

## DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES – ECONOMIC PROSPERITY

### Option DMEP1 - Retention of Employment Land and Premises

***DMEP1: Include a criteria based policy in the LDF identifying how, and what employment land and premises will be protected from unsuitable development.***

<b>DMEP1: Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Evidence base consideration</b>	<b>Policy or Proposal</b>
<p>It would be entirely inappropriate and contrary to national policy guidance for the Core Strategy to seek to protect all existing employment land and premises from alternative development.</p> <p>Something similar is already contained in the draft RSS. If the policy doesn't add any value then there is no need to duplicate a higher order plan.</p>	<p>The comment is correct, it would be inappropriate to prevent the change of use of all employment land and premises, but the cumulative loss of employment land is an issue, which has been highlighted through Stages 1 and 2 of the Employment Land Review, and so strengthening the existing Saved Local Plan Policy ME6 and ME7 (which seek the protection of employment land and premises) would seem appropriate.</p> <p>Policy ES3 in the RSS protects employment sites by enabling the release of only those, which no longer meet the needs of business or are poorly located for economic development purposes, but it does not protect established premises.</p>	<p>To ensure that suitable employment land and premises are sufficiently protected because at the moment the RSS only protects allocated sites, include a Development Management policy in the Core Strategy. The policy should adopt a similar approach to that outlined in RSS Policy ES3.</p> <p>The criteria identified should be explored further with colleagues in Economic Development, to ensure a robust policy that protects existing employment land and premises, to ensure a supply of land that caters for the differing needs of business, but does not hinder development. Evidence will be crucial.</p>

### Question DMQEP1 - Retention of Employment Land and Premises

***DMQEP1: Should we protect all existing employment land and premises or can some be used for other uses?***

<b>DMQEP1: Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Evidence base consideration</b>	<b>Policy or Proposal</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, all existing employment land and premises should be protected.</li> <li>• As a general principle it should all be protected with the local community having the final say over any changes to that status.</li> </ul>	<p>It would be inappropriate to prevent the change of use of all employment land and premises, and contrary to PPS4.</p> <p>Policy ES3 in the RSS protects employment sites</p>	<p>To ensure that suitable employment land and premises are sufficiently protected because at the moment the RSS only protects allocated sites, include a Development Management policy in the Core Strategy. The policy should adopt a similar</p>

DMQEP1: Summary of Issues	Evidence base consideration	Policy or Proposal
<p>final say over any changes to that status.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protected in towns, but case-by-case basis in rural areas.</li> <li>No, other uses are permissible, because the need for land and premises changes with time.</li> </ul> <p>Clearly it would be absurd to put a blanket protection on all employment land. Derelict sites can be used. Sites that have been market tested to establish that the current use is no longer viable. If there is alternative land available, existing employment sites may be used for alternative uses. Land supply for employment and housing should be reviewed through an integrated approach to employment land reviews and strategic housing land availability assessments. We are facing a housing crisis and in South Somerset have only 1.3% unemployment. The answer to the question must therefore be that some employment land should be put to housing. Farming/allotment development should be the alternative use.</p>	<p>by enabling the release of only those, which no longer meet the needs of business or are poorly located for economic development purposes.</p> <p>In terms of allocated sites, the South Somerset Employment Land Review has undertaken a 'fitness for purpose' exercise, and any existing, employment allocations that have deliverability issues, and have been allocated for longer than 10 years are being tested through the SHLAA process to establish whether they have potential for any residential use.</p>	<p>approach to that outlined in RSS Policy ES3.</p> <p>The criteria suggested by respondents to the Issues and Options should be explored further with colleagues in Economic Development, to ensure a robust policy that protects existing employment land and premises, to ensure a supply of land that caters for the differing needs of business, but does not hinder development. Evidence will be crucial.</p> <p>Employment land provision should reflect the 'fitness for purpose' exercise undertaken in the South Somerset Employment Land Review and the future of any existing, undeliverable employment allocations should be determined in accordance with Policy ES3 of the emerging RSS.</p>

