

Dartmouth Neighbourhood Plan

South Hams District Council Regulation 14 Response, received 28th September 2021

With comments/ actions by the DNP Steering Group added

1) The Draft DNP: Comments on General Text

Comment	SG comment/ response	Action
Para 1.7: 3rd sentence: Suggest this reads....."then forms part of the Development Plan for South Hams alongside the JLP."	Noted	Will correct
Para 2.3: suggest under Green Environment last objective reads...."Protect Local Views". Under Built Environment suggest....."Designate Settlement Boundary". Under Housing perhaps "Controls on private hosing" needs to be more explicit in what is sought.	Noted these objectives were developed by the community, topic groups and steering group.	Will change
Para 3.3: The latest NPPF is dated 2021.	Noted	Will correct
Map 3: Suggest Undeveloped Coast Designation is shown on this Map.	Please refer to Map 6 where the Undeveloped Coast designation is clearly shown	No change proposed
Para 6.2.1: Suggest reference to JLP Policy and in particular DEV 14 is mentioned in the Background .	Please refer to para. 6.2.2 where Dev 14 is referenced	No change proposed
Para 6.6.8: My colleague officers suggest that a combined LEAP/LAP may be the best approach. I would suggest this is discussed with the relevant officer.	Noted however this does not change the relevance of the text as drafted	Text will be revised to make reference to a LEAP/LAP in Rock Park

Policies and SHDC comments

Policy	SHDC Comments	SG response	Action taken
Policy DNP GE 1 Impact on the South Devon Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) In addition to National and Development Plan policies and guidance controlling development in and within the setting of the South Devon AONB, Undeveloped Coast and Heritage Coast, development within the Parish must demonstrate, where appropriate due to the size and scale of the development the following;- a) how it maintains and enhances the intrinsic Landscape Character Areas and Types (LCT) of the	Suggest this Policy is refined. Firstly remove references that are already covered by the JLP and NPPF. These need not be repeated. Secondly does this Policy apply to straightforward development such as house extensions and changes of use? It would be worthwhile I suggest that the Policy clearly identifies the categories of development it aims to control. The term	We do not agree with this comment and believe that reference to the NPPF and JLP gives context to the policy and 'due to the size and scale' gives the appropriate level of interpretation to exclude smaller projects. Similar wording has passed examination on other Plans	Title to be amended to 'Impact on the South Devon AONB, Undeveloped Coast and Heritage Coast'. 'Parish' to be replaced by 'designated landscapes'

<p>landscapes affected as set out in the latest Landscape Character Assessment for the South Hams;</p> <p>b) why it cannot be accommodated reasonably outside the Heritage Coast and Undeveloped Coast designation;</p> <p>c) How the natural assets and constraints of a development site have been assessed. Substantial harm to or loss of irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland and within historic boundary features, walls, hedges, banks and ditches should be wholly exceptional;</p> <p>d) how opportunities for improving public access to and the enjoyment of the coast have been included.</p>	<p>used in the opening sentence “due to size and scale” is not clearly defined. Furthermore the Policy in its opening sentence appears to imply the Policy applies across the Parish and other formal designations whereas its title is limited to appears to limit to the AONB area.</p> <p>Criterion c) This criterion asked for significant information to be submitted with relevant planning applications. The LPA’s Validation checklist sets out the requirements, this need not be repeated. Any addition to this list should be fully justified.</p>	<p>(such as South Huish and Salcombe) in fact the specific reference to the NPPF and JLP was requested at examination on South Huish so we are reluctant to change it. Similar wording of Criterion c) has passed examination at South Huish and Salcombe. A review of the LPA’s Validation Checklist is subject to review and a recent consultation so we are unsure what the version at the time of examination of this Plan will say.</p>	
<p>Policy DNP GE 2 Safeguarding the biodiversity and Green Infrastructure throughout the Parish Where appropriate due to the size and scale development proposals should;-</p> <p>a) Include a Green Infrastructure plan to show how the development can improve greenspaces and corridors for people and nature, in the context of the parish and where possible connecting to the green matrix of the plan area and the broader green infrastructure of South Devon. The individual components of the green matrix illustrated in Map 7 should be protected and opportunities sought to improve accessibility and enhance and extend this matrix.</p> <p>b) Include a biodiversity action plan which includes details of how the development will achieve a net gain in biodiversity in compliance with national policy requirements.</p> <p>c) Retain on site natural features such as Devon banks, stone walls, hedgerows,</p>	<p>As with Policy DNP GE1, the opening sentence refers to “size and scale of development” which is not clearly defined.</p> <p>Criteria a) and b): As above with the comments on Policy DNP GE1 criterion c) requirements on the Validation Check list need not be repeated and if additional should be fully justified.</p>	<p>As above the text of the policy follows similar lines to the adopted South Huish N Plan which was significantly changed at examination including adding reference to ‘size and scale’. The adopted version of the Salcombe Plan has no reference to size and scale so is more onerous.</p> <p>Please note that the adopted South Huish policy SH Env 3 follows very similar lines to this policy. We are reluctant to change or dilute a policy that is considered sound at examination. See our comments above regarding the</p>	<p>Minor changes proposed for clarity</p>

<p>protecting existing mature trees beyond those protected within a Tree Preservation Order.</p> <p>d) Where possible replace any alien and foreign species of trees considered invasive or harmful with indigenous species.</p> <p>e) Promote where reasonable opportunities for improving access to heritage assets and green space through new walking routes.</p>		<p>Validation Checklist which is subject to review.</p>	
<p>Policy DNP GE 3 Local Green Spaces</p> <p>The following areas illustrated in Map 8 with supporting evidence of their special qualities included in Table 3 are designated as Local Green Spaces:-</p> <p>LGS1 Coronation Park LGS2 Royal Avenue Gardens LGS3 Community Greenhouse and adjacent gardens LGS4 Dartmouth Castle Wall LGS5 Castle Estate LGS6 Jawbones Allotments LGS7 Milton Lane Allotments LGS8 Longcross cemetery LGS9 Community Orchard LGS10 Warfleet Creek, Lime Kilns, Quay and Slip. LGS11 Sandquay wood LGS12 Norton Wood LGS13 Norton Field LGS14 Manor Gardens LGS15 Crosby Meadow LGS16 Jawbones Beacon Park LGS 17 Bowling Green LGS 18 Play area at the junction of Victoria Road and Vicarage Hill</p>	<p>This Policy should include policy guidance on development proposed in an LGS. I would suggest having regards to policies in “made” NPs and the JLP content will guide this.</p> <p>Concerns remain regarding the following LGS designations in that the proposal could compromise Council’s Plans:- LGS 12 LGS14 LGS 17</p> <p>Furthermore, an agreement was reached with the Council, regarding LGS 16, to exclude land from this allocation. The plan (Map 8) illustrating this needs to be clearer.</p> <p>I have been asked by my colleague officers why Rock Park Open Space/ Britannia Avenue, Collingwood Road, Archway Drive play areas have not been allocated?</p> <p>I WOULD SUGGEST A MEETING IS CONVENED WITH RELEVANT OFFICERS</p>	<p>Point noted, but please refer to our response to this comment before on 20/5/21 .Policy guidance is already included in para. 6.1.4 as supporting text. We shall add extra guidance as suggested however such background guidance was specifically removed at examination on the South Huish NP as it was considered unnecessary due to clear requirement for a LGS under the NPPF. In view of the above we do not consider your comment on regarding ‘made’ plans is fully justified.</p> <p>It is not clear what SHDC’s ‘plans’ are for LGS’s 12,14 and 17 and suggest officers share these with the steering group and Town Council. On 1/12/20 SHDC officers offered support for the designation of LGS 12, this was repeated on 12/5/21 their view now appears to have changed.</p>	<p>Expand introductory text.</p> <p>We have reviewed additional LGS designations suggested by SHDC but have concluded that no changes are justified.</p> <p>Make clear reference to Map 8A</p>

