

Questions for the Parish Council and their responses

Andrew's Question	Parish response
<p>Policy 1</p> <p>Should I conclude that the combined effect of part 1.1 to part 1.3 of the policy is that small scale sustainable development will be supported in the neighbourhood area?</p> <p>Is part 1.4 of the policy necessary given the nature of the existing policies in the development plan?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Included as a backup to all other policies</p> <p>This policy highlights a key issue/area of concern in our neighbourhood area, given the development pressures in and around and the extent of environmental assets.</p>
<p>Policy 2</p> <p>I understand the general thrust of the policy. Nevertheless, is it necessary as affordable housing will have been safeguarded at the time it was permitted?</p>	<p>Included as a backup to ensure affordable homes are protected even if they are not protected under other legislation.</p> <p>Our intentions are to ensure that the properties are maintained as affordable in perpetuity.</p> <p>EDDC Housing team have advised that there are models of low-cost home ownership where remaining as affordable housing in perpetuity can be maintained,</p>
<p>Policy 3</p> <p>Is part 3.1 of the policy a restatement of existing local policy and procedures?</p> <p>Should part 3.2 of the policy be applied where it is appropriate to do so?</p>	<p>This policy is important in the physical characteristics of the three settlements.</p> <p>Both parts of the policy we wish to retain.</p> <p>Developments may link to local services via existing routes which the PC considers unsafe; this policy is to encourage improvements to existing off site routes.</p> <p>The intention was to engage local knowledge to help residents, developers and the planning authority to improve safety.</p>
<p>Policy 4</p> <p>Is this policy needed?</p> <p>Is it a strategic issue already addressed by the District Council on a day-to-day basis?</p>	<p>We feel that this is the most important policy and support by EDDC comments.</p> <p>Most developments are considered in isolation or at best in association with other developments within the parish. Woodbury Parish is significantly impacted by</p>

Andrew's Question	Parish response
	<p>development in Exmouth and other towns, parishes and proposed new towns. The cumulative effects particularly of traffic arising from planned developments outside the parish need to be considered.</p> <p>We understand the comments being made in the submissions by developers and suggest we clarify our policy wording. We can see the need for our policy wording to be clarified. For your consideration, we would like to propose the following where the first sentence will now read:</p> <p>Any development of more than ten dwellings within the parish must have an assessment of the cumulative impact of speed, volume, pollution and noise of traffic on the environment which takes account of any other development that has been granted or is known to be strategically planned within the parish or adjacent to the parish boundary.</p>
<p>Policy 7</p> <p>I appreciated the landscape character throughout the visit. In general terms the policy reads well.</p> <p>In part 7.2 of the policy, I note that several examples are provided as viewing points. Nevertheless, if viewing points are not otherwise defined in the Plan will it be practicable or reasonable for the District Council to be able to apply the policy through the development management process?</p> <p>In addition, how would views out of the neighbourhood area be determined? Is the intention to identify views which begin within the neighbourhood area (which are appropriate for a neighbourhood plan to address) and then extend out of the neighbourhood area (and where a neighbourhood plan cannot address land outside its defined area).</p>	<p>Specific view points have not been included as we consider it would be impractical to list every view into our settlements. and we are concerned that as a list would never be comprehensive and would allow the opportunity for developers to exploit loopholes.</p> <p>It is difficult to identify views out of the Plan Area as these will be specific to a proposed development.</p> <p>The policy aims to protect important views and landmarks, encouraging the conservation and enhancement of key view types and patterns. We consider that a list of viewpoints cannot be provided as different types, design and scales of development will impact upon any view in differing ways and to different extents. The policy is intended to allow flexibility for the decision maker to determine the impact on the particularly important views from the specific development proposed (and this might include impact on the visual integrity, identity, scenic quality or contribution to a heritage assets setting).</p>

Andrew's Question	Parish response
<p>Policy 8</p> <p>Does the policy bring any added value beyond the contents of national and local planning policies?</p>	<p>Yes. The intention of the policy is to set the EDDC policy as a minimum to be exceeded wherever possible and to emphasise the issue raised by many residents during consultation.</p>
<p>Policy 9</p> <p>In general terms this is a good policy. I am minded to recommend that it is modified so that it can take a proportionate approach (based on the type and scale of the development proposed). Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?</p>	<p>We would however be keen for any modification not to reduce the provision of our drafted policy.</p>
<p>Policy 10</p> <p>The policy takes a positive approach towards non-designated heritage assets. Did the Parish Council consider identifying any such assets?</p>	<p>The purpose of this policy is to protect heritage assets which, as yet, are unknown or unidentified it is therefore not possible to identify them in the Plan.</p> <p>I would refer you the Community Action set out in your plan at 6.12 which shows an intention to identify assets, as this work is intended to be undertaken to work with our Conservation Officer of EDDC to identify local non-designated heritage assets for local listing.</p>
<p>Policy 11</p> <p>Did the Parish Council consider providing clarity on the green spaces to be safeguarded by the contents of this policy as part of the Plan preparation process?</p>	<p>Green and community spaces are identified in the existing Local Plan or permitted land use designations.</p> <p>Recreation Areas, Allotments and Accessible Open spaces" shown at Woodbury on the adopted Local Plan policies map:</p> <p>New Local Plan district West</p>

Andrew's Question	Parish response
<p>Policy 12 In general terms the policy takes a positive approach towards business development. Nevertheless part 12.1 of the policy takes a very matter-of-fact approach. It would be helpful if the Parish Council explained its approach.</p>	<p>The Plan Area includes several designated business areas whose boundaries are set by EDDC. If EDDC seek to extend these boundaries we will consider those proposals based on their merit. Where boundaries are extended we will support appropriate development within the extended boundaries.</p> <p>There has recently been an application to develop a large food distribution facility on a greenfield site not associated with any of the designated business areas.</p> <p>This policy seeks to increase our powers to protect the Parish from proliferation of such developments. There have been incidents of unauthorised development and this has heightened our desire to emphasise our need for managed business expansion.</p>
<p>Policy 15 This is a good policy which recognises the importance of community facilities and acknowledges that their circumstances may change in the Plan period. In this broader context, did the Parish Council consider providing clarity on community facilities to be safeguarded by this policy as part of the Plan preparation process?</p>	<p>Identifying specific 'community facilities' has not been considered as it is difficult to prepare a definitive list. A list could be included such the doctor's surgery, the post office, village halls, village school, retail premises or any other facility adding to the sustainability of the communities within the Plan Area.</p>
<p>Representations Does the Parish Council wish to comment on any of the representations made to the Plan? I would value the Parish Council's comments on the representations from:</p>	<p>Some of the representations are from developers and relate to specific proposed development sites – we do not consider that these require any amendment of the Plan as drafted.</p>

Andrew's Question	Parish response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 West Group; • Deven County Council; • Richard House (via LRM Planning); • FWS Carter; and • Devon Countryside Access Forum. <p>The District Council makes a series of comments and suggestions. I would find it helpful to receive the Parish Council's comments on the representations made by the District Council.</p>	<p>The representation from EDDC covers many of the points raised in previous comments and observations. We have already considered these and do not propose making any further amendments to the Plan as drafted.</p> <p>We have already therefore considered representations from DCC and DCAF and made any changes to the Plan that we felt were necessary before submission.</p>