## **Option DMEP2 - Retention of Employment Land and Premises**

***DMEP2: Include a strict policy ensuring that employment sites/premises are not lost to housing unless there is an absolute need for that housing. How would the need be demonstrated?***

DMEP2: Summary of Issues	Evidence base consideration	Policy or Proposal
<p>Do not agree with this, there is an absolute need for housing. Central government has been repeating this position again and again, yet the Council still proposes a strict policy to protect</p>	<p>These comments are correct, this position would be in direct conflict with National Guidance in PPS3 – the approach outlined above under Question DMQEP1 is more flexible and follows</p>	<p>To ensure that suitable employment land and premises are sufficiently protected include a Development Management policy in the Core Strategy. The policy should adopt a similar</p>

<b>DMEP2: Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Evidence base consideration</b>	<b>Policy or Proposal</b>
<p>employment land. The need for housing has been demonstrated by the plan, monitor and manage approach. All the monitoring indicators proposed by government at the introduction to the approach have gone through the roof, indicating an overwhelming need for additional housing provision. Yet, the Council still needs to ask 'How would the need be demonstrated?' It has been demonstrated, please move away from the arcane approach of protecting land for employment and restricting housing supply, it is damaging our economy, our social fabric and the future of our children.</p> <p>No, there should be a flexible approach to the retention of employment land. The approach should relate to demand, take-up and nuisance factors of existing uses.</p> <p>It is more important to ensure that adequate and spatially appropriate allocations for employment use are made so that the most appropriate uses can be found for each PDL opportunity as it arises.</p> <p>It would be entirely inappropriate and contrary to national policy guidance for the Core Strategy to seek to protect all existing employment land and premises from alternative development.</p> <p>The key criterion needs to be the suitability of the employment land not the housing need.</p>	<p>the approach outlined nationally and regionally.</p>	<p>approach to that outlined in RSS Policy ES3.</p> <p>The criteria suggested by respondents to the Issues and Options should be explored further with colleagues in Economic Development, to ensure a robust policy that protects existing employment land and premises, to ensure a supply of land that caters for the differing needs of business, but does not hinder development. Evidence will be crucial.</p>
<b>How would the need be demonstrated?</b>		
<p>Public demand for property and housing needs surveys.</p>	<p>This position would be in direct conflict with National Guidance in PPS3 – the approach outlined above under Question DMQEP1 is more flexible and follows the approach outlined nationally and regionally.</p>	<p>None required.</p>

## Question DMQEP2 - Retention of Employment Land and Premises

***DMQEP2: If we allowed the loss of some employment land and premises, how would we decide what land and premises could be lost? For example would a judgement be made based on a percentage above which further losses would not be allowed? Would this be a District-wide percentage, or different for each settlement?***

<b>DMQEP2: Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Evidence base consideration</b>	<b>Policy or Proposal</b>
<p>The key is whether or not South Somerset provides sufficient employment land both in terms of quantity and quality and this will need to be based on evidence from a current Employment Land Review.</p> <p>We should consider all employment land, to assess whether the need for housing provision outweighs the need for jobs.</p> <p>Overall % for each type of settlement but allowing for special cases.</p> <p>Based on need, demand and future vision for area, so different for each settlement.</p> <p>No limits - each item/site should be reviewed individually.</p>	<p>In terms of allocated sites, the South Somerset Employment Land Review has undertaken a 'fitness for purpose' exercise, and any existing, employment allocations that have deliverability issues, and have been allocated for longer than 10 years are being tested through the SHLAA process to establish whether they have potential for any residential use.</p> <p>There is a need to identify employment land to meet the RSS targets for the District, and allowing further significant losses of employment land to housing or any other uses would result in the need to identify additional land.</p> <p>The approach to deciding what land and premises could be lost to other uses cannot be too prescriptive, and a judgement needs to be made on a case-by-case basis to ensure flexibility.</p> <p>Whilst the methodology behind establishing a percentage target seems logical, in practice it would be difficult to manage, and a percentage in one settlement may be acceptable whilst in another, it may not be. The percentage may also vary over time, based on economic climate etc.</p> <p>Additionally the approach would be above and beyond what is recommended in national and regional guidance. A robust, criteria based policy should afford sufficient protection and the prescriptive approach suggested by this question is not necessary.</p>	<p>To ensure that suitable employment land and premises are sufficiently protected include a Development Management policy in the Core Strategy. The policy should adopt a similar approach to that outlined in RSS Policy ES3.</p> <p>The criteria suggested by respondents to the Issues and Options should be explored further with colleagues in Economic Development, to ensure a robust policy that protects existing employment land and premises, to ensure a supply of land that caters for the differing needs of business, but does not hinder development. Evidence will be crucial.</p>