	<p>OF THE COUNCIL TO DISCUSS THE ISSUES RAISED.</p>	<p>Please refer to Map 8A in the evidence base that clearly shows the agreed area. We will however make this reference clearer in the revised Plan.</p> <p>Following SHDC officer’s suggestion of 12/5/21 the play area at Britannia Avenue was considered for LGS designation but the SG did not consider it fully met the criteria . The SG reviewed this again and the other two suggestions for designation and concluded that they should not be included.</p> <p>The Reg 14 consultation was the main opportunity for the LPA to make representations. Meetings have been held with officers so we are not sure what benefit a further meeting will deliver without clear proposals from SHDC. The group can make themselves available for such a meeting but we see no clear benefit or scope to change existing views.</p>	
<p>Policy DNP GE4 Allotments The plan supports the retention of allotments at Milton Lane and Jawbones. The importance of Milton Lane and Jawbones allotments as assets to the community, and local food production is recognised by their designation in this plan as Local Green Spaces. The repurposing or</p>	<p>Suggest the first sentence could be worded more strongly”The allotments at Milton Lane and Jawbones will be retained...”</p>	<p>Comment noted and we shall consider the suggestion.</p>	<p>Review and change text as suggested.</p>

<p>encroachment on these existing sites will not be supported. Development that includes provision for community allotments will be supported.</p>			
<p>Policy DNP GE5 Maintaining the character and the environmental quality of the river The natural characteristics of the Dart estuary should be retained in any development along the waterside. For any future waterside development consideration should be given to respect the following criteria;- a) All existing wooded areas visible from the river, particularly those running to the water's edge and/or where they start at the visible natural ridge line should be retained; b) Any adverse impact on the health and quality of the river from development must be mitigated against; this includes impact from noise, pollution, such as sewage and litter; c) There should be an overall positive impact on the wildlife designations along the river edge as indicated in the Green Matrix strategy (Map7) and the Wildlife Resource Map for the Plan Area (Appendix E2) Designations that must be safeguarded include; Special Areas of Conservation, County Wildlife Sites, Strategic Nature Areas and Other Sites of Wildlife Interest.</p>	<p>Criterion c): The documents referred to are already material considerations suggest reference to them is moved to the justification for this Policy.</p>	<p>We do not agree with your suggestion. Para c) makes specific reference to locally specific evidence e.g., the Green Matrix and the wildlife resource map.</p>	<p>No change proposed</p>
<p>Policy DNP GE 6 Locally Important Views Development within the foreground or middle ground of the views shown in Map 9a and b , and Appendix F should not harm and should, where possible, contribute positively to the existing composition of natural and built elements. Development should not be overly intrusive, unsightly or prominent to the detriment of the view as a whole, or to the landmarks within the view.</p>	<p>No comment other than many views have been identified it may be worthwhile considering a reduction identify key views. The identification of so many views may dilute the overall intent of this Policy.</p>	<p>Point noted but we do not agree that the number of LIVs is excessive for a complex built and natural environment. All are clearly justified in Appendix F</p>	<p>No change proposed</p>

<p>Policy DNP GE7 Actions to mitigate against climate change and carbon reduction</p> <p>This Plan supports the objectives contained in the Devon Climate Change Strategy (September 2018) and the emerging Devon Carbon Plan. All new development should:-</p> <p>a) Assess and monitor the carbon footprint of the development its impact on and community actions including local tourism, employment, transport, farming and its own operations to enable it to reduce carbon in the development and future operation.</p> <p>b) Make the town and employment activities more innovative, environmentally friendly and responsible, carbon neutral and sustainable. This applies to all businesses but in particular tourist accommodation, ferry companies, the marina, hospitality, and event sectors.</p>	<p>I suggest this Policy is more clearly focussed. Firstly is it appropriate to apply to all development, I believe this is too onerous.</p> <p>Criteria a) is difficult to understand and I would suggest difficult to put into practice. Criteria b) is more focussed but applies a greater onus on identified sectors. This needs to be fully justified</p>	<p>We shall review the wording of the policy but are surprised by this comment, all projects should endeavour to mitigate against climate change and reduce carbon. SHDC declared a Climate change and bio-diversity emergency on 25th July 2019 and in the absence of a clear policies from the LPA beyond JLP Dev 32 (which generally only refers to Major Projects) this policy builds on the emerging Devon Carbon Plan and is in general conformity with the Local Plan. Criteria b) applies to all employment sectors however we have highlighted the most prevalent in the Plan area.</p>	<p>Review text wording based on this and other representations</p>
<p>Policy DNP GE 8 Promotion of tree planting</p> <p>All appropriate development where it is demonstrated that the proposals achieve an increase in biodiversity and carbon capture through additional tree and other planting and appropriate land management will be supported.</p> <p>Development that damages or results in the loss of ancient trees or trees of good arboricultural and amenity value will not normally be permitted. Proposals should be designed to retain ancient trees or trees of arboricultural and amenity value. Proposals should be accompanied by evidence that establishes the health and longevity of any affected trees.</p>	<p>Second paragraph, third sentence: the Local Validation List determines if the information required is necessary to the determination of a planning application and need not be repeated here.</p>	<p>Comment noted however there are examples locally where there has been in the past damage to valuable trees and this policy wording helps reinforce this.</p>	<p>Changes to text based on this and other representations.</p>

<p>New tree planting must not conflict with and should complement wildflower rich grasslands. Community based initiatives to plant trees and enhance biodiversity, wildlife habitats and will be supported where appropriate.</p>			
<p>Policy DNP GE 9 , Encouraging renewable energy If planning permission is required the development of small scale renewable energy generation where supported by the community will be encouraged, this includes;-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biomass; where material is sourced from the coppicing local woodland and hedgerows; • Hydro power generation from local watercourses; • Technologies making use of the River Dart; • Small scale solar power when roof mounted on domestic, employment and agricultural buildings; • Ground source and air source heat pumps; • Community heating and combined heat and power. <p>Wind turbines and large-scale ground mounted solar power are not considered appropriate methods of generation within the parish. Where appropriate proposals should demonstrate that they will not affect the integrity of the Statutory and Non-Statutory wildlife sites within the parish and will have no detrimental impacts on South Devon AONB, and the SSSI's within the parish. Where necessary proposals must be supported by protected species surveys and the identification of any necessary mitigation measures. For the purposes of this policy small scale is defined as less than 50Kwp..</p>	<p>No need to say “if planning permissions is required” since the Policy will naturally apply to all new development. In terms of the penultimate sentence the Local Checklist will determine the level of ecological information necessary which need not be repeated.</p>	<p>We note that on 12/5/21 SHDC had ‘no comment’ to make on this policy. The wording as drafted reflects a similar policy that was amended at examination at South Huish (SH Env6) We will modify the text but are concerned we are changing wording that is considered sound elsewhere in the District.</p>	<p>Modify text as suggested</p>

<p>Policy DNP GE 10 Prevention of light pollution; Development should not detract from the unlit environment of Dartmouth and surrounding countryside and should minimise their impact on the night sky. The use of a high proportion of glass in walls and roofs without consideration of the impact on the environment when internally lit will be discouraged. Security lighting, outside lighting, and floodlighting should be designed to minimize their impact on the night sky with lighting deflected downwards and switched off after midnight</p>	<p>Much of what this Policy seeks is outside planning control. I would suggest this Policy recognises this by stating that “support is given” for the inclusion of the measures listed.</p>	<p>Noted, however very similar wording passed examination at South Huish (SH Env 8) without change. Other representations have suggested the policy should go further.</p>	<p>Review policy text based on this and other representations.</p>
<p>Policy DNP GE 11 Prevention of Flooding; Development proposals should, where necessary demonstrate that the impact on the existing foul and surface water system has been assessed and includes details of on-site mitigation if required. Any proposals in the proximity of the Environment Agency flood risk areas illustrated in map 10, and subsequent revisions to the Flood Map, and highlighted in their flood risk modeling should have due regard to historic flooding incidents and the reports of these prepared on behalf of Dartmouth Town Council, included as Appendix O. There should be no adverse impact on local streams, leats, flood channels and neighbouring properties. The design of any flood defences should be carried out in consultation with the community and appropriate to the historic and natural settings of the plan area. Materials used should be in accordance with the policies of this plan and the planning guidance of the South Devon AONB.</p>	<p>I would suggest the Environment Agency are specifically consulted on the content of this Policy. NB they are a Statutory consultee at Reg 14 also the Flood Risk Maps are updated frequently so better include a link rather than the Map itself?</p>	<p>The Environment Agency have made a representation at Reg 14 and generally welcome this policy however they have made specific suggestions to give greater reference to flood risk and we shall address these. We believe that including a map with reference to ‘subsequent revisions’ is a sounder approach.</p>	<p>Review policy wording based on representations from the Environment Agency</p>
<p>Policy DNP GE12. Settlement Boundary A settlement boundary for Dartmouth is designated in this Plan and illustrated in Map 11. Development inside the settlement boundary is supported in principle subject to National Policy and Guidance and the Development Plan.</p>	<p>Second sentence: suggest this reads....”Development inside the settlement boundary is acceptable in principle.....”</p>	<p>Noted however the wording used was considered sound at examination of the South Huish Plan (SH Env 1)</p>	<p>Modify text</p>

