

**Feedback from Consultant/LPA/Full Council for Consideration/Action by the
Steering Group/Work Group Leads**

	Criteria	Source	Response/Comments	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
1.1	Have the necessary statutory requirements been met in terms of the designation of the neighbourhood area?	Dartmoor NP and Teignbridge DC websites	Letters from both authorities confirm Parish formally designated as the Neighbourhood Area, and Teignbridge DC as lead authority.	Liz Beth LB Planning		
1.2	Have the necessary statutory requirements been met if designation of a forum is needed?	N/A	N/A	Liz Beth LB Planning		
1.3	Has the plan been the subject of appropriate pre-submission consultation and publicity, as set out in the legislation, or is this underway?	Town Council website and draft Consultation Statement	Yes. The consultation is on-going, and progress on the Plan is well documented on the Town Council website – which has all minutes of the steering group available. The process set out on the website for Reg14 has some inaccuracies, which I understand will be updated after our discussion.	Liz Beth LB Planning		
1.4	Has there been a programme of community engagement proportionate to the scale and complexity of the plan?	Website, Parish Clerk and draft Consultation Statement	Volunteers were sought for a NDP Steering Group, and it is comprised of Town Councillors and residents. They have been organising the engagement as well as drawing up the Plan. An initial questionnaire was drawn up and sent to over 4000 homes and businesses. Responses were received from just over 20% of the adult population, which for a town this size is a good result. Devon Communities Together were commissioned to	Liz Beth LB Planning		

	Criteria	Source	Response/Comments	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
			<p>analyse the results of this survey, which was done clearly and comprehensively.</p> <p>The draft Consultation Statement details engagement events where qualitative information and views were sought, and attempts were made to engage young people specifically with trips to schools.</p>			
1.5	Is there a clear project plan for bringing the plan into force and does it take account of local authority committee cycles?	Draft Plan	There is a section on Projects to be undertaken, and a commitment to review the Plan and use it in responding to planning applications (paras 10.2-3) is good. However the commitment to review is vague, a timeline of annually or biannual review to assess if the Plan is still up to date would be better, perhaps a decision reported to the annual parish meeting?	Liz Beth LB Planning		
1.6	Has an SEA screening been carried out by the LPA?	Steering Group	This process is just being initiated. It would be advisable to wait on the screening opinion before beginning Reg14, in case an assessment is needed. If it is, it would need to be available during the Reg14 consultation.	Liz Beth LB Planning		
1.7	Has an HRA screening been carried out by the LPA?	Steering Group	This process is just being initiated. Advice as for SEA provided.	Liz Beth LB Planning		

Part 2 – Content

	Criteria	Source	Response/Comments	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
2.1	Is it clear which parts of the draft plan form the 'neighbourhood plan proposal' (i.e. the <i>neighbourhood development plan</i>) under the Localism Act, subject to the independent examination, and which parts do not form part of the 'plan proposal', and would not be tested by the independent examination?	Draft Plan	There is a separate projects section, but it comes before the final Section 10 on Monitoring and Review. As projects should be clearly separate from the Plan itself, the information on Projects should come after Section 10. Para 9.1 should make it clear that a neighbourhood plan is concerned with planning policy, not setting out a strategy for implementing projects. Projects and the made Plan could be reviewed annually.	Liz Beth LB Planning		
2.2	Are there any obvious conflicts with the NPPF?		No, although policy is often too vague contrary to NPPF requirements	Liz Beth LB Planning		
2.3	Is there a clear explanation of the ways the plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development?		Discussion of sustainable development is included in the text in Section 3.2, with regard to local and national policy. A consideration of how the BPNP policies promote sustainable development will be needed for submission, and could be undertaken as part of the Basic Conditions Statement.	Liz Beth LB Planning		
2.4	Are there any issues around compatibility with human rights or EU obligations?		None apparent.	Liz Beth LB Planning		
2.5	Does the plan avoid dealing with excluded development including		Yes	Liz Beth LB Planning		

