

 <p>Isle of Man Government <i>Reil'tys Ellan Vannin</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Cabinet Office</p> <p>Isle of Man Strategic Plan Review – Preliminary Publicity Consultation Response Form</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">FOR OFFICE USE ONLY</p> <p>Response Number:</p> <p>Date received:</p>
---	---	---

RESPONSE FORM

Please use this Response Form to make comments and representations on the Preliminary Publicity stage of the Isle of Man Strategic Plan Review. Alternatively, you may complete this form online using the Consultation Hub.

The Preliminary Publicity stage of the Isle of Man Strategic Plan Review consists of a Main Consultation Document and several Evidence Papers which cover specific subjects at a greater level of detail. You should familiarise yourself with these documents prior to completing this form. These documents are available on the Consultation Hub, as well as on the Strategic Plan Review section of the Government Website.

The closing date for submissions is **Friday 29th September 2023**. Submissions received after this date may not be included. It is recommended that completed response forms be returned via email to newstrategicplan.co@gov.im or by post to:

**Planning policy
Cabinet Office
3rd Floor
Government Office
Bucks Road
Douglas
IM1 3PN**

Overview

Cabinet Office is undertaking the 'Preliminary Publicity' stage signalling the start the review process into the Isle of Man Strategic Plan 2016. This is in line with Paragraph 2, Schedule 1, of the Town and Country Planning Act (1999). Preliminary Publicity represents the first statutory step of the Development Plan Procedure and sets out the matters that the draft plan will deal with.

The Strategic Plan provides the high-level planning policy framework for the future sustainable development of the Island and aims to ensure that the land use needs and other spatial planning requirements which may relate to economic, social and environmental matters are adequately met.

This is a comprehensive review process which will, once complete, replace the existing plan in its entirety. Some policies may simply be amended and updated but others will be added or potentially removed. The review provides the opportunity to embed Climate Change policies into statutory planning policy and reflect the core strategic objectives set out in Our Island Plan 2023 (GD No. 2022/0095), to build a secure, vibrant and sustainable future for our Island and specifically deliver one of the 'Building Great Communities' programmes.

Accordingly, Cabinet Office is inviting representations on the documents published as part of the Preliminary Publicity. This suite of documents comprises the Main Technical Consultation Paper and a number of Evidence Papers which explore specific subject areas in more detail.

Why your views matter

In accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act (1999) Schedule 1, when preparing a Development Plan, Cabinet Office must give adequate publicity to the matters that the plan proposals intend to deal with. The review of the Strategic Plan will cover a wide range of topic areas, and set out the overarching planning policy direction to guide the production of Area Plans and the determination of planning application decisions. The Plan will cover the broad topics listed in the current Strategic Plan, namely: the Island Spatial Strategy, Housing, the Environment, Business (employment land) and Tourism, Sport, Recreation, Open Space and Community Facilities, Transport, Infrastructure and Utilities, Minerals, Energy and Waste. The new Plan will embed policies on Climate Change and in respect of other national policy areas such as: design quality, landscape protection, heritage and conservation, and renewable energy. These are issues which touch the everyday lives of all Island residents, and to ensure a robust Draft Plan, Cabinet Office is seeking input from a wide range of stakeholders at this early stage of the Development Plan process.

Strategic Plan review Preliminary Publicity Consultation - Response Form

1. **What is your name?**

2. **What is your email address?**

3. **What is your age range?**

- 16-24.
- 25-34.
- 35-44.
- 45-54.
- 55-64.
- 65+

4. **Which of the following are you?**

- Member of the public.
- Private Company (not a developer or built environment professional).
- Developer or built environment professional.
- Local Authority or Politician.
- Government Department or Statutory Body/Board.
- Special interest/community group.

Other, please specify:

5. **May we publish your response? Please read our Privacy Policy for more details and your rights.**

- Yes, you can publish my response in full.
- Yes, you may publish my response anonymously.
- No, please do not publish my response.