<p>Development proposals outside the settlement boundary will be treated as development in the open countryside.</p> <p>To protect the character and appearance of Dartmouth, development which erodes the visual separation of the settlement will not be permitted.</p>			
<p>Policy DNP EC 1 Tourism related employment and retention of hotels</p> <p>The change of use or redevelopment of a hotel to non-hotel use will generally not be supported . Such a change will only be supported provided that;-</p> <p>a) The proposed use would be compatible with the existing building and its surroundings and setting within the Dartmouth Conservation Area and South Devon AONB;</p> <p>b) No loss of hotel accommodation in the Parish or detriment to local employment will result;</p> <p>c) Demand for the hotel accommodation no longer exists.</p> <p>Development may include;-</p> <p>d) Change of use to residential care or extra care which supports the Plan objectives to both provide employment and specialist affordable housing for the elderly.</p> <p>Where the loss of a hotel or tourism related site is justified as no longer viable the applicant must demonstrate through an independent assessment that the vacant unit has been actively marketed and offered at a reasonable sale price (comparable with valuations achieved elsewhere in the District) for a minimum period of 2 years.</p>	<p>How will “significant” in criterion b) be assessed.</p> <p>Criterion d) appears to counter the principle on which this Policy is set?</p> <p>Suggest the final paragraph to this Policy better sits alongside criterion c)?</p>	<p>You comment on ‘significant’ refers to an earlier draft of this policy issued to SHDC in April / May 2021. The word was removed prior to Reg 14 however such wording passed examination on the South Huish Plan (SH ECO1)</p> <p>Similar wording to criterion d) passed examination at South Huish so we consider it sound.</p> <p>The final paragraph relates to all the criteria and again this wording has been considered sound at examination at South Huish</p>	<p>Text modified</p>
<p>Policy DNP EC 2 Promotion of innovative tourism businesses</p> <p>This plan supports development that includes new, innovative and sustainable tourism related uses. Activities include but are not limited to;-</p> <p>a) Green , low carbon and sustainable tourism</p>	<p>No comment</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No change proposed</p>

<p>b) River and water based leisure activity; c) The research and development of technologies that support the marine leisure industry; d) Activities that link to the SW Coastal Path and cycle routes; e) Cycle and electric cycle hire supporting sustainable tourism and transport. The proposed uses should be compatible with their surroundings and setting within the town, river, countryside and conserve and enhance the South Devon AONB.</p>			
<p>Policy DNP EC3 Additional employment land and safeguarding of existing employment uses. a) Retention of existing employment sites is supported unless other suitable sites are found that are more compatible with the existing transport infrastructure and surrounding residential neighbourhoods. Changes of use resulting in the loss of employment land will generally not be supported. c) Upgrading, intensification and enhancement of existing employment sites with poor environments and access is supported. Provision of additional storage space on existing sites will be supported. d) In order to consider improvements on a comprehensive basis rather than piecemeal a Development Brief and masterplan for their regeneration should be prepared in consultation with the Town Council. A model brief is included in the Appendix P1. All development should respect and respond to the agreed brief. e) Where other suitable sites are identified and the loss of an existing employment related site is considered justified as no longer viable the applicant must demonstrate through an</p>	<p>JLP Policy DEV 14 adequately covers the loss of employment sites does it need to be replicated in this Policy?</p> <p>Criterion d) Requiring the production of Development Briefs is onerous and, I consider, unreasonable. Have any discussions with owners, stakeholders and employees been undertaken?</p> <p>Criterion f) Please clarify what is meant by “Where other suitable sites are identified”</p> <p>Criterion e) Please clarify when the viability test is required for example would it be required where an acceptable change of use is proposed?</p> <p>Criterion f) Would the logic of this criterion be better understood if it simply states that prior to consideration of an application for change of use to a</p>	<p>Please refer to our response to SHDC on 20/5/21:- <i>‘This policy is more specific to Dartmouth where there are particular challenges on existing sites and specific needs e.g., extra storage. We do not agree that a development /planning brief or framework/ masterplan is an onerous requirement as is found frequently in Development Plans including the JLP.’</i></p> <p>Regarding your comments on criteria f) – there is no such criteria in this version. However, In response to the points raised;</p> <p>Criteria e) ‘where other suitable sites are identified’</p>	<p>Policy text to be revised as noted.</p>

<p>independent assessment that vacant units has been actively marketed and offered at a reasonable sale price (comparable with valuations achieved elsewhere in the District) for a minimum period of 2 years.</p>	<p>non employment use a viability test will be required?</p>	<p>refers to the provisions of criteria a) where other sites found in the plan area- we do not consider this needs clarification. Viability testing is only required if an employment use is lost-this is made clear in the wording. 'and a change of use to non-employment use is proposed' to be added after viable in the first sentence.</p>	
<p>Policy DNP EC4 Support for the primary and secondary shopping area of Dartmouth All development in the primary and secondary Shopping Areas illustrated in Map 12 should retain business and retail uses (User Class E) including restaurants and cafes. With the exception of those granted under Permitted Development other changes of use that compromises the primary and secondary shopping areas will not be supported . Subdivision of existing retail and business units will generally be supported. At upper levels of the Primary and Secondary Shopping Area this plan supports development of flats over shops in vacant or under-used accommodation. Adequate parking must be provided in accordance with Plan Policy DNP ST2. Ancillary uses will be permitted providing they do not undermine the shopping and historic characteristics of the Conservation Area and the Primary Shopping Area. The amenity of existing uses should not be compromised with new development through noise, smells and congestion on pavements.</p>	<p>I suggest it would be worth setting out clearly in the justification the changes of use that would be unacceptable. As it stands the Policy opposes any change of use which may not be the case.</p> <p>Third para requires adequate car parking, this may not be possible in Town Centre locations and its application could lead to upper floors remaining vacant. I would suggest tie up between this Policy and ST2 is required to make clear expectations.</p>	<p>Comment noted, there is considerable flexibility in new User Class E so we do not consider further justification is necessary. The policy as drafted also supports residential uses at upper levels.</p>	<p>No change proposed</p>