## **Question DMQEP3 - Retention of Employment Land and Premises**

***DMQEP3: Should employment land and premises in Villages and Rural Centres be given greater protection than at present, as this encourages self-containment in those settlements?***

<b>DMQEP3: Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Evidence base consideration</b>	<b>Policy or Proposal</b>
<p>Support the greater protection of employment premises within villages and rural centres as this would assist with self-containment.</p> <p>No, the protection policy should be District wide.</p> <p>Needs to be assessed on each occasion depending upon the local circumstances and site characteristics.</p> <p>In settlements where specific employment allocations are not appropriate then there is a case for a more protective approach. However all the issues raised above are still relevant and more significant due to the lower values applicable to these settlements, mixed use redevelopments of PDL in these cases can help to overcome viability issues and often retain similar employment densities.</p>	<p>Draft PPS4 (May 2009) protects economic uses in rural communities by requiring consideration of the impact of their loss on the supply of economic sites in that community.</p> <p>A robust, criteria based policy should afford sufficient protection and the more prescriptive approach in Villages and Rural Centres suggested by this question is not necessary.</p>	<p>To ensure that suitable employment land and premises are sufficiently protected include a Development Management policy in the Core Strategy. The policy should adopt a similar approach to that outlined in RSS Policy ES3.</p> <p>The criteria should be explored further with colleagues in Economic Development, to ensure a robust policy that protects existing employment land and premises, to ensure a supply of land that caters for the differing needs of business, but does not hinder development. Evidence will be crucial, as outlined in PPS4 and policy will need to expand upon this.</p>

## **Question DMQEP4 - Retention of Employment Land and Premises**

***DMQEP4: Given the guidance in the RSS, what criteria should be used to determine that a site is poorly located for economic development or is no longer needed?***

<b>DMQEP4: Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Evidence base consideration</b>	<b>Policy or Proposal</b>
<p>The market force is probably the best method to determine the need and future potential of the site.</p> <p>It should be market tested for a specified length of</p>	<p>The District Council document "Commercial Marketing of Property in relation to Planning and Listed Building Applications" outlines how applicants should demonstrate that they have</p>	<p>Using the document "Commercial Marketing of Property in relation to Planning and Listed Building Applications" work this into the Development Management Policy for protecting</p>

<b>DMQEP4: Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Evidence base consideration</b>	<b>Policy or Proposal</b>
time - proven uneconomic viability. Aggressive marketing should be introduced to assist economic development within planning. Amenity Issues - negative impact on neighbours. Detailed and clear reasons should be given BUT the final decision should remain in the hands of the local community.	marketed a site sufficiently.	employment land and premises.

### **Question DMQEP5 - Retention of Employment Land and Premises**

***DMQEP5: This section is duplicated in the Economic Prosperity section of the Core Strategy, where should the issue of retention of employment land and premises be considered? Is it a core strategy, principle of development issue?***

<b>DMQEP5: Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Evidence base consideration</b>	<b>Policy or Proposal</b>
14 (56%) = Core Strategy 5 (20%) = Development Management Policy 6 (24%) = Other There is no need for Development Management Policies on this or many other subjects. The Core Strategy should indicate that land supply for employment and housing will be assessed according to Government guidance and decisions will be taken on the basis of this evidence	This matter has been considered further and it has been resolved that the Development Management policies will not be in a separate section of the Core Strategy, this is confusing to end-users and could lead to duplication.	None required.