	Criteria	Source	Response/Comments	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
	nationally significant infrastructure, waste and minerals?					
2.6	Does the Plan have an end date?	Draft Plan	Yes - 2033	Liz Beth LB Planning		
2.7	Is there consensus between the local planning authority and the qualifying body over whether the plan meets the basic conditions including conformity with strategic development plan policy and, if not, what are the areas of disagreement?		The LPA have identified some policies that they feel may not be in general conformity with strategic policy in the development plan. Where appropriate this is considered in Section 3 of this report.	Liz Beth LB Planning		
2.8	Are there any obvious errors in the plan?		Some minor references to process need to be corrected (see below).	Liz Beth LB Planning		
2.9	Are the plan's policies clear and unambiguous and do they reflect the community's aspirations?	Draft Plan	See Section 3 of this report, below.	Liz Beth LB Planning		

Part 3 – Policy Review

Policy Title and number	Potential Basic Conditions issues	Recommended improvements – if any	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
BPNP Policy H1 – Affordable housing	LPA has Questioned compliance with strategic policy WE2.	<p>Policy H1 supports the provision of a higher percentage of affordable housing on sites where it is required, than the 30% required by Policy WE2 in the development plan (TLP33). As this is just ‘support’ not a requirement I do not consider it contrary to the strategic policy, there is no mention of 30% being unacceptable – which would threaten to not be in general conformity with strategic policy – unless reasons for it were well-evidenced.</p> <p>The local connection requirement for affordable housing will need to be defined within the policy for clarity. The advice from the LPA on wording is helpful as regards need and implementing a cascade of ‘local’. The Dartmoor NP SPD on affordable housing (2014) has examples of local definition and timelines for offering locally before widening the search for an occupier. I appreciate the detail may not be appropriate for settlements outside the national park, but the SDP usefully identifies issues that a policy needs to be clear</p>	Liz Beth LB Planning		

Policy Title and number	Potential Basic Conditions issues	Recommended improvements – if any	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
		<p>on.</p> <p>The statement that “if demand for this type of house exceeds supply, the qualification criteria will be amended to impose more control” is contrary to the Basic Conditions. It is not acceptable for reasons of policy clarity to include an intention to increase restrictions in a policy without any detail or certainty (NPPF para16). It also introduces ambiguity contrary to NPPF para16.</p>			
BPNP Policy H2 – Housing for elderly residents	LPA has Questioned compliance with strategic policy S22 in TLP33.	<p>The objective to enable local people to continue to live in their community is laudable, and there is a recognition that there is a need for housing better suited to the elderly. However as currently worded the policy is too vague to be effective, and could as the LPA point out, be seen to promote residential development outside of settlement boundaries within the national park and defined countryside. This may well mean the policy would be ruled out at an examination as being contrary to the Basic Conditions.</p> <p>The suggestion that the policy could include a requirement for elderly housing provision within new sites would be worth considering.</p>	Liz Beth LB Planning		

Policy Title and number	Potential Basic Conditions issues	Recommended improvements – if any	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
		<p>Examples of neighbourhood plans doing this include the Hengrove and Whitchurch Park NDP in Bristol – where policy HWP9 requires 3% of new dwellings to be wheelchair accessible. Other policies require a certain amount of homes to meet higher standards of accessibility as defined by the Building Regulations Part M.</p>			
BPNP Policy H3 – Provision of storage		<p>This policy, by use of the word ‘supported’ is quite weak. As the LPA suggest, you could use firmer language here. This is a general issue with many of the policies as currently drafted. Unless you state clearly what is required, and give any caveats necessary, then the policy is not going to have ‘teeth’, and can be ignored by a developer without redress.</p>	Liz Beth LB Planning		
BPNP Policy H4 – Accommodation for vehicles		<p>I agree with the LPA comment that there is some duplication, and potential conflict with policy T5. The issue would seem to be better dealt with in the transport section of the plan, and any policy will need to be firmer – again the use of ‘support’ negates the lengthy list of requirements that follows.</p>	Liz Beth LB Planning		

