

Date: 22 August 2018
Contact number: 01395 571736
Email: ptwamley@eastdevon.gov.uk



Colyton NPSG

East Devon District Council
Knowle, Sidmouth, EX10 8HL
DX 48705 Sidmouth
Tel: 01395 516551
Email: csc@eastdevon.gov.uk
www.facebook.com/eastdevon
www.twitter.com/eastdevon

Colyton Neighbourhood Plan: Draft feedback

Our comments are intended to enhance what is already a well-considered plan. The Plan has a good flow and is clearly punctuated with informative tables and content throughout.

I would stress at the outset that this letter provides informal officer comments only that relate to matters that you may feel warrant attention or consideration. We have not had the opportunity to seek member opinion or views on your consultation plan and these views are expressed without prejudice to any officer or Council opinion (including potential formal or informal objections) that may be made at a later date. We are seeking to be helpful and constructive in views expressed but it is important to recognise that it is your plan and the clear onus will be on you justifying plan content and satisfying yourselves that through your work you have followed correct procedures as applicable to your role in Neighbourhood Plan production. Advice is provided in relation to conformity with the adopted Local Plan 2013-2031.

Our comments are included below for your consideration.

Colyton Draft NP Response – EDDC

East Devon – an outstanding place

Chief Executive: Mark R Williams Deputy Chief Executive: Richard Cohen



Para 3.2 – The revised NPPF (2018) is used as the main reference. Just to note this is acceptable if you are planning for submission after January 24th, 2019. Any plan submitted before that date must reference and be assessed using the NPPF (2012).

Para 3.4 – East Devon Villages Plan was adopted on 26 July 2018.

Para 3.5 – Not essential but might be worth referencing the quote (East Devon Local Plan, 2016, p159)

Para 4.10 – We'd suggest you add the East Devon Villages Plan to this section.

Para 5.4 – We'd suggest rephrasing 'A neighbourhood plan policy has been introduced where it is felt that it strengthens or brings local specificity to the Local Plan.' Maybe... 'All policies contained within the Neighbourhood Plan strengthen or bring local specificity to better determine planning outcomes for Colyton Parish beyond those policies contained in the Local Plan'.

Policy No. Coly1 –

Could you link to the Natural England list of priority habitats/species in the footnote?

'Development proposals should: ... ii) protect, manage and enhance the network of habitats, species and sites of importance including trees and woodlands' hedgerows and roadside verges' – intention is sound, however in reality we cannot demand that development proposals manage and enhance an environment, the focus needs to be on limiting the adverse impact of development and demanding mitigation measures and contributions where adverse effects are identified. If a resident applies for a minor extension it would be onerous to request that the proposal includes a scheme to manage and enhance the local network of habitats.

Does Coly1 add any local distinction to the Local Plan policy as it is written? We'd suggest adding specific reference to map 2 in the policy to drive home the locally informed aspect.

Para 7.8 – We'd suggest avoiding reference to the remainder of the land outside of the AONB and BUAB as being treated as equal to AONB as that may undermine your policy. The parish wide reference may also appear to conflict with national and strategic AONB policy. The AONB designation should be recognised as being distinct and associated AONB national and local policy should be supported in the plan (no need to repeat what is already highly restrictive policy contained in the Local Plan). Coly1 should be specific to areas outside of the AONB / BUAB to avoid conflict with AONB or BUAB strategic policy.

Map 2 – Very blurred, needs to be a better quality for final version for effective management. The map in the original linked document is clear, would just need to match that resolution.

Policy No. Coly2 – Great to see woodlands specific policy. Could be enhanced in line with guidance linked below:

Woodland Trust's manual for

planners: <http://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/publications/2017/09/planning-for-ancient-woodland/>

Woodland Trust's neighbourhood planning microsite:

<https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/campaigning/neighbourhood-planning/>

National Planning Context - Suggest your text is brought in line with below final copy:

NPPF paragraph 175 states:

When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:

c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons[58] and a suitable compensation strategy exists;

Footnote 58 states:

For example, infrastructure projects (including nationally significant infrastructure projects, orders

under the Transport and Works Act and hybrid bills), where the public benefit would clearly outweigh the loss or deterioration of habitat.