### **Option DMEP3 – The Rural Economy**

***DMEP3: Include a criteria based policy in the LDF identifying the type of farm diversification schemes we would view as acceptable.***

<b>DMEP3: Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Evidence base consideration</b>	<b>Policy or Proposal</b>
Farm diversification should include the possibility of combining Employment Land with Residential Land. There will come a time sooner rather than later	PPS7 'Sustainable Development in Rural Areas' states that diversification into non-agricultural activities is vital to the continuing viability of many farm enterprises, local planning authorities should	To ensure that proposals for Farm Diversification schemes do not or undermine the agricultural nature of the countryside, a policy should set out the circumstances under which such activities will

<p>when all agricultural land will be needed to feed the expanding population. The most productive land should be safeguarded for that eventuality. With the above in mind, diversification of farms should be reversible i.e. that there are no permanent buildings allowed or activities which would permanently damage the productivity of the land.</p>	<p>set out in their LDDs the criteria to be applied to planning applications for farm diversification projects. Draft PPS 4 reiterates these principles.</p> <p>Evidence supplied by the Councils Development Control Officers and Agricultural Development Officer show that the Local Authority has received a large number of farm diversification applications in the past and that many of these are for the conversion of dairy farms to an equestrian related use. Officers believe that further guidance is needed to clarify this situation. Given the policy vacuum, criteria is required in relation to the use of buildings and new build. Diversification by its nature means that the farming enterprise must continue to operate, the principle is not about changing the use of the farming activity.</p>	<p>be permitted. The policy will generally support farm diversification schemes.</p> <p>Given the specific concerns over equine related proposals, a policy should be included in the Core Strategy outlining clearly how these activities will be dealt with.</p> <p>Further work should now be undertaken in conjunction with Development Control Officers and the Agricultural Development Officer to determine the full scope of the proposed policies.</p>
---	---	---

## Question DMQEP6 – The Rural Economy

**DMQEP6: *Given the huge development potential, what type of criteria do you think we should used to assess farm diversification schemes? What forms of development is viewed as acceptable?***

<b>DMQEP6: Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Evidence base consideration</b>	<b>Policy or Proposal</b>
<p><u>Criteria</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In assessing farm diversification schemes we would highlight the requirement to consider the impact on the highway network and the extent to which additional car borne trips are generated as a result of proposals.</li> <li>We must retain the present farm diversification and avoid amalgamating them into large conglomerates that no longer reflect that diversification.</li> </ul>	<p>PPS7 and draft PPS4 outline general criteria for farm diversification schemes. The criteria suggested needs to be explored further with colleagues in Development Management in the context of a supportive Farm Diversification Policy.</p>	<p>To ensure that proposals for Farm Diversification schemes do not or undermine the agricultural nature of the countryside, a policy should set out the circumstances under which such activities will be permitted. The policy will generally support farm diversification schemes.</p> <p>The criteria should be explored further with colleagues in Development Management, to ensure a robust policy that protects the</p>