Policy Title and number	Potential Basic Conditions issues	Recommended improvements – if any	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
BNPN Policy H5 – Open space		LPA advice is useful here, and would make the policy more effective.	Liz Beth LB Planning		
BNPN Policy H6 – Sustainable homes		Here the use of ‘supported’ is correct, as neighbourhood plans are not allowed to require higher standards.	Liz Beth LB Planning		
BNPN Policy LE1 – Protection and enhancement of landscape		LPA suggestion re wording would make the policy more effective and stronger.	Liz Beth LB Planning		
BNPN Policy LE2 – Tranquillity and dark skies		You may wish to specify no light pollution here for clarity. Policy DMD5 in the Dartmoor NP DMD2013 refers to development that will ‘introduce or increase light pollution’.	Liz Beth LB Planning		
BNPN Policy LE3 – Native hedgerows and Devon banks		OK	Liz Beth LB Planning		
BNPN Policy LE4 – No net loss of priority habitat or species		There is a requirement in the Government 25year Environment Plan that development offers a net gain to biodiversity, which is discussed in the text of the BNPN (section 5.1). This policy needs to be stronger and introduce the idea of net gain rather than protect against net loss.	Liz Beth LB Planning		
BNPN Policy LE5 – Wildlife-friendly		The wording needs to remove reference to ‘We’, as it is the	Liz Beth		

Policy Title and number	Potential Basic Conditions issues	Recommended improvements – if any	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
development		development plan not an organisation that offers policy. The list of possible wildlife-friendly construction details is useful, but the use of 'should' needs to be clarified with 'where appropriate' as the requirement will not always be relevant to a development. The last sentence and requirement is likely to meet with resistance, as most developers do not have an ongoing interest in the development. This requirement may be reasonable in cases of mitigation measures, but would apply to the development and mitigation works, not to a developer.	LB Planning		
BPNP Policy LE6 – Lowland heath		The policy needs to use the present tense 'will be' not 'would be'. It would be wiser to state that "The restoration or re-creation of lowland heath will be supported and required where relevant in mitigation proposals." To state that development that does this without caveat is supported, could allow development that is contrary to many other requirements in the development plan.	Liz Beth LB Planning		
BPNP Policy LE7 – Protection of bat	LPA has noted the need to	Amend wording of 'strategic flyways' to 'landscape connectivity zone'.	Liz Beth LB Planning		

Policy Title and number	Potential Basic Conditions issues	Recommended improvements – if any	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
flyways	reference flyways differently for clarity.	Not for reasons of plain English though...			
BPNP Policy LE8 – Protection of views		Policy and evidence are good. See comments in the Introduction re presentation of evidence. An overall plan showing where the protected views are would be useful.	Liz Beth LB Planning		
BPNP Policy LE9 – Character areas		Figure 5.1 is currently a long way from this policy in the text. I am not sure why the figure is relevant for LE4 – will it be showing linking habitat? Or does the term ‘Character Area’ refer to the different natural habitats and features? If it is the latter, then there will be some confusion caused, as ‘character area’ is normally used to define differing urban forms within a settlement. I can’t see any assessment of the urban form undertaken for these purposes – but perhaps it is work that has been done?	Liz Beth LB Planning		
BPNP Policy LE10 – Local Green Spaces		The evidence for the LGS has been presented adequately. Future improvement plans are not really relevant, although they do show community involvement I suppose. Where there is little evidence	Liz Beth LB Planning		