<p>Where the loss of a retail or business related use is justified as no longer viable the applicant must demonstrate through an independent assessment that the vacant unit has been actively marketed and offered at a reasonable sale price (comparable with valuations achieved elsewhere in the District) for a minimum period of 2 years.</p>			
<p>Policy DNP EC 5 Business start-ups and mixed use employment including living over the shop, and live work. This plan supports the development of business start-up units within new and existing employment areas through the development of Brownfield sites and the upgrading of existing sites and the combination of employment and living accommodation, providing;- a) The development is in keeping with the scale of the surrounding residential area and other businesses; b) The new use will not have any detrimental impact on local residential amenities; c) Significant amounts of traffic and a need for parking will not be generated that cannot be adequately catered for by the existing infrastructure locally; d) The proposal will not have a harmful visual impact on the town or the adjacent open countryside.</p>	<p>First paragraph: “new” sites are mentioned yet no sites have been identified in the NP.</p> <p>Suggest this Policy is better split into two Policies one that deals with business start-ups and a second that deals with live work proposals.</p>	<p>Please refer to our response to SHDC dated 20/5/21. New sites refers to those delivered through brownfield and upgrading under DNP EC3.</p> <p>We do not agree that the policy should be split the subjects are interconnected.</p>	<p>No changes proposed</p>
<p>Policy DNP EC 6 Employment uses in the countryside The conversion of redundant agricultural buildings, their expansion or development of new buildings for small-scale employment uses will be acceptable in principle within the countryside provided that;- a) The scale of employment use is appropriate to the accessibility of the site by public transport, cycling and standard of local highways;</p>	<p>This Policy replicates the content of JLP Policy DEV15. The purpose of an NP Policy is to define and justify local requirements. NB; DEV15 is specific that only “suitable locations” will be considered.</p> <p>Last sentence: I am checking with Development Management whether the definition of redundancy conflicts with the standard test applied by</p>	<p>Please see our response on 20/5/21, this policy goes beyond Dev 15, is more locally specific and more positively worded. As noted before a similar policy in the District (South Huish) was considered sound at Examination. Two other made Neighbourhood</p>	<p>No change proposed</p>

<p>b) Proposals respect the character and qualities of the landscape and environment as outlined in Policy DNP GE1 and include effective mitigation measures to avoid adverse effects or minimise them to acceptable levels. An existing building is considered redundant if it has remained vacant for a period exceeding two years. Evidence in the form of dated photographs will be required to confirm the period that the building has remained vacant.</p>	<p>Development Management. (NB: It is considered the inclusion of this test complicates an already adequate JPL Policy DEV 15)</p>	<p>Plans in South Devon (Kenton and Ogwell) have similar policies.</p>	
<p>Policy DNP ST1: Footpaths and cycleways The existing PRoW and other access routes to the natural environment of Dartmouth should be protected and enhanced. All new development in the Plan area should link to a safe path network that connects the Parish, surrounding settlements, and the SW Coast Path where feasible. Where appropriate, opportunities to improve and extend the existing network will be sought as part of any development proposals. New and existing footpaths should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) where appropriate and excluding the SW Coast Path promote their use as cycleways; b) in consultation with landowners introduce and help establish new routes which include completing the footpath links between Stoke Fleming and Dartmouth on the A379 and linking safely Dartmouth Academy, Jawbones and Crowthers Hill. The route is illustrated on Map 13 c) have durable surfacing and effective drainage; d) be easy to navigate with discreet signage; e) be accessible to those with special needs where feasible; f) facilitate the use of electric bikes with charging points at location agreed with Devon County Council; g) include improved footbridges and stiles where required. 	<p>Last Paragraph: This need not be stated since the relevant legislation covers the matters raised.</p>	<p>Comment noted, we shall move the last paragraph to supporting text.</p>	<p>Revise policy moving last para. to supporting text.</p>

<p>No new footpath, bridleway or multi access route should have a detrimental impact on wildlife habitats as outlined in the Wildlife Resource Map (AppendixE2) and any future revision.</p> <p>The existing footpath network is shown in Map 13. Proposals for new footpaths, changes in existing PRow, new surfaces and structures must follow due legal process and obtain consent of the landowners and the Highways Authority.</p>			
<p>Policy DNP ST2: Car Parking and Coach Parking</p> <p>a) Existing public car parking should be managed to support the functional sustainability of the town and follow the recommendations of the DCC Transport Study (Appendix Q) and the emerging Transport Study. Where new development has impacts on public car parking these should be neutral or positive in terms of this requirement.</p> <p>b) No development will be supported that causes the loss of public car parking. Should the spaces be relocated there should be no reduction in their convenience to the town and local centres unless it can be demonstrated that the parking is no longer needed due to changes in vehicle use.</p> <p>c) All proposals which are likely to generate an increase in on-street car, trailer and boat parking will be resisted, unless designed as part of an overall parking strategy within a development.</p> <p>d) New residential development including sheltered housing must ensure there is no increase in on-street car parking.</p> <p>e) Where achievable the indicative on-site parking standards set out in the JLP SPD (2020) should be met;</p> <p>1 bedroom: 1 space plus 1 space per 3 dwellings for visitors;</p> <p>2 bedrooms: 2 spaces;</p>	<p>Criterion a) There are concerns that the DCC Transport Study is somewhat dated to include as a material consideration. For information Appendix Q contains the “First Draft” of this Study. Suggest if it is included the adopted Study is included.</p> <p>Criterion b) is very onerous and could stifle supportable development. See comments on DNP EC4.</p> <p>Criterion f) Have the management implications been discussed with the Council?</p> <p>Criterion i) Has this proposal been discussed with the owners of this site I understand the Council and Stagecoach have interests in this site.</p>	<p>Comment noted however the 2004 report is the latest informed study of the transport issues in Dartmouth, Appendix Q1(issues) is noted draft however Appendix Q2 (proposals) are not. In the absence of any further work by the LPA or DCC we consider the report is material to future transport related issues in Dartmouth until the new study is undertaken as outlined in Community Aspiration 6.3.3.</p> <p>We do not agree with your comment on criteria b), lack of parking is a major issue which this clause helps to address. In a similar situation (Hope Cove/ South Huish) a similar policy SHT1 clause b) was considered sound at examination.</p> <p>We do not consider criteria f) is contentious where communities are moving away</p>	<p>The NPG have tried to source the final version of the 2004 study without success having approached the authors and sponsors - DCC, DTC and the consultants responsible (and their successors). Reference to Appendix Q1 and Q2 shall be made.</p> <p>No other changes proposed.</p>

<p>3 or more bedrooms: 3 spaces. This standard can be provided off site if such provision would be of greater overall benefit to the functional sustainability of the town and the development in question, and that off-site provision can be guaranteed as permanently available to the development.</p> <p>f) Parking and charging facilities for electric vehicles, car club/pool vehicles and autonomous vehicles should take priority over petrol and diesel cars. Where new housing development can demonstrate a reduced need for parking due to the utilisation of car club/pool vehicles and autonomous vehicles this will be supported, provided that there are measures in place to support their use.</p> <p>g) Provision for cycle and motorcycle storage, parking and EV charging should be provided wherever appropriate.</p> <p>h) New car parking proposals which adversely affect the setting of a development and surrounding landscape features will be discouraged.</p> <p>i) The area shaded in Map 14 should be safeguarded for coach and bus parking . No other use will be supported unless other suitable locations for coach and bus parking can be found.</p>		<p>from diesel and petrol cars. The Town Council are in dialogue with the District and County councils on this issue. We welcome any specific comments SHDC would like to make at this stage.</p> <p>i) The owners of the site, namely SHDC have been consulted. The purpose of this clause is clear to avoid the removal of the coach/ bus parking provision until an alternative location is found.</p>	
<p>Policy DNP TE1–Subdivision of existing plots . The subdivision of existing plots will only be supported where;</p> <p>a) There is no loss to the character or environmental quality of the surroundings including the Conservation Area and South Devon AONB;</p> <p>b) The site is serviced by a suitable existing highway on one or more boundaries;</p> <p>c) The proposed plot sizes and dwelling sizes are in keeping with other building plots and dwelling sizes in the surrounding area;</p>	<p>The justification of the Policy does not provide evidence regarding the need for the Policy nor where it applies. If issues have been encountered with unacceptable development of this nature, suggest this provides a basis for the justification and an identification of where the Policy should be applied. The current justification solely refers to car parking and potential harm to the CA and</p>	<p>We shall add further justification for this policy however, please note to our response to SHDC on 20/5/21;-</p> <p><i>'Noted, please refer to approval ref 4120/20/FUL (Drakes Cottage) which was considered unacceptable by</i></p>	<p>Further justification to policy has been added. No change to policy proposed.</p>