DMQEP6: Summary of Issues	Evidence base consideration	Policy or Proposal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is essential that diversification is that, and not redevelopment that removes the focus on the origin of the land. Diversification must be in keeping with rural affairs and should not be new urban business in rural location.</li> <li>• Development that will enhance the area economically and create employment and wealth.</li> </ul> <p>Re-use of buildings, no agricultural land should be built on.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on landscape, impact on public amenities such as footpaths - otherwise same criteria as for any business (eg noise and environmental pollution, traffic etc).</li> <li>• Generally those that will give local employment.</li> <li>• Nothing which is irreversible.</li> <li>• Development that sustains the farm as a business while limiting the effects on the land, environment, bio-diversity, infrastructure, etc of the area.</li> </ul>		<p>countryside, but does not hinder development, which will sustain farming enterprises. Evidence of how the proposal will help to sustain the agricultural enterprise will be crucial, as outlined in PPS7 and policy will need to expand upon this.</p>
<p><b><u>Acceptable Development</u></b>  Each proposal for diversification needs to be assessed on its merits - the range of possibilities is too great to stipulate.  Small, horticultural forms of development are acceptable.  Recreation/Tourism.</p>	<p>Agree with the comment relating to the need to assess proposals on a case-by-case basis, the range of possibilities are enormous and specifying acceptable proposals would not be logical. A robust criteria-based policy will ensure that only acceptable forms of farm diversification are undertaken.</p>	<p>To ensure that proposals for Farm Diversification schemes do not or undermine the agricultural nature of the countryside, a policy should set out the circumstances under which such activities will be permitted. The policy will generally support farm diversification schemes.</p>



## Question DMQEP7 – The Rural Economy

***DMQEP7: The issue of impact of large-scale uses in the countryside was discussed at the inception meeting, equine-related activities, popular forms of recreation in the countryside, can fit in well with farms seeking to diversify, and so have become popular.***

<b>DMQEP7: Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Evidence base consideration</b>	<b>Policy or Proposal</b>
This is not a question!	The comment is correct and any comments related to large-scale uses in the countryside have been addressed in DMQEP8 below.	None required.

## Question DMQEP8 – The Rural Economy

***DMQEP8: There are issues surrounding large scale uses in the countryside, especially equestrian uses in the District – what do you think these issues are and how could they be dealt with? Do we need a separate policy for equestrian activity or could large-scale uses all be dealt with under one policy?***

<b>DMQEP8: Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Evidence base consideration</b>	<b>Policy or Proposal</b>
Deterioration of landscapes needs controlling. Given the quality of the landscape we should seek to protect the land from large-scale use and consider policy that monitors the usage and scale of equestrian activity as it does have a significant impact on the rural networks, especially on bridle ways. One suggestion is to seek contributions towards the maintenance of bridle ways where new development comes forward for growth of equestrian activity. One of the biggest issues surrounding the increase in equestrian activity in the urban fringes and countryside is the lack of a connective off-road network for horse-riding. This is true across	PPS7 and draft PPS4 is clear that development should be of an appropriate scale in rural areas, to ensure that communities can prosper and thrive whilst ensuring continued protection for the countryside. Large-scale schemes are rare, and will require special justification in lines with PPS7. A policy is not required as national guidance covers the issue sufficiently. In terms of equine activities, the comments are supplemented by evidence supplied by the Councils Development Control Officers which shows that there are concerns over the impact such activities are having on the countryside, in particular the landscape impact.	Given the specific concerns over equine related proposals, a policy should be included in the Core Strategy outlining clearly how these activities will be dealt with.  Criteria to deal with the suggested issues should be explored further with colleagues in Development Management, to ensure a robust policy that protects the countryside, but does not hinder development, which will sustain farming enterprises and economic activities in the countryside.

DMQEP8: Summary of Issues	Evidence base consideration	Policy or Proposal
<p>most of Somerset but is particularly the case in South Somerset. The Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2006-6011 is the prime means by which the County Council will identify changes to be made to the rights of way network for the benefit of walkers, equestrians. Assessment of route development takes into account the available off-road network as well as the numbers of horses locally.</p> <p>No Go-kart racing, Paint-balling or Raves.</p> <p>Allow all non-anti social activities that maintain integrity of landholding.</p>		

### **Question DMQEP9 – Live/Work Units**

***DMQEP9: Should we continue to support workplace homes? If so, how can we ensure that the unit functions as approved through the granting of planning permission? Can we ever ensure this?***