Policy Title and number	Potential Basic Conditions issues	Recommended improvements – if any	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
		provided for designation of the current space (Churchfield Drive Meadow), they will not on their own justify designation. Without visiting the sites, I would suggest that Churchfield Drive Meadow, Rendells Meadow and the allotments need further consideration and evidence to support designation, which is specifically not suited to all green spaces, and needs to be allocating a 'special' space.			
BPNP Policy LE11 – Bovey and Heathfield Gateway Preservation Area		The Policy needs to formally designate the Preservation Area, saying that this has been done in the text only does not meet acceptable standards of clarity. As I find map 5.1 difficult to read in its current draft form, and do not know the area, I cannot really comment on how reasonable in planning terms this designation is. I am assuming it is an area of separation – which has been done in other made plans – in Wiltshire for example.	Liz Beth LB Planning		
BPNP Policy LE12 – Provision of green infrastructure	Possibly too vague to be useful.	Again, use of 'We' is not correct. The policy is rather vague, and may be considered to not have the clarity required of planning policy by the NPPF.	Liz Beth LB Planning		
BPNP Policy LE13 –		Do you want to include the Town	Liz Beth		

Policy Title and number	Potential Basic Conditions issues	Recommended improvements – if any	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
Management and maintenance of green infrastructure		Council as well as ‘local people’ in the last sentence – perhaps in an oversight role rather than ‘engaged’? ‘encouraged’ rather than ‘supported’ would be more appropriate.	LB Planning		
BPNP Policy LE14 – Water courses and river banks		The Policy is rather awkwardly worded at present, the first two lines are really justification rather than policy. The meat of the policy is in fact referring to all watercourses, not just the River Bovey. It is not a Basic Conditions issue, but you may want to tidy it up. It is possible the Environment Agency will suggest wording when they are consulted.	Liz Beth LB Planning		
BPNP Policy LE15 – Sustainable energy		With this policy you have rightly caveated your support for any development with conditions when it will be acceptable or not acceptable.	Liz Beth LB Planning		
BPNP Policy T1 - Highway Safety and Environmental Impact	Improvements for clarity needed.	The first sentence here is not policy, it is a statement of what will happen when a planning application is received. Rather than state that ‘planning applications will be supported, which is vague and too open, refer to the need for development to incorporate measures. “All development proposals will be expected to incorporate..... local road network”.	Liz Beth LB Planning		

Policy Title and number	Potential Basic Conditions issues	Recommended improvements – if any	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
		Would be a more acceptable policy.			
BPNP Policy T2 - Traffic Management		Again, I'd suggest you frame the policy as "Where appropriate development will be expected to...."	Liz Beth LB Planning		
BPNP Policy T3 - Sustainable Travel		And for this policy use the phrase "encouraged to include" or "Where appropriate, development will be expected..."	Liz Beth LB Planning		
BPNP Policy T4 – Compensation for loss of parking		The Parking zone will need to be formally designated by this Policy. "A Parking Policy Zone is designated as shown in Figure 6.6...". Has this been agreed with the highway authority? If not, then it could be seen as dealing with highway matters not landuse, although as the policy is aiming to enhance the street environment there is a landuse element. As the policy could be contentious it needs evidence, and there has obviously been some work on this. For clarity, you may like to add a sentence or two in the justification, explaining how the Parking Zone will improve things.	Liz Beth LB Planning		
BPNP Policy T5 - Residential Parking	Rationalisation of policy T5 and H4 needed.	As discussed above, this Policy will usefully be amalgamated with Policy H4. The LPA have raised very pertinent issues about a sliding scale of provision depending on the	Liz Beth LB Planning		

Policy Title and number	Potential Basic Conditions issues	Recommended improvements – if any	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
		number of bedrooms. As for other types of development, does the Highway Authority have parking standards? Properly evidenced requirements for all type of development would be a significant piece of work.			
BPNP Policy T6 - Electric Vehicles	At present the policy is too onerous.	Not all developments would warrant provision of a charging point – change of use and minor household applications for example. The use of the phrase “Where appropriate, developments will be expected to include...” gets round this, and dropping the “will be supported” at the end.	Liz Beth LB Planning		
BPNP Policy C1 – Provision of additional health care facilities	LPA has Questioned compliance with strategic policies S22 and S1 in TLP33.	Policy S1 in the TLP33 requires development to be located where sustainable travel modes are likely to be well-used, and that services are provided where they are accessible. The LPA have criticised policy BPNP C1 as potentially encouraging development in the countryside, and without knowledge of the settlements of Brimley or Heathfield, I understand that the Settlement Boundary includes these two areas as well, so including this as a criteria may address issues of the policy being too open and possibly	Liz Beth LB Planning		