Para 7.14 - ...major contribution to the rural and natural character of the area and **should be afforded be protected from** development. Included amongst their... (extra words 'be afforded'?).

Para 7.20 – We'd suggest removing any reference to Green Belt designation, the two designations of Green Wedge and Green Belt are distinct and the reference potentially risks undermining your rationale.

Policy No. Coly6 -

'Development within or immediately adjoining the Built-Up Area Boundary will generally be supported provided it: ' – 'Immediately adjoining the BUAB' would allow for significant development outside of the boundary and not conform to the Local Plan, we suggest 'or immediately adjoining' is removed.

Development within BUABs has robust policy in place through the development plan for East Devon including the Local Plan and the Villages Plan. Does policy Coly6 improve on those policies or provide local specificity? We consider that as it is written it may supersede existing policy that provides more comprehensive development control for the parish. This is an opportunity to introduce locally specific design policy to add detail to the Local Plan should you wish.

Not sure that the second point is necessary- Colyton is recognised as being sustainable and so has a Built-up Area Boundary- there is no need to refer to the settlement hierarchy? Is there any scope to include renewable energy/carbon reduction measures?

The section title includes 'Heritage' but there aren't any heritage policies?

Policy No. Coly7 – Not complete at this stage for comment.

Para 8.9- Add 'the' before local planning authority.

Para. 9.4 – 'It is the only oak bark tannery in **the** Britain' (extra word 'the').

Para. 9.5 – Suggest removal of '**it is quite possible that there is a significant degree of under-employment**' unless this can be evidenced.

Policy No. Coly8 –

'small-scale' – Could do with defining small-scale and why limit the scale of employment opportunities if a proposal could meet all of your criteria?

'predominantly residential areas' is a little vague and could be open to interpretation by potential developers, could do with defining this as within the BUAB or specifying where you support employment development proposals outside of the BUAB. In addition, the revised NPPF para 84 requires policy to allow for development outside of existing settlements to meet local business and community needs, 'predominantly residential areas' may not conform to that requirement.

Policy No. Coly9 –

- i) **'scale of development is small'** – suggest small needs some definition, in any case the policy works well without it. Suggest removal of 'is small'.

Policy No. Coly11 –

'All new residential, educational and business premises development will be required to make adequate, appropriate and effective provision for high speed broadband and other communication networks.' - This cannot be enforced as a 'requirement', suggest rephrasing to **'All new residential, educational and business premises development should seek to make adequate, appropriate...'** or similar. We cannot insist that a developer (of any scale) installs a communication network.

Policy No. Coly12 – Does this policy have any impact or local advantage beyond Strategy 5B? Coly12 doesn't have the checks and measures to reduce the impact of any development on the environment. You mention interchanges / linkages / bus refuges but would the community want a bus depot built in the parish backed by this policy? We think the policy may not serve any real planning purpose, if you feel you wish to maintain it we'd suggest tightening up the criteria to avoid any potential impact.

Policy No. Coly15 -

'Proposals for public car parking areas within or adjoining to town of Colyton, will be supported in their entirety or as part of new developments on suitable sites where: - suggest rewriting this section, not clear as it is written.

Para 11.4- Woodrolfe should be Woodroffe.

Policy No. Coly16-

Should this include a reference to development carried out as part of these uses? eg sheds/ subdivisions/ hard standings/ parking as they can be detrimental to the landscape and visual amenity if they are 'haphazard'.

Policy No. Coly17-

New recreational facilities may result in impacts wider than residential amenity and traffic/parking. Potentially noise, landscape impact, floodlighting and impact on wildlife and the historic environment are important considerations.

Glossary – The term 'Use Classes' is not in alphabetical order.

If you have any questions on our comments please do come back to me. I'm away on leave from Friday 23rd, returning Monday 3rd September.

Yours sincerely

Phil Twamley
Neighbourhood Planning Officer