DMQEP9: Summary of Issues	Evidence base consideration	Policy or Proposal
<p>Workplace homes (as opposed to home-based working) can be facilitated by planning control, but residential occupancy of such workplaces cannot be enforced.</p> <p>The concept of Live/Work units is not generally supported. It is considered that there are few examples of where such accommodation has been constructed and retained in the intended use.</p> <p>Workplace homes as a concept has never really taken off, a great deal of home-based working takes place from normal unregulated residential property, and with the main required infrastructure being no more than a telephone line this is not</p>	<p>Draft PPS4 (May 2009) states that Local Planning Authorities should be facilitating new working practices such as live/work or the use of residential properties for homeworking, but it also states that in rural areas the need to protect the countryside should also be taken into account.</p> <p>The concern is that Workplace Homes or Live-Work units are one attempt at ‘blurring’ the lines between residential and employment land. Whilst they are supported nationally (draft PPS4) they have been plagued with difficulties in the past, both in South Somerset and elsewhere, as it is difficult to ensure that they function as intended.</p> <p>The Council should be supportive of new</p>	<p>Homeworking from existing residential properties can take place without the need for planning permission - the Council can support such homeworking through their business support service. Homeworking that requires planning permission can be dealt with through a generic Development Management Policy for new development, it does not require a specific policy.</p> <p>The re-use of buildings in the countryside for economic development purposes is preferable and supported by national guidance (PPS7 and draft PPS4). Where it is not viable to re-use for just economic development purposes, some live/work option might be the best approach.</p>

<b>DMQEP9: Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Evidence base consideration</b>	<b>Policy or Proposal</b>
<p>really a planning issue. The advent of high quality and affordable flexible business centres can often fill in the gaps ie the need for postal addresses, meeting and conference facilities on a local basis. The sorts of business that require more substantial and permanent dedicated workspace are probably better located at such a business centre or in more traditional office or business unit locations, which are usually well located to residential development and or public transport, and certainly will be in the future.</p> <p>Has it been a problem with those approved in the past? How significant is it? How would you deal with it without such a policy? What gap is there that really needs to be filled?</p> <p>A workplace approved by the planning department should employ at least one person. Have them in groups in clearly designated areas. Give the Enforcement Officers the task of ensuring compliance.</p> <p>These should be supported but must be policed and enforced so this idea does not become a loophole for further residential development. This means the planning phase must be rigorous and clearly define what is expected in each case.</p>	<p>live/work units that require planning permission, but in line with PPS7 and draft PPS4, these need to be in appropriate locations. New live/work units in the countryside should be restricted to cases where the accommodation is essential to enable the enterprise to operate. It should be the needs of the enterprise and not the personal preferences or circumstances of the persons involved. There is no need for a Development Management Policy to cover this form of development, as there is sufficient guidance in ANNEX A: Agricultural, Forestry and Other Occupational Dwellings, of PPS7. The key will be that live/work forms of development will not be allowed in locations where residential development would not normally be allowed, simply because there is an employment element to the development.</p>	<p>Saved Local Plan Policies on the re-use and conversion of buildings are not robust enough and a Development Management Policy is required which lists the criteria for such development. Principle elements could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How much of the building should be residential/economic</li> <li>• Inclusion of a Business Plan to assess the viability of the proposed business</li> <li>• Design of the conversion – should live/work be clearly separated</li> <li>• Temporary permission until proved viable.</li> </ul>

## Question DMQEP10 – Live/Work Units

***DMQEP10: Should we use a criteria based policy such as we do for agricultural and forestry workers dwellings, to assess whether the workplace home application is genuine? If so, what criteria should we use?***