Policy Title and number	Potential Basic Conditions issues	Recommended improvements – if any	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
		encouraging development in the open countryside or National Park. Alternatively you could add the caveat “and comply with other policies in the development plan” at the end of the policy. Although this caveat has been criticised as being always understood as applying and therefore unnecessary; I feel it usefully ensures there can be no perceived conflict encouraged in some circumstances.			
BPNP Policy C2 – Provision of community facilities	Policy is vague, and may be taken to support development with the right facilities in unsuitable locations.	The first sentence presents an either or situation with the Le Molay Littry Way site, <i>or</i> another, and I am not sure this is intended. There is no information about what ‘suitable’ means here. For clarity I would remove the reference to other sites from this first paragraph. The third paragraph deals with general provision of community facilities, and so covers alternative provision. Again I would use the caveat “and complies with other policies in the development plan” in order to make it clear that the support does not override strategic and other policy considerations.	Liz Beth LB Planning		
BPNP Policy C3 – Re-provision of Bovey		OK	Liz Beth LB Planning		

Policy Title and number	Potential Basic Conditions issues	Recommended improvements – if any	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
Tracey Primary School					
BPNP Policy B&E1 – Application for change of use		Policy EC2 in the TLP33 does not protect retail uses from change of use to residential, as the justification text recognises. Policy BPNP B&E1 is not necessarily contrary to the development plan, but it is quite onerous, and evidence of any recent loss of retail units and Pubs would help justify it.	Liz Beth LB Planning		
BPNP Policy B&E2 – No subdivision of existing buildings		Definition of a core retail area should be done within this policy, with reference to the figure that shows it. Again local evidence of a problem would usefully support this policy. This need not require extensive research, but ‘it would seem sensible’ needs further clarification to be robust. See also comments on B&E3 below	Liz Beth LB Planning		
BPNP Policy B&E3 – Provision of start-up units		Would new build be a problem in the Core Retail Area? If so, policy B&E2 will need to also set out the types of development that is acceptable within in.	Liz Beth LB Planning		
BPNP Policy B&E4 – Internet speed and technology		OK	Liz Beth LB Planning		

	Criteria	Source	Response/Comments	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
2.2	Section 2.2 bottom of page 4:		There are no regional planning authorities now. Housing allocations are determined by the LPA after undertaking research into housing needs of their area (or commissioning it). The 5 year land supply requirement comes from central government, and how that is assessed has now been standardised (subject to review due to current circumstances possibly). So this information needs some changes for accuracy.	Liz Beth LB Planning		
2.5	Section 2.5 1 st para:		The definition of 'strategic' is not quite accurate, for example site allocations, unless very small would normally be considered strategic. The LP Review (2.12) has listed strategic policies as the NPPF now requires. Until the LP Review is an adopted document however, the list given is not accurate for the purposes of the Basic Conditions, as general conformity is required with the adopted development plan. You may wish to state this instead, and perhaps agree with the LPA which policies in the TLP33 are strategic.	Liz Beth LB Planning		
2.7	Section 2.7:		The description of process here is muddled and sometimes inaccurate. At Reg14 the LPA will need to be consulted, and are very likely and can be expected to offer detailed	Liz Beth LB Planning		