<p>d) The amenity of adjoining properties is not compromised;</p> <p>e) Adequate amenity space provision is made creating useable private garden space for both the existing and proposed dwellings;</p> <p>f) The existing front building line, where appropriate, is maintained;</p> <p>g) There is adequate space for off street parking as outlined in Policy DNP ST2.</p> <p>h) The increase in hard surfaces and resultant surface water run-off is mitigated on-site and does not exacerbate flooding risks.</p>	<p>AONB. The JLP gives sufficient protection in regard of these designations.</p>	<p><i>DTC where such a policy would have been beneficial. ‘</i></p> <p>The NPG are able to cite other examples which will be forwarded to SHDC separately but it would in our view be inappropriate to include these in the Plan. It is clear to the community at Dartmouth that the JLP does not give sufficient protection.</p> <p>Please note that following guidance from SHDC a similar policy was included in the adopted South Huish Plan (SH HBE3) so we are surprised by the LPA’s comments .</p>	
<p>Policy DNP TE2: Design Quality throughout the Parish</p> <p>Development proposals in Dartmouth Parish should demonstrate high quality design and will be supported where;-</p> <p>a) The design is locally distinctive, reflecting the appearance and character of the area in which the development is to be located. Innovative contemporary design solutions will be supported providing they do not have a detrimental effect on the overall appearance and character of the area.</p> <p>b) The height, scale and density of development reflects the existing grain, height, density and pattern of development in the surrounding area. The design should be in keeping with the site and its</p>	<p>Criterion c) simply repeats National and Local Policy and is not required and should be placed in the justification.</p> <p>Criterion d) requiring local sourcing of materials is too onerous.</p> <p>I would suggest this Policy is reviewed in the light of the above comments and generally it terms of it repeating policy covered at National and Local level.</p>	<p>Please refer to our response to SHDC dated 20/5/21. We believe this response addresses the issues raised.</p> <p>Criterion c) is more locally tailored and it is the opinion of the NPG that this requirement needs highlighting and given more consideration in the Plan area.</p> <p>Criterion d) is good sustainable practice and the inclusion of</p>	<p>No changes proposed</p>

<p>setting and respect the scale, character and siting of existing and surrounding buildings.</p> <p>c) Strategically important , sensitive and prominent schemes of all scales should be considered at an independent, bespoke Design Review Panel, such an approach is outlined in JLP SPD 2020.8 This is of particular importance where proposals impact on the South Devon AONB , Conservation Area and heritage assets.</p> <p>d) The external materials used should be locally distinctive, natural and where possible sourced within South Devon;</p> <p>e) Building setbacks reflect adjoining buildings;</p> <p>f) They incorporate the principles of sustainable and low carbon design as defined by this Plan and Development Plan Policy Dev 32;</p> <p>g) It has regard to the requirements of CPtED and 'Secured by Design' to minimise the likelihood and fear of crime and acts of anti-social and unacceptable behaviour and community conflict in the built environment;</p> <p>h) It reduces the dependence on the private car by supporting and connecting directly, where achievable to other more sustainable modes such as walking, cycling and public transport;</p> <p>i) It retains and protects, wherever possible existing trees, verges, stone walls and hedges in situ. Any lost trees or hedges should be replaced elsewhere on site. Any wall affected should be reinstated;</p> <p>j) It does not exacerbate flooding risks;</p> <p>k) Existing footpaths or public rights of way must be retained, or acceptable diversions agreed.</p> <p>l) There is a safe means of access to the site, that does not result in the unacceptable</p>		<p>the words 'where possible' gives some flexibility.</p>	
---	--	---	--

<p>loss of natural features, or the need to provide excessive widening of local roads. m) Adequate off street car parking is provided; n) The infrastructure needs of the development can be put in place prior to the commencement of the main development.</p>			
<p>Policy DNP TE3 Safeguarding Designated and Non-Designated heritage assets and the conservation area of Dartmouth All proposals in the Dartmouth conservation area and in the vicinity of Designated and Non-Designated Heritage Assets must comply fully with National planning policy and the Development Plan relating to the Historic Environment and;- a) Respect and enhance the Dartmouth Conservation Area and make a positive contribution to the heritage assets and their setting. Have regard to the Dartmouth Conservation Area Appraisal January 2013 including the four extensions to the area. All proposals must give due regard to one of the ten character areas listed below within which the proposal sits. The prevalent traditional materials, finishes and typical building forms outlined in the appraisal should also be respected. b) Give due regard to the asset and demonstrate an awareness of the Devon Historic Coastal and Market Towns survey(DHCMTS) and the Historic Urban Character Areas (HUCA) for Dartmouth produced by Devon County Council and English Heritage which is included as Appendix J3. Due consideration should be given to the historic character of the area within which a proposal sits. c) Where relevant, include design features such as setbacks, stone or render walls and</p>	<p>This Policy repeats protection already in place at National and Local level. I would suggest this Policy is reassessed and concentrates on the protection of Non Designated Assets. Designated assets are protected as a matter of course.</p> <p>Criterion c) It is considered, given this criteria applies to the CA and development “in the vicinity of Designated and Non-Designated Heritage Assets” it is overly onerous.</p>	<p>Comment noted however the policy already focusses on Non-Designated Heritage Assets and the approach taken is generally supported by Historic England and the Historic Environment Team of DCC so we are surprised that SHDC would suggest its reassessment. There is some confusion locally and within the district of the differences between designated and non-designated assets. This policy as worded helps clarify this.</p> <p>We do not consider c) to be onerous and similar wording in a similar situation was considered sound at examination in the South Huish NDP (SH HBE2)</p>	<p>Additional and detailed maps and descriptions of the proposed Non designated/Local Heritage assets has been added to the Plan and supporting appendices. No other changes proposed.</p>

<p>roof details that reflect the character and appearance of the surrounding buildings. For extensions, new doors, windows and roofing materials should be of a similar appearance to those used in the construction of the exterior of the original building.</p> <p>d) Proposals that directly or indirectly affect the significance of Designated Heritage Assets included in Appendix J2 and the following Non-Designated Heritage assets and described in Appendix J,J1 and illustrated in Map 15 should be judged according to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the asset to the parish. Heritage assets that should inform development include archaeological features and historic field boundaries.</p> <p>LHA1 Telephone Box, Victoria Road LHA2 Dartmouth Lower Ferry LHA3 Dartmouth Visitor Centre LHA4 Pony hoops, Crowthers Hill LHA5 Former Norton Heliport Control Tower LHA6 Water tower, Jawbones Hill LHA7 The Armada Memorial Beacon, Jawbones Hill LHA8 Crosby Meadow LHA9 Historic walls of Dartmouth in various locations LHA10 Coombe Recreation Ground, Coronation Park LHA11 Dartmouth Cottage Hospital</p>			
<p>Policy DNP TE 4 ; Respect, protection and enhancement of civic spaces</p> <p>The following spaces illustrated in map 16 and Appendix R1 are identified as civic spaces within Dartmouth;-</p> <p>CS1 Rue de Courseulles Sur Mer/ Coronation Park Riverside CS2 Flavel Place / The Quay CS3 Bottom of Brown's Hill / Foss Street CS4 Foss Street CS5 Market Square</p>	<p>I have consulted the Council's Assets Team in regard of Council owned land that is CS 1, CS10 and CS11: No objections have been raised.</p> <p>Have the owners of the other sites allocated been individually consulted?</p>	<p>Thank you for your support, all owners have been consulted as part of the Reg.14 process</p>	<p>No changes proposed from this representation. However, CS9 to be extended southwards based on other representations.</p>