The following questions are based on matters relating to the Island Spatial Strategy, housing employment, town centres and the environment which are covered in both the Main Consultation Document and expanded on in detail in the Spatial Strategy Paper. Please refer to these documents for supporting background information.

6. Which of the following years do you think the Strategic Plan period should run until? Please select one.

- 2036
- 2041
- Other, please specify below:

7. In respect of affordable housing provision, which of the following broad policy options do you prefer? Please select one.

- Policy Option 1 – Units provided under the Shared Equity Purchase Assistance Scheme (or replacement) should be retained in perpetuity so that they are not able to be sold on the open market i.e. retained as affordable units.
- Policy Option 2 – Units provided under the Shared Equity Purchase Assistance Scheme (or replacement) should be retained for a period of 5 years (as they are now) so that they are able to be sold on the open market after a period of a minimum of 5 years.
- Policy Option 3 – Units provided under the Shared Equity Purchase Assistance Scheme (or replacement) should be retained for a period of 10 years to lengthen the time that they are considered an 'affordable unit' before being able to be sold on the open market.

8. When considering how the Island's settlements may be developed in future, which of the broad policy options identified in Table 1.2 of the Spatial Strategy Evidence Paper do you prefer? Please select one. If you think a variation of that broad option more agreeable, please indicate under that chosen option.

- Policy Option 1: Future development continues to be distributed across all identified settlements on the Island depending on their position in the settlement hierarchy.
- Is there a variation of this option that you want to highlight/propose?

- Policy Option 2: Future development is focused in the East only, specifically around the settlements of Douglas, Onchan, Union Mills and the Strang.
- Variations – as above: use this box if you find some, but not all aspects of Option 2 agreeable, please specify which aspects of Option 2 you agree with.

- Policy Option 3: Future development is dispersed across the Island which could be in more rural locations if there can be better alignment with infrastructure availability.
- Variations: as above: use this box if you find some, but not all aspects of Option 3 agreeable, please specify which aspects of Option 3 you agree with.

9. Do you agree with the method of calculating housing need set out in Part Two of the Spatial Strategy Evidence Paper i.e. the 'Standard Method'.

- I agree.
- I have a neutral view.
- I do not agree.
- I have no views on this question.

10. Do you agree with the gross calculation of 7,460 new dwellings needed between 2021 and 2037 to meet a population of 100,000 people set out in Part Two of the Spatial Strategy Evidence Paper?

- I agree.
- It is too high.
- It is too low.
- I have no views on this question.

11. Do you agree with the residual housing need of 1,847 as set out in Table 1.9 of the Spatial Strategy Evidence Paper?

- I agree.
- It is too high.
- It is too low.
- I have no views on this question.

12. The average household size on the Island at the time of the Census in 2016 was 2.28. It reduced to 2.22 in the 2021 Census. The Spatial Strategy Paper sets out calculations based on a projected average household size of 2.16 in 2031 as well as the possibility of it being 2.22 in 2031. Do you have any comments on:

- A 2.16 average household size by 2031

- A 2.22 average household size by 2031

13. How supportive would you be of interim reviews of the housing figures within the Strategic Plan via a National Policy Directive (NPD)? Such reviews could revise 'targets' upwards or downwards outside of the plan process.

- I am supportive.
- I have neutral views.
- I am unsupportive.
- I have no views on this question.

14. Do you agree with the gross calculation of 6.26 ha. of employment land needed to 2026 as specified in Table 1.12 of the Spatial Strategy paper based on existing evidence?

- I agree.
- It is too high.
- It is too low.
- I have no views on this question.

15. Should retail and general office development continue to be directed to town centres?

- Yes.
- No.

Should there be exceptions, where retail and general office development might be located outside of a town centre? If yes – what? Please use the box below.

- **I have no views on this question.**

16. In terms of renewable energy generation, which of the following broad policy options do you most agree with? Please select one.