	Criteria	Source	Response/Comments	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
			<p>comments on the Plan. At submission stage (Reg15) the LPA is just checking that the Plan and other documents meet the requirements of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations. Finally, once the examiner has produced a report, the LPA will decide whether to accept the report and produce a decision statement giving their reasons. The Town Council does not have a formal opportunity to alter the Plan at this stage, they may be consulted but do not have to be. Basically once you submit your Plan, it is also a handover of most decision-making to the LPA.</p>			
4.3	Section 4.3		<p>This short section could use further explanation of what neighbourhood plans can and can't do. For example not mineral and waste issues or strategic infrastructure. Traffic calming as land-use is OK, specific highway measures are not (eg speed limits). 'Land-use' is a concept that most people will need further explanation of.</p>	Liz Beth LB Planning		
8	Section 8 - Introduction		<p>I understand the reason for emphasising uncertainty at this time. However you will need to remove this reference before the Reg14 consultation. The draft plan has to be clear what it proposed and can't indicate that it may change beyond</p>	Liz Beth LB Planning		

	Criteria	Source	Response/Comments	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
			alterations in response to comments received at Reg14.			
P8	Page 8		At the top of page 8 there is reference to the draft Local Plan containing a 'large' number of policies with a viability caveat. I wouldn't say there were a large number of these as only 13 out of the 80 policies include this. The purpose of this caveat is not to suggest that the policy would be fundamentally changed, just that the specific percentages included might vary once the viability of the plan as a whole has been tested. Therefore the principle of what the policy says shouldn't be affected, just the actual figures.	Michelle Luscombe TDC		
H1	H1	exceedance of Local Plan affordability requirements may prejudice the Council's ability to secure other Local Plan requirements, including essential	I understand why you would want to try and exceed Local Plan requirements, however whilst the policy only seems to be 'supporting' this, it is not clear whether that means you would be opposing any proposals which came in for less than 30%. Without a viability clause this is problematic as it has the			

	Criteria	Source	Response/Comments	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
		infrastructure and carbon reductions.	potential to conflict with delivery of other Local Plan policies. The Local Plan 30% target is based on a viability assessment NOT a needs assessment. Unfortunately it is just not feasible to deliver the amount of affordable homes that are evidenced as needed in the district. Viability is a material consideration and this is confirmed through national policy so we must take it into account. In addition, the Local Plan target is likely to change (reduce) in the new plan due to a) the desire to build more socially rented homes rather than affordable rented homes which generate less income for the developer and b) the additional requirements we are asking for in terms of carbon neutral development, accessible housing, better design etc. which all have added costs to a development.			

	Criteria	Source	Response/Comments	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
			I have raised a query with my housing colleague about the local connection requirement and whether that conflicts with the Councils' housing policies. I will forward her comments on as soon as I receive them.			
H2	H2	Potential conflict with LP policy S22 which strictly manages development in the countryside. More detail is required about what an acceptable location would be, particularly in relation to whether this sort of development would be acceptable with the national park.	<p>Does this policy give free rein to this type of development anywhere in the parish? The way that it is currently worded means housing for the elderly could theoretically be developed anywhere as long as it is on a bus route. Do you want to qualify this any more, i.e. only outside of the DNP, only within or very closely related to/adjoining Bovey, Heathfield or Brimley?</p> <p>Also, what sort of schemes would this apply to? Would you permit a single bungalow/step-free property anywhere on a recognised bus route or with</p>	Michelle Luscombe TDC		

	Criteria	Source	Response/Comments	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
			<p>easy access to the town centre? Or does this policy only relate to larger schemes for managed elderly accommodation such as care homes, retirement communities, retirement homes? These all have differing levels of care/independence provision.</p> <p>Are you wanting to include a requirement for elderly housing provision within any potential new allocated sites that might come forward in the Local Plan review?</p> <p>Would you require any part of the elderly housing to be affordable or would it all just be available on the open market? If you don't have/don't want anything specific about this then it will just default to the Local Plan affordable housing targets but it might be useful to make clear what your expectations</p>			