<b>DMQEP10: Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Evidence base consideration</b>	<b>Policy or Proposal</b>
<p>14 people require a criteria-based policy 3 people do not want a criteria (out of 37 responses) Workplace homes (as opposed to home-based working) can be facilitated by planning control, but residential occupancy of such workplaces cannot be enforced. Why is there an issue over the genuineness? Presumably the issue is over whether the land is going to continue to be used for business purposes. If we lose the distinction between employment land and residential land, then the question will not arise. A development can contain some business premises, some residential premises, and some workplace homes. The balance between them will depend on market forces and the needs of the people in them. The concept of Live/Work units is not generally supported. It is considered that there are few examples of where such accommodation has been constructed and retained in the intended use. Sounds good but is probably impractical. A case-by-case approach is probably the best one with the onus on the applicants to conclusively demonstrate the intentions and how a reversal of that intent would be avoided. Job specific requirements versus travel and level</p>	<p>Draft PPS4 (May 2009) states that Local Planning Authorities should be facilitating new working practices such as live/work or the use of residential properties for homeworking, but it also states that in rural areas the need to protect the countryside should also be taken into account.</p> <p>The concern is that Workplace Homes or Live-Work units are one attempt at 'blurring' the lines between residential and employment land. Whilst they are supported nationally (draft PPS4) they have been plagued with difficulties in the past, both in South Somerset and elsewhere, as it is difficult to ensure that they function as intended.</p> <p>PPS7 Annex A clearly outlines when new permanent dwellings will be allowed in the countryside for agricultural, forestry and other occupational dwellings.</p> <p>The Council should be supportive of new live/work units that require planning permission, but in line with PPS7 and draft PPS4, these need to be in appropriate locations. New live/work units in the countryside should be restricted to cases where the accommodation is essential to enable the enterprise to operate. It should be the needs of the enterprise and not the personal</p>	<p>Homeworking from existing residential properties can take place without the need for planning permission - the Council can support such Homeworking through their business support service. Homeworking that requires planning permission can be dealt with through a generic Development Management Policy for new development, it does not require a specific policy.</p>

<p>of employee pay. Proof of turnover, business plan.</p>	<p>preferences or circumstances of the persons involved. There is no need for a Development Management Policy to cover this form of development, as there is sufficient guidance in ANNEX A: Agricultural, Forestry and Other Occupational Dwellings, of PPS7. The key will be that live/work forms of development will not be allowed in locations where residential development would not normally be allowed, simply because there is an employment element to the development.</p>	
---	--	--

## **Question DMQEP11 – Expansion of Existing Tourism Facilities**

***DMQEP11: Should Tourism be dealt with as a separate issue, or should it be considered as other forms of economic development? Should Policy ME4 be retained and expanded to relate to tourism facilities also?***

<b>DMQEP11: Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Evidence base consideration</b>	<b>Policy or Proposal</b>
<p>The nature of tourism as an industry is very different from normal employment requirements. The customer base is generally mobile (by car) and will not easily be persuaded on the public transport, their interests are spread throughout the district and cannot be correlated into the settlements. Customers must ALWAYS be persuaded to come to the business and never the other way round. Such is the local scale of this activity that it warrants it's own policy consideration.</p>	<p>The 'Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism' states that where the future development of tourism is a key issue for the local authority, it will be appropriate for the core strategy to cover tourism issues together with any objectives relevant to tourism. In other local authorities it may be that the plan's broad approach to economic growth and regeneration sets the framework for the future development of tourism.</p> <p>Tourism is actively promoted in Regional Spatial Strategy policies TO1: Sustainable Tourism, TO2: Safeguarding and investing in Tourism Destinations and TO3: Major New Tourism Facilities.</p>	<p>No policy required. Applications for Tourism Development will be determined through the use of a 'general development policy' within the Core Strategy, the RSS Tourism Policies and the 'Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism'.</p>

DMQEP11: Summary of Issues	Evidence base consideration	Policy or Proposal
	<p>South Somerset Tourism Strategy (2004-2007) sets out the districts tourism objectives. The Somerset Tourism Strategy (2008-2011) will replace the South Somerset Strategy on its completion.</p> <p>A review of National &amp; Regional Planning Guidance demonstrates that 'The Good Practice Guide' and RSS contain sufficient guidance to steer and make decisions on tourism development in the district, this view is supported by the Tourism and Development Control Teams who confirm that there are no locally specific issues in South Somerset that would warrant a local policy.</p>	

**Other Issues Development Management Policies – Economic Prosperity**

None identified.