<p>CS6 Anzac Street CS7 St. Saviour's Church (areas to the North, West and South sides) CS8 The Quay/Boatfloat CS9 Pillory Square (Higher Street/ Smith Street) CS10 South Embankment CS11 Bayards Cove/ Coles Court</p> <p>All development in the vicinity of these civic spaces should where appropriate;-</p> <p>a) Respect, protect and enhance the physical qualities of the space expressed in the Conservation Area appraisal 2013 and the Historic Urban Character areas of the Devon Historic Coastal and Market Towns Survey for Dartmouth 2016.</p> <p>b) Support community uses in the space, which can include but not limited to;-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External seating areas; • Shared surfaces for vehicles and pedestrians; • Pedestrian priority; • Improved public realm including soft landscaping, street furniture, durable and sustainable paving surfaces; • Public art. <p>c) Facilitate greater economic activity in the spaces through external seating, events, dining and temporary 'pop up' uses.</p> <p>d) Support active street frontages to attract social interaction and facilitate natural surveillance and the prevention of crime.</p> <p>e) Facilitate clear, safe and legible public routes.</p> <p>f) Support pedestrianisation on a temporary or permanent basis as and when appropriate.</p> <p>g) Facilitate litter and recycling facilities within the spaces.</p> <p>h) Any loss of car parking spaces within the civic spaces should be re-provided elsewhere</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>within the town and respect the provisions of Policy DNP ST2.</p> <p>The plan also supports the introduction of new civic spaces within new residential areas that should also respect the above qualities.</p>			
<p>DNP TE5 Brownfield first</p> <p>This Plan promotes the redevelopment of previously developed land or ‘brownfield’-first strategy before greenfield sites. This approach will minimise encroachment on the countryside and AONB unless there is proven demand that cannot be met by the brownfield-first approach. The brownfield sites considered suitable for long term re-development as and when there is landowner support and they become available include existing builders merchants, former health facilities, post office, a carpark located within the urban area of Dartmouth. Within the lifetime of the Neighbourhood Plan such sites may become redundant or would benefit in the long term from intensification of existing employment sites and more effective use of land or change of use to C2 Residential Institutions C3 Housing or mixed use (C3 Housing and E Commercial, Business and Service.)</p> <p>As stated in policy DNP EC3 changes of use resulting in the loss of employment land to the plan area will not be supported.</p> <p>A schedule of sites considered suitable for intensification or re-development with a plan locating these are included as Appendix R2 and R3 The conversion of existing buildings are also subject to the other policies of this plan. Priority will be given to new uses that provide maximum community benefit and are appropriate for the site in terms of accessibility and minimum traffic generation.</p> <p>In order to consider development of brownfield and existing buildings is undertaken on a comprehensive</p>	<p>My strong concerns regarding the content of this Policy are set out in my email dated 22/3/21 in respect of the Kingsbridge NP. These comments equally apply to DNP TE5 Brownfield first:-</p> <p>“Your proposal to promote the development of brownfield sites as a priority reflects National and Local Policy. I am concerned however that allocating these sites in the NP could give rise to issues. In the first instance have the owners of these sites been approached to determine their views on the potential for redevelopment if not I consider obtaining their position in advance of formal consultation is important. In the second, and as important as the first, has any work been carried out to test whether these sites can in fact be redeveloped. It is a requirement that sites identified for development/redevelopment in a NP are accompanied by technical, landscape and environmental assessments that exhibit to an Examiner that sites earmarked in the NP can in fact be developed. Two further issues: firstly, I assume, but this is not stated, that the preferred use for these sites is housing?... and secondly I note some of the sites are currently being used so are not technically brownfield. Despite this, my initial view</p>	<p>Comments noted. We have sought independent advice on the wording of the policy (AECOM) which significantly differs from the position taken by SHDC. The NPG’s opinion with other respondents at Reg. 14 consider that the policy as worded contributes to sustainable development within the Plan area, has regard for national policy e.g., NPPF 119 to 123. We would encourage the LPA to take a more positive approach to supporting the development of brownfield sites. It is also the opinion of the NPG and others that the sites referred to in Appendix R2 and R3 are not allocated but are considered ‘suitable for re-development’.</p> <p>As previously advised all the owners have been notified and are generally supportive of our approach. As previously advised, we consider the detailed technical, landscape and environmental assessments is the responsibility of the applicant. We will however as recommended by HE and the</p>	<p>Text revised based on advice from HE and the EA with respect to flood risk.</p>

<p>basis a Development Brief should be prepared in advance of a planning application in consultation with the Town Council. A model brief is included in the Appendix</p> <p>P2 All development should respect and respond to the agreed brief.</p>	<p>is that formal allocation of these sites in the Plan should not be made.”</p> <p>NB: I acknowledge that discussions are ongoing between the Council and the Dartmouth NPG regarding the content of this Policy.</p>	<p>EA draw attention in the policy to the need for comprehensive heritage, environmental and flood risk assessments.</p> <p>Suggested uses are included in the policy wording.</p> <p>We consider the sites referred to in this policy and Appendices R2 and R3 meet the definition of brownfield and previously developed land in the NPPF (Annex 2)</p>	
<p>Policy DNP H1 - Market Housing</p> <p>New market housing is supported in the Parish on infill sites within the settlement boundary. In addition, market housing forming part of an exception site as set out in Policy DNP H2 where it is required to cross subsidise the affordable housing scheme will be supported. All development should meet the following requirements;-</p> <p>a) The housing should respond to local housing needs in terms of type, size and tenure .</p> <p>b) Consideration should be given to provision of places for housing for the increasing number of older people in the parish in the form of market sale sheltered, specialist accommodation, extra care , or assisted living housing. By further consideration of older people this Plan also supports opportunities for existing residents to downsize and make more larger units available to the market.</p> <p>c) Higher standards of accessibility , adaptability and for wheelchair users should be considered beyond the JLP as evidence by the 2021 Housing Needs Assessment prepared for this Plan.</p>	<p>This Policy repeats JLP Policy without adding to it.</p> <p>First sentence: suggest this states.... “the principle” of new market housing on infill sites.....is supported.</p> <p>Criteria a) Suggest need for this criteria is reviewed in the light of JLP Policy DEV 8.</p> <p>Criterion b) Suggest this better sits in Policy DNP H5?</p> <p>Criterion c) As above if this Policy were extended to include the disabled.</p>	<p>We disagree that this policy simply repeats the JLP. A similar worded policy was considered sound in the Salcombe Neighbourhood Plan. We can add ‘the principle’ to the first para. but are unsure of the logic for this. JLP Dev8 is less specific for Dartmouth than this policy which draws on the recommendations of the Housing Needs Assessment (Appendix N) We disagree that b) and c) are better placed in Policy H5; the needs of the increasing number of older people in the Plan area should apply to all market housing- this is made clear in the HNA.</p>	<p>Wording of first sentence changed as suggested.</p>
<p>Policy DNP H2- Exception Sites outside the settlement boundary</p>	<p>This Policy repeats JLP Policy without adding to it.</p>	<p>Please refer to our response to SHDC dated 20/5/21. TTV 27 is</p>	<p>No changes proposed</p>

<p>The use of Exception Sites adjoining the settlement boundary to deliver affordable housing will be supported where they comply with National and Development Plan policy and the policies of this plan. A site will only be permitted if;-</p> <p>a) It meets a proven need for affordable housing for local people;</p> <p>b) The needs of the local community are addressed;</p> <p>c) Management of the scheme will ensure that the dwellings continue to meet such proven needs for initial and subsequent occupiers;</p> <p>d) The development should reflect the character and scale of the parish and be physically integrated with it in terms of design, scale and pedestrian access.</p> <p>e) The proposal conserves and enhances the landscape, scenic and natural beauty of the AONB and the design is in compliance with the latest South Devon AONB Management Plan and AONB Planning Guidance.</p> <p>f) Cross subsidy through the provision of open market housing on the scheme will be allowed only where it ensures the delivery of the affordable housing and shall comprise the minimum number of open market dwellings necessary to ensure the delivery of affordable housing as part of the same development proposal, to be demonstrated by a viability appraisal of the full scheme.</p>	<p>Criterion f) JLP Policy TTV27 sets out the percentage of affordable homes that should be provided on exception sites. This Policy appears to seek higher percentages if this is the case then this needs to be explicitly justified.</p>	<p>less specific than this policy which is why the policy wording is tailored to the particular issues facing Dartmouth, surprisingly in TTV 27 the term Exception Site is not used. TTV 27 sets out the maximum number of market homes permissible on sites, we believe this is contrary to principle of exception sites which should maximise the provision of affordable homes. The policy wording is informed by national guidance (Locality)</p>	
<p>Policy DNP H3 Affordable Housing; Proposals for affordable housing development within the settlement boundary or as exception sites will be supported where;-</p> <p>a) The number of affordable homes to be delivered is in line with the need as defined by Devon Homes Choice or the local affordable housing register in place at the time and where a need has been</p>	<p>As already indicated I consider this Policy is over complicated, prescriptive and includes potential and actual conflicts with JLP Policy. I repeat below the concerns already raised and others that have become apparent:-</p>	<p>This comment expands significantly from earlier comments by SHDC our response to these made on 12/5/21 by the NPG on 20/5/212 refers;-</p>	<p>Clause d) deleted, no other changes.</p>