	Criteria	Source	Response/Comments	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
			are if you have strong feelings about it.			
H3	H3		Could be stronger, e.g. <i>“Development will be required to incorporate the provision of...”</i>	Michelle Luscombe TDC		
H4	H4		See comments on T5 and T6	Michelle Luscombe TDC		
H5	H5		Sometimes the most important thing isn't about quantity of green open space but its quality, location and connectivity. The new draft Local Plan policies on green/natural infrastructure is proposing to only ask for the Fields in Trust standards to be used as a starting point for planning green open space/natural infrastructure. This is because there are sometimes existing nearby facilities (e.g. a play area, recreational field) which are accessible from new	Michelle Luscombe TDC		

	Criteria	Source	Response/Comments	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
			<p>developments and with additional investment could provide a better facility with better connections to a wider range of residents and reduce longer term management costs of multiple facilities. I'm not saying your policy is wrong to be aspirational and achieve lots of green space but when you're trying to balance lots of competing land uses (parking, housing, gardens, bin storage, SuDS, roads, footpaths, biodiversity gain etc.) it's just something to bear in mind.</p> <p>One suggestion is to focus in the policy on the key things you have listed in your supporting text and be more firm about the things that you will require, e.g.</p> <p><i>"All major housing developments (above 10 units) will make the provision of public green open space a priority and</i></p>			

	Criteria	Source	Response/Comments	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
			<p><i>will be required to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Provide a visible central space with public seating</i> - <i>Be clearly visible from the internal living spaces of nearby properties</i> <p><i>Be designed to maximise walking and cycling and to encourage health benefits which arise from access to green space.”</i></p>			
LE1	LE1		<p>Suggest you just reword this to make it stronger: <i>“Development will be required to protect and enhance the unique moorland....”</i></p>	Michelle Luscombe TDC		
LE7	LE7	Reference to strategic flyways just needs to be replaced with landscape connectivity zone	<p>We don't have strategic flyways anymore – these have been replaced by a “landscape connectivity zone”. Suggest you just amend the policy to read: <i>“To help protect the landscape connectivity between the component roosts of the South Hams Special Area of Conservation (SAC),...”</i></p>	Michelle Luscombe TDC		
T5,	T5, T6 and H4		Policy H4 seems to repeat and	Michelle Luscombe TDC		

	Criteria	Source	Response/Comments	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
T6 and H4			<p>conflict slightly with T5 and T6. It might make more sense to remove H4 and combine its dimension requirements within T6.</p> <p>Do you want to include standards/requirements for cycle parking and/or electric bike charging points?</p> <p>In terms of parking requirements, I think you need to consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do they apply to ALL new developments? At the moment, only housing development qualifies. What about offices, warehouses etc.? - Should you have a blanket approach or a sliding scale depending on number of bedrooms? A one bed flat near the town centre will have less demand for parking spaces than a 4 bed 			

	Criteria	Source	Response/Comments	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
			<p>house on the edge of the town.</p> <p>Do they apply to extensions or changes of use? For example, someone applies for an extension to turn their 2 bed home into a 4 bed home. Would you require additional parking? We do have a clause within our Local Plan policy that adequate provision for car parking is made where necessary on this sort of proposal but within your parking hot spots is this sufficient? On the other hand, would you want to resist someone being able to extend their own home just because of a potential parking issue, particularly if they were near to the town centre and their car use may be limited?</p>			
C1	C1	Potential to conflict with policy S22 which strictly manages development in the countryside.	It's not clear from the policy whether there are any geographical restrictions to the relocation of the health facility. Could you specify for example that it is within or adjoining the settlements of BT, Heathfield or	Michelle Luscombe TDC		

	Criteria	Source	Response/Comments	Reviewer	Resulting Action	Undertaken by
		Also potential to conflict with policy S1 Sustainable Development.	Brimley? Otherwise the facility will encourage car travel and conflict with other policies of the plan.			
C2			It might be useful to add a bit more detail about what you mean by a suitable site, even if this is in the supporting text. For example, do you just mean a site that is flat, low flood risk, no environmental designations etc? Or more that it is closely related to BT, accessible via foot and cycle, within or adjoining the settlement, redeveloped brownfield land etc?	Michelle Luscombe TDC		
				Full Council		
				Full Council		
				Full Council		