- Policy Option 1 – To retain the rural exception policy in General Policy 3 that relates to over-riding national need – recognising that strategic renewable energy initiatives would be considered to be of “over-riding national need”.
- Policy Option 2 – Include an additional rural exception policy within General Policy 3 specifically for renewable energy initiatives e.g. on-shore wind development, allowing for consideration based on its merits allowing for a careful balancing of the impacts including factors for and against.

Policy Option 3 – Other, please expand on using the text box below:

17. Do you have any other comments to make on the themes discussed in the Main Consultation Document? If so, please use the text box below:

Rural Housing

The following questions are based on matters relating to rural housing issues which are covered in both the Main Consultation Document and expanded on in detail in the Rural Housing Evidence Paper. Please refer to these documents for supporting background information.

18. In respect of potential changes to rural housing policy, which of the following statements do you most agree with? Please select one.

- There should be a presumption against residential development in the countryside without exception (please see question 21).
- Housing in the countryside may be permitted in exceptional circumstances (please see question 19).

19. If you agree that residential development in the countryside should be permitted in exceptional circumstances, which of the following cases do you believe should be exceptions? Please select multiple.

- Essential housing for agricultural workers who have to live close to their place of work.
- As above but include other industries.
- The conversion of a redundant agricultural building to form a dwelling.
- Residential development on land deemed to be previously developed (as defined in the existing Strategic Plan) or as amended and what should that amendment refer to.

Other, please specify below:

20. In respect of replacement dwellings in the countryside, should there be greater protection for vernacular Manx cottages/dwellings for instance in terms of demolition, replacement or extension? Please explain below

21. Should there be design guidance or pattern books relating to rural dwellings and other development? These could cover matters such as design features, size, materials, layout, landscaping, external treatment and care for vernacular buildings etc.

- Yes
- No
- I have no views on this question
- If yes, what other elements might be covered? Please use the text box below

22. In respect of tourism, which of the following statements do you agree with most?

- Tourism development in the countryside should be the exception i.e based on opportunities in existing buildings.
Some new accommodation (of scale) is acceptable in the countryside including on our coasts (Please see question 23.)

23. If you agree that some new accommodation (of scale) is acceptable in the countryside, including on our coasts, which of the below types of accommodation might you find acceptable in principle? Please select multiple.

24. Serviced accommodation (such as hotels)

25. Non-serviced accommodation (such as self-catering units)

Other, please state:

24. In respect of Manx Tholtans, which will be defined, which of the following broad policy options do you prefer? Please select one.

25. Policy option 1: They should be retained in their ruinous state

26. Policy Option 2: They should be viewed as 'bothies' with virtually no services and thus little environmental impact. Any development could be linked to a footpath network.

27. Policy Option 3: They should be renovated with a greater degree of service provision for tourism or permanent residential uses.

Biodiversity Net Gain

The following questions are based on matters relating to Biodiversity Net Gain which is covered in both the Main Consultation Document and expanded on in detail in the Biodiversity Net Gain Evidence Paper. Please refer to these documents for supporting background information.

25. Do you agree that a target for Biodiversity Net Gain should be set?

- I agree.
- I have a neutral view.
- I do not agree.
- I have no views on this question.

26. Should there be a standard or a tiered approach to Biodiversity Net Gain?

- Standard approach.
- Tiered approach.
- I don't know.

27. Do you agree that a Biodiversity Net Gain Tariff should be set for small planning applications such as the extension of a dwelling?

- I agree.
- I have a neutral view.
- I do not agree.
- I have no views on this question.

28. Do you agree that Biodiversity Net Gain policies should be linked to an independent verification process in respect of the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain supply?

- I agree.
- I have a neutral view.
- I do not agree.
- I have no views on this question.

29. While not every topic or existing policy can be covered with a specific question we would like to hear if you have any other thoughts or proposals for consideration as part of this review. Let us know in the text box below.