<p>identified, this includes custom and self-build plots where feasible.</p> <p>b) Affordability is determined with consideration of the particular circumstances of Dartmouth, namely high average property prices and low salaries.</p> <p>c) The range and size of dwellings especially single bed units is in line with the need as defined by Devon Homes Choice or the local affordable housing register in place at the time.</p> <p>d) Housing for the increasing number of elderly in the parishes is provided in the form of sheltered, extra care or assisted living housing. Homes are proposed for rent or purchase.</p> <p>e) Discounted 'First Homes' for young families shall be provided in line with National policy. Discounts should be 50% on the new home price to ensure First Homes are affordable to local incomes.</p> <p>f) Homes should be occupied by people with a demonstrable local connection to the Parish which is defined within the SHDC Adopted Local Allocation Policy (2017). The early and urgent needs of key workers including teachers, healthcare workers, fire brigade and lifeboat crew should be considered exceptional circumstances under the provisions of the allocation policy.</p> <p>g) Affordable housing for sale is subject to a legal restriction to ensure the homes remain affordable and that the discount is maintained in perpetuity;</p> <p>h) Development in or within the visual impact of the AONB conserves and enhances the landscape, scenic and natural beauty of the AONB and the design is in compliance with the latest South Devon AONB Management Plan and AONB Planning Guidance;</p>	<p>Criterion a) The JLP sets out the %age of affordable homes that should accompany development proposals. Any deviation from this should be fully evidenced. This Policy seeks to identify other criteria that should be applied when making this assessment. The justification nor the evidence give a clear explanation of why this is necessary.</p> <p>Criterion b) Suggest reference to affordability issues in Dartmouth is best covered in the Policy justification since National and Local test determine affordability.</p> <p>Criterion c) Please see JLP Policy DEV8 which sets out the basis for seeking a locally appropriate mix of housing types. This Policy should form the basis for drafting this criteria.</p> <p>Criterion d) Does this better sit in Policy DNP H5?</p> <p>Criterion e) Have you evidence to submit showing the 50% discount is viable. The AECOM HNA states the highest possible discount should be sought but qualifies by stating "where there is evidence to suggest this is appropriate". My assumption is this would include viability testing. Has the Group undertaken this work?</p> <p>Criterion f) Last sentence: It is not acceptable to seek to amend the Allocation Policy under the aegis of an NP Policy.</p>	<p><i>'Policy wording c) expanded. The HNA 2021 by AECOM commissioned for this Plan gives strong justification for the highest level of First Home subsidy (copy forwarded to SHDC). A more robust definition for Local Connection is considered important by the community and Town Council and will be pursued. The policy with exception of g) follows similar lines to Made plans e.g. South Huish and Salcombe</i></p> <p>a) does not contradict the JLP and the wording follows similar lines to the adopted policies of Salcombe and South Huish.</p> <p>b) Your comment ignores the particular circumstances of Dartmouth which are clearly articulated in the Housing Needs Assessment.</p> <p>c) See above.</p> <p>d) agree, delete clause</p> <p>e) The evidence from the HNA is clear, paras 194 to 201, and 266 refer. You appear to have been selective in quoting the HNA. The steering group have not carried out any viability testing however based on the clear recommendations of the</p>	
---	---	---	--

<p>Such developments could include proposals for Community Led Housing.</p>	<p>Criterion g) This happens as a matter of course.</p> <p>AS YOU WILL NOTE I HAVE SIGNIFICANT CONCERNS REGARDING THE CONTENT OF THIS POLICY. I WOULD SUGGEST A MEETING IS CONVENED WITH THE RELEVANT OFFICERS OF THE COUNCIL TO DISCUSS.</p>	<p>HNA this approach could have been supported by the LPA. We accept that the level of First Homes will be subject to viability testing however the evidence of the HNA indicates that the maximum level (50% discount) should be sought.</p> <p>f) We have quoted the SHDC local allocation policy and the exceptional circumstances provisions of it (paras 1.2 and 4.4) the Plan is not deviating or amending the allocation policy. The key workers described are specific to Dartmouth and will not be addressed in the allocation policy covering the whole District.</p> <p>g) Noted however such a clause has been considered sound in the Salcombe and South Huish Plans.</p> <p>Given the challenging affordable housing market in the Plan area we are unsure why SHDC chose to query rather than support the HNA conclusions. We are unsure what benefit a further meeting will have. A meeting was held with SHDC officers on this issue.</p>	
---	--	--	--

<p>Policy DNP H4 - Principal Residence</p> <p>a) New open market housing, excluding replacement dwellings, will only be supported where there is a restriction to ensure its occupancy as a principal residence guaranteed through a planning condition or legal agreement. This policy is as a result of impact upon the local housing market of second or holiday homes. New unrestricted market homes will not be supported at any time.</p> <p>b) Principal residence is defined as one occupied as the residents' sole or main residence, where the residents spend the majority of their time when not working away from home. The condition or obligation on new open market homes will require that they are occupied only as the primary (principal) residence of those persons entitled to occupy them.</p> <p>c) Occupiers of homes with a Principal Residence condition will be required to keep proof that they are meeting the obligation or condition, and will be obliged to provide this proof if and when SHDC requests this information. Proof of Principal Residence includes but is not limited to residents being registered on the local electoral register and being registered for and attending local services including healthcare, and schools.</p> <p>d) This policy applies to all new build development both allocated and windfall sites where open market housing is proposed within the Neighbourhood Plan Area.</p> <p>e) A replacement dwelling is defined as a single new build dwelling replacing an existing dwelling. of equivalent size and design as the original dwelling.</p> <p>f) Where a non-domestic property is converted to residential use through planning consent or by Permitted Development Rights such dwellings are considered new dwellings for the purposes of this policy.</p>	<p>No comment.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p>
---	--------------------	--------------	-----------------------------

<p>Policy DNP H5 Specialist Accommodation for Older People ,residential care nursing homes and loss of existing residential care.</p> <p>a) Additional Specialist Residential care provision will be supported in the Plan area. This should be provided with reference The Dartmouth Housing Needs Assessment 2021 (HNA) by AECOM Consultants and included in Appendix H1 The provision may comprise;-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extra Care • Sheltered Housing • Affordable Specialist Accommodation • Market Specialist Accommodation <p>b) Loss of existing residential care and nursing homes for older people</p> <p>The change of use or redevelopment of a care home or nursing home will only be permitted providing that new facilities of a similar type are provided in the parish to replace the facilities being lost; or there is a proven absence of demand for the continuation of the use and the site has been marketed effectively for such use over a period of at least 24 months at an appropriate level. In circumstances where the loss of an existing care home or nursing home is considered to be acceptable, the site should be used for an alternative provision for the elderly, such as the provision of dwellings specifically designed for the elderly, and subject to an occupancy restriction to ensure that the dwellings are used for this purpose in perpetuity.</p> <p>c) New homes for older people</p> <p>All new development for older people should comply with all the other housing policies of thisplan and should be on previously developed land or sites within the settlement boundary,within easy access to local centres and meet the other policies of the plan, including those relating to design quality. Any</p>	<p>I would suggest the content of this Policy is reviewed in the light of comments on other Housing Policies and the content of JLP Policy DEV 9. If the Plan is seeking to apply higher requirements than DEV 9 then this needs to be fully justified.</p> <p>Criterion a) I am concerned at the requirement in this Policy to consider the AECOM HNA as a material consideration. This document is not adopted by the Council and has no status beyond being a Background Paper.</p> <p>Criterion d) It is possible to require higher standards than set out in the JLP. The justification to this Policy should set out explicitly the evidence base for this. As it stands a cross reference to the HNA is not sufficient.</p>	<p>Noted, however the HNA gives justification for exceeding the provisions of JLP Dev 9 4</p> <p>We disagree with the comment that the HNA is not a material consideration for this Plan. In the absence of specific data relating to the Plan area the HNA provides specific guidance on the housing needs of Dartmouth. We are surprised by this comment and the position taken by SHDC on evidence that informs the Plan.</p> <p>d) Please refer to section 6 of the HNA, the evidence identified in paras. 385 and 386 and the conclusion drawn in para.397.</p>	<p>No changes proposed</p>
---	--	--	----------------------------

