

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE
PLANNING AND PUBLIC ART

Summary of Representations	Observations and Recommendations of the Deputy Director (Planning & Community Strategy)
<p>Comments</p> <p>Martin Grant Homes Limited consider that provision of public art on every site over 0.5 hectares may not always be achievable and this should be made clearer in the SPG.</p> <p>Section 106 contributions for public art should be considered 'in the round' with other Section 106 obligations, and only if funds are available after other obligations have been taken into account, allow contributions.</p> <p>SPG goes into too much detail on contract specifications and risk assessments of works of art. The excessive detail should be removed.</p> <p>The Ancient Monuments Society consider that Section 106 agreements should include the re-siting of existing works of art and the inclusion of examples of glass would be welcomed.</p> <p>Vale Engineers considered a reference should be included in the approval section on page 7 for ongoing maintenance assessment where appropriate.</p> <p>The House Builders Federation consider that the policy DC4 is unreasonable and excessive and the policy must be amended to make it clear that the Council will seek to negotiate with developers for the provision of or contributions towards public art where appropriate rather than requiring it in all circumstances on all sites greater than 0.5 hectares.</p>	<p>This draft Supplementary Planning Guidance reflects Policy DC4 of the local plan.</p> <p>The local plan Inspector (at para 4.5.2 of his report) considered that the 0.5 ha threshold is reasonable in all the relevant circumstances and would mean that no scheme is likely to be rendered economically unviable by the application of the policy. Also given that it refers to seeking rather than providing such provision he was satisfied that it does not breach government guidelines relating to such matters, including Circular 05/2005.</p> <p>One of the purposes of Supplementary Planning Guidance is to supplement specific policies in a plan, in this instance policy DC4. The level of detail is considered appropriate and will assist developers in determining the terms and resources that will need to be set aside to achieve public art through the development process.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: No change to the Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance - Planning and Public Art.</p> <p>The aim of this draft SPG is to secure further works of public art through the planning process. The Council during the time that it has operated policy DC4 has not found the re-siting of existing works of art to be an issue and do not consider it necessary to amend the guidance specifically to take account of this. The guidance already highlights examples of glasswork at para 5.1.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: No change to the Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance – Planning and Public Art.</p> <p>Para 9 of the guidance already refers to maintenance and it is not considered necessary to make any change.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: No change to the Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance – Planning and Public Art.</p> <p>See response to martin Grant Homes Ltd above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: No change to the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance – Planning and Public Art.</p>