherwise must satisfy the tests of demonstrating 'no alternatives' and 'reasons of overriding public interest'. The SPD is clear that payment of the RAMS tariff is one option for providing that mitigation. The alternative would be for the developer to gather their own evidence for a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) and then to secure the necessary bespoke mitigation measures for delivery in perpetuity.</p> <p>The wording at paragraph 19 highlights that some schemes may require additional mitigation measures in addition to payment of the tariff. It would not possible, or appropriate to define all the circumstances in which this might be necessary within the SPD.</p> <p>Some guidance is included in the advice from Natural England</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------|----|-----------|--|---|-------|
| | | | | <p>which is set out in annex 1 of the Habitat Regulation Assessment Record template: Suffolk-Coast-RAMS-HRA-Record.pdf (eastsoffolk.gov.uk) Agree to add a link to this advice to paragraph 14 of the SPD.</p> | |
| Pigeon Investment Management | 39 | Objection | <p>Although the SPD summarises the aspects of the Strategy that relate to the tariff, it does not contain detail over key aspects such as the mitigation actions to be undertaken and the management of funds.</p> <p>The SPD is also based upon full cost recovery and does not take into account existing funding streams. This is questionable in the context of the tests set out under Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended). Consideration should therefore be given to existing funding streams.</p> | <p>The mitigation measures and other proposals connected to the implementation of the RAMS project are set out in the Strategy: https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Section-106/Habitat-mitigation/Suffolk-HRA-RAMS-Strategy.pdf</p> <p>The focus of the SPD is to support the collection of the tariff through the development management process. It is not considered necessary, or appropriate to repeat all aspects of the strategy in the SPD.</p> <p>The strategy does make reference to potential other sources of funding (e.g New Burdens funding). It is not considered necessary, or appropriate to</p> | None. |

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------|----|-----------|--|---|-------|
| | | | | repeat this level of detail in the SPD. | |
| Pigeon Investment Management | 40 | Objection | <p>The source of funding for the River Deben is unclear.</p> <p>This Suffolk Coast RAMS SPD relates only to Zone A and should be focussed towards mitigation along the Stour and Orwell Estuaries SPA/Ramsar and possibly the Deben SPA/Ramsar only.</p> <p>There is no commentary or guarantee that funds will be ringfenced in relation to the sites for which their respective schemes would impact. Greater assurance is requested over the point that “development in any location is only contributing to mitigation relevant to that location”.</p> | <p>As shown on the map in Appendix 2 of the SPD, the Deben sites fall within tariff Zone B. However, the wording in the SPD reflects the fact that zone of influence specific to the Deben does extend into Zone A. Further detail on how the Zones of Influence have been established is set out in section 6 of the Strategy.</p> <p>The East Suffolk Council area is covered by both Zone A and Zone B and therefore the SPD covers mitigation requirements across both tariff zones.</p> <p>As outlined in section 6 of the Strategy, it is necessary to define a simple, pragmatic and useable approach to the tariff zones, whereby development in any location is only contributing to mitigation relevant to that location. Within the overall zone it is therefore necessary to draw divisions to reflect the relevance to different sites. For example,</p> | None. |

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------|----|-----------|---|---|-------|
| | | | | there is no link between development in the far south, near the Orwell and impacts to Little Terns at Benacre or Kessingland. | |
| Pigeon Investment Management | 41 | Objection | It is suggested that the payment of the tariff is more strongly linked to the occupation date of homes, with payments linked to the phasing of larger schemes. | The SPD sets out a number of options for securing the RAMS tariff. Upfront payment is not the only option. | None. |
| Pigeon Investment Management | 42 | Objection | <p>Within the Strategy the number and quantum of measures to be implemented are not explained or justified in quantitative terms, e.g. the overall website costs and the numbers of automated car counters.</p> <p>It is not clear how these measures relate to new homes and whether there is overlap with the activities and duties of other organisations.</p> | <p>The tariff set out in the SPD is taken from the RAMS Strategy where the approach is fully evidence. The tariff is based on a comprehensive assessment of housing delivery, the impacts of that development and the cost of mitigation measures. The measures are set out and costed in table 6 of the Strategy: https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Section-106/Habitat-mitigation/Suffolk-HRA-RAMS-Strategy.pdf It is not considered necessary to repeat this level of detail in the SPD.</p> <p>Section 8 of the strategy, details the role of the RAMS Delivery Officer which includes identifying</p> | None. |

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------|----|-----------|--|--|-------|
| | | | | <p>‘opportunities that will enhance the success of the Strategy, such as adding to existing initiatives or identifying local delivery bodies for particular projects.’ The strategy includes provision for biannual stakeholder group meetings to facilitate this.</p> | |
| Pigeon Investment Management | 43 | Objection | The RAMS tariff should not apply to reserved matters applications. | <p>Regulation 63 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017) (as amended) requires that the council, as a competent authority, must undertake an Appropriate Assessment before giving any consent, permission or other authorisation for a plan or project which is likely to have a significant effect on a Habitat site. This requirement applies to all types of planning application, including those for Reserved Matters and Variation of Condition. Because the requirements of the Habitats Regulations apply to the granting of all types of permissions, developments which were granted Outline permission prior to the existence of RAMS will</p> | None. |

| | | | | | |
|------------------|----|-------------|---|---|-------|
| | | | | <p>need to be subject to a new Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) on the submission of Reserved Matters applications. Therefore, in order to comply with the requirements of the Habitats Regulations, financial contributions to RAMS will be requested at Reserved Matters application stage for eligible developments which did not make a contribution at the Outline stage.</p> | |
| Historic England | 48 | Observation | <p>We regret that we are unable to comment specifically at this time as a result of the number of consultations we are currently receiving. Although we have not been able to provide a substantive response at this stage, this does not mean that we are not interested in further iterations of the document. Please note that we may still advise on, and potentially object to, any specific development proposal(s) which may subsequently arise from this or later versions of the</p> | Noted. | None. |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | documents subject to the consultation. | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|