<p>new development should ensure that the appearance and character of the town or surrounding countryside are not harmed.</p> <p>d) Design Standards for Specialist Accommodation for older people</p> <p>Where viable the access standards should exceed the provisions of JLP Policy DEV9 against national standards for accessibility and adaptability (Category M4(2)), and for wheelchair (Category M4(3)).</p>			
<p>Policy DNP HW 1 Re-use of the former hospital site.</p> <p>This plan supports maintaining a portion of health and wellbeing facilities and obligations under the title deeds in the former hospital once the facilities are re-provided in the new Health and Wellbeing Centre at the top of town. The options for re-use or redevelopment of this site should include in all or part appropriate health and social care facilities, as part of a package to meet the on-going identified health and wellbeing needs in the Town.</p> <p>A development brief expanding on the above qualities should be prepared in advance of a planning application . All redevelopment proposals should respect this brief.</p> <p>This policy respects the provisions of a covenant on the original hospital, this is included in Appendix S.</p>	<p>There appears to be no planning justification for the requirement to retain a portion of the site for “ <i>health and wellbeing facilities</i>”. There may be covenants which apply but these will be separate and distinct from what the planning system can require. Have any discussions taken place with the Health Board? Is their evidence from that quarter to support the requirements of this Policy?</p> <p>The requirement to produce a Development Brief appears onerous and requires full justification.</p>	<p>Further evidence shall be gathered to support the policy which will include an up to date assessment of the current and planned health care facilities in the Plan area covering Upper and Lower Town. This will also include the services to be provided in the new Health and Well-being Centre and how they are able to serve the population of Lower Town.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing with the NHS Health Trust. The reference to the need for a development brief for the site should not be contentious. Dialogue is ongoing with representatives of the Trust to modify this policy wording and to further the preparation of this brief.</p> <p>Reference to the existing covenant will be removed</p>	<p>Policy text modified including removal of the reference to the covenant. Additional evidence added (Appendix S2) and the Infrastructure Topic Group paper updated. Please note the policy now includes the re-use of Zion Place Health Centre.</p>

		from the policy text but will remain in the supporting text as background information.	
<p>Policy DNP HW 2, Community Facilities</p> <p>a) Development that results in the loss of community facilities and public spaces as outlined above in paragraphs 6.6.4-10 or that results in any harm to their character, setting, accessibility, appearance, general quality and amenity value will only be permitted if they are replaced by community facilities and/or public spaces of equal or higher quality, economic viability and value to the community or it can be demonstrated they are no longer needed.</p> <p>b) New residential development will where practicable be expected to deliver new community facilities including Open Space, Sports and Recreation (OSSR) facilities on site. On smaller sites or where this is not practicable a planning obligation will be sought to mitigate the impact of new residents through new and improved provision in an appropriate location. For OSSR facilities this should be in accordance with the priorities and projects identified in the latest SHDC and DTC OSSR Plans and SHDC's Playing Pitch Strategy. Facilities identified include new play facilities at Rock Park to replace those at Victory Road, improvements at Norton Field recreation ground and a shelter and storage at Coronation Park.</p> <p>c) Proposals that involve the use of land in the countryside to facilitate and enhance informal recreational activities and access related to the enjoyment and interpretation of the countryside will be supported where they would not have an adverse effect on</p>	<p>Criteria b) Suggest that alignment with the Council's approach to recreation contributions from new development is sought if this differs from that being advanced in the NP then this needs to be fully justified.</p> <p>Suggest the last sentence is redundant since it repeats what is already in the documents referred to.</p> <p>Criterion f) Have the owners of the site identified been individually consulted?</p>	<p>b) we would welcome specific suggestions on the re-wording of this clause however similar wording was considered sound at examination of the South Huish NDP. Some Examiners require all the community facilities to be listed in the policy but we will leave this to the direction of the Examiner.</p> <p>f) The owners of site referred to in Map 17 have been consulted.</p>	<p>Delete last sentence of b).</p>

<p>the AONB, countryside, historic environment, and other land uses in the vicinity. Any proposals that improve access to existing public rights of way will be supported.</p> <p>d) Proposals that promote the public awareness and enjoyment of the historic and natural environment such as heritage and nature trails will be supported. Any future development should include the appropriate enhancement of adjacent heritage and nature trails.</p> <p>e) Ancillary facilities to public spaces must, where practicable, be accommodated in existing buildings. New facilities should be in keeping with their surroundings and respect policy DNP TE2(Design Quality throughout the Parish).</p> <p>f) The area shaded in Map 17 is safeguarded solely for emergency and community services to serve the Parish. Other uses will not be supported.</p>			
<p>Policy DNP HW3 Improved water access for recreational users.</p> <p>This plan supports new and improved access and infrastructure to the River Dart for recreational water craft users. Improvements should be focussed at North Embankment in the vicinity of the Higher Ferry and include the following:</p> <p>a) An improved slipway on the North Embankment.</p> <p>b) The present boat storage facilities on Coronation Park should be retained and enhanced;</p> <p>c) Associated traffic improvements to facilitate the safe crossing of the A379 by craft and users when launching and retrieving craft;</p> <p>d) Short term parking provision for craft and vehicles adjacent to the slipways.</p>	<p>The proposal included at Criteria a) b) and c) are specific land use proposals as such they should be included on a Proposals Map. Have any discussions with the owners of the sites identified been carried out to establish whether what is being proposed has their support?</p> <p>Criterion c): This is a traffic management issue and should not be included in this Policy. It can be recorded as a Community Aspiration.</p>	<p>Noted we shall produce a proposals map.</p> <p>Owners of the sites have been consulted</p> <p>We shall include clause c) in Community Aspiration 6.3.3 and refer it to the Town Council for separate negotiations with SHDC/DCC and inclusion in the future transportation study</p>	<p>We have produced a proposal map. Delete and relocate clause c) and we have referred the comment to DTC.</p>

<p>POLICY DNP HW4 Education Facilities</p> <p>a) Further development required by The Dartmouth Academy for education and sports purposes during the period of the Plan shall be supported.</p> <p>b) Development that results in the loss of existing education facilities or causes any harm to their function, character, setting, accessibility, appearance , general quality, and amenity value will only be permitted if they are replaced by education facilities of equal or higher quality, economic viability and value to the community or it can be demonstrated they are no longer needed.</p> <p>c) The area illustrated in Map 18 encompassing the Dartmouth Academy and grounds is safeguarded solely for education and community related uses. Other uses will not be supported</p>	<p>Criterion a) Is it wise to give open ended support. Whilst support for the development and improvements of this educational facility is understood , should that support be tempered by such proposals meeting other policy requirements that apply to general development proposals.</p> <p>Criteria b) Has this criteria been discussed with the Education Authority/Providers?</p> <p>Criteria c) Have the owners/occupiers of this site been individually consulted?</p>	<p>Support is strongly felt in the community for safeguarding the school site.</p> <p>The whole policy has been presented and consulted on with the Academy.</p>	<p>Changes made to a) as suggested.</p>
--	---	--	---

PJS draft 1/10/21
Updated 28/10/21
Updated 10/11/21
Updated 24/11/21
Updated 8/12/21
Updated 10/12/21