

Policy DM60: Public Houses

Response to Haringey's Local Plan: Development Management Policies

Policy DM60: Public Houses

1. Introduction

1.1 This response relates to Policy DM60 Public Houses

1.2 We have considered the policy with regard to the principles set out within the Framework. Local Plans should “plan” positively for development; be justified; effective; and consistent with the Framework. Policy DM60 is not sound.

1.3 The proposed policy restricts development in areas where the local planning authority sees unfit, therefore contradicting the Frameworks aims of promoting sustainable development. Not only is this negative planning but should be considered unjustified. The Framework provides no justification for protection of unviable community facilities.

2. The policy is not positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with the Framework.

2.1 The policy will restrict growth. The Framework “foreword” confirms that sustainable development is about positive growth, making economic, environmental and social progress for this and future generations.

2.2 The proposed policy is overly protective and not justified or positive in its approach. This is contrary to para 14 of the Framework which advises authorities to positively seek opportunities to meet development needs of their area.

2.4 Thus the policy is inconsistent with para 19 and 21 of the Framework. Para 19 states:

Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system.

Para 21 states:

Investment in business should not be over-burdened by the combined requirements of planning policy expectations.

2.5.1 Furthermore the policy requires that “*any permitted change of use from Use Class A4 involving the alteration and/or extension of a public house must ensure any proposed alteration does not affect the vitality of the area, detract from character and appearance of the building and the street scene and any significant features of historic or character value are retained and, where possible, enhanced*”.

2.5.2 This is substantially more prescriptive than the test in para 21 “*Policies should be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan and to allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstance*”.

2.5.3 No consideration is given to the achievement of sustainable development as required throughout the Framework.

2.5.4 No consideration has been given to the potential negative impact that the policy may have on the local community, employment provision or to sustainability.

2.5.5 We have demonstrated above that the policy is not consistent with national planning policy.

2.5.6 The proposal does not accord with the “golden thread” running through the Framework which seeks to build a strong competitive economy. The policy potentially stifles economic development and is not consistent with the policy framework.

3. **Soundness – summary**

3.1 The proposed policy is considered unsound and fails to meet the four tests of the Framework. It is not positively prepared; justified; effective; or consistent with national planning policy. The policy should therefore be deleted.

3.2 We reserve the right to expand on, and provide evidence to support the points raised above at any examination in public.