

Date: 14 January 2019  
 Contact number: 01395 571736  
 Email: ptwamley@eastdevon.gov.uk  
 Reference: PT/SVNP/R16/EDR1



East Devon District Council  
 Knowle, Sidmouth, EX10 8HL  
 Tel: 01395 516551  
 Email: csc@eastdevon.gov.uk  
[www.facebook.com/eastdevon](http://www.facebook.com/eastdevon)  
[www.twitter.com/eastdevon](http://www.twitter.com/eastdevon)

### Response to the submission of the Sid Valley Neighbourhood Plan

Having considered the plan in detail, please find herewith East Devon District Council's response to the Regulation 16 submission consultation of the Sid Valley Neighbourhood Plan. We wish also to congratulate and commend the hard work and dedication of the plan producers on reaching this stage of the process.

EDDC Cmnt No	Issue / Policy In Plan	Comment
1.	Page 2	Contents page needs correcting – for example Policy 5 is on page 20, not 19; policy 6 is on page 27, not 22; etc....
2.	Page 4 and others	Map 1 (and subsequent maps) – All need updating to include copyright information (legal requirement for use of OS maps).
3.	Page 5	<i>'The SVNP expects any housing development to achieve 12 Greens in Building for Life 12'</i> – Although this represents an ideal it seems excessive to require all housing development to guarantee 12 greens. Developments may be acceptable that have addressed BFL criteria and achieved a number of greens and ambers, BFL no longer has accredited assessors so who will manage the requirement?
4.	Page 11	Policy 1 – Suggest 'Built-up Area' references are updated to 'Built-up Area Boundary' (BUAB), or clearly stated as defined by those areas within the BUAB, to improve clarity and clear link to BUAB map on page 12.
5.	Policy 2	<i>'building heights should not normally be higher than neighbouring properties'</i> – Difficult in Sidmouth where developments are often on sloping sites. Suggest revision to 'building heights should be in keeping with the context of neighbouring properties'.
6.	Page 14	Suggest that map 9 is presented in the same style as map 8 for clarity.
7.	Page 15	Image 10 typo – extra comma '10.,'

8.	Policy 3	<p><i>'There will be a presumption against any built development within the 'Green Wedges' shown in the Map 10' – This goes beyond Strategy 8 of the East Devon Local Plan where development is limited that would 'add to existing sporadic or isolated development or damage the individual identity of a settlement or could lead to or encourage settlement coalescence'.</i></p> <p>The policy as written would seem to exclude development of a footpath/cycleway in this area, which is identified in Community Action AC03</p> <p>This policy should be associated with the proposed 'Sidford Sidbury Coalescence area' (map 10) and the policy could be specific to that proposed area, possibly based on the logic of strategy 8, rather than confused with existing green wedges identified by the Local Plan.</p>
9.	Policy 4	<p>Policy needs to be revised as current format appears to be an oversight. Currently bullet points 2, 3 and 4 follow on from the top line 'other than...'. We suggest the opening line is framed positively rather than negatively. Bullet point 1 should then form part of the opening line. Bullet point 2 should be a new non-bulleted line followed by current bullet points 3 and 4.</p> <p>The areas also include existing housing – will this policy apply to smaller developments such as extensions?</p>
10.	Policy 5	<p>Policy is overly restrictive. We suggest supporting development that is linked to the core purpose of the Local Green Space such as club houses, storage etc.</p>
11.	Policy 8	<p><i>'Development proposals will be expected to have regard to [the] character of...'</i>  <i>'The' is currently missing.</i></p> <p><i>'Building heights should not normally be higher than neighbouring properties. ' See comment 3 above</i></p>
12.	Policy 9	<p>Suggest settlement areas are defined. Also need to understand what represents an overwhelming operational requirement – Is this a legal concern related to safety or simply a business function need for lighting?</p>
13.	Page 34	<p>'Rati' at top of page needs deleting</p>
14.	P35	<p><i>'However, the neighbourhood plan is proposing to extend the principles of "exception sites" to Sidmouth. The existing provisions under Strategy 35 do not apply as the policy limits their use to settlement with a population under 3,000. '</i></p> <p>This approach is recognised in the copy as not being in conformity with strategy 35. The justification for going beyond strategy 35 is not made explicit.</p>
15.	Policy 10b	<p>This does not conform to Strategy 35 and lacks comprehensive justification for rural exception sites policy to be introduced adjacent to the Sidmouth BUAB. The suggested imposition of a local connection criteria for all development under policy 10b, including affordable and open market, would reduce the viability and likelihood of such sites coming forward. This is further exacerbated by Policy 14 principal residency criteria applying to exception sites, further reducing final development value. Policy 10b does not include any limitations on quantity of properties or area of exception site. We suggest deletion of the policy. Strategy 35 will still allow exception sites for relevant rural settlements in the parish area.</p>

EDDC Cmmt No	Issue / Policy In Plan	Comment
16.	Page 37	<b><i>'East Devon Local Plan Policies 2013 -31 Strategy 26: Development at Sidmouth'</i></b> Duplicated information needs deleting.
17.	Policy 11	This appears to be an abbreviated version of Strategy 34 rather than adding any local distinction. If policy 11 is considered to be applicable to the neighbourhood plan we suggest the following revision: <i>'On sites in the AONB schemes of between 6 and 10 units a financial contribution equivalent to a 50% site affordable housing provision will be expected'.</i> Suggest this is updated to <b>'6 and 9'</b> in accordance with the EDDC approach to seeking affordable housing contributions: <a href="http://eastdevon.gov.uk/planning/planning-services/planning-development-management/unilateral-undertakings-section-106-agreements-habitat-mitigation-and-affordable-housing-contributions/what-are-planning-obligations-and-how-much-will-it-cost/">http://eastdevon.gov.uk/planning/planning-services/planning-development-management/unilateral-undertakings-section-106-agreements-habitat-mitigation-and-affordable-housing-contributions/what-are-planning-obligations-and-how-much-will-it-cost/</a>
18.	Policy 12	Suggest this is too prescriptive as it is written. Could avoid the use of 'must' and allow flexibility whilst requesting that proposals account for the identified housing mix.  Policy 12 would give rise to schemes where there are more large market houses than affordable. The affordable housing mix should reflect the market housing mix unless specific evidence has arisen.
19.	Policy 13	<i>'Apart from sites promoted under SVNP Housing Policy 10 B, the eligibility for affordable housing will be administered by EDDC as the Housing Authority.'</i>  We need clarification on this point. EDDC would administer the eligibility for affordable housing in all cases.
20.	Policy 14	Policy 14 is likely to reduce the viability and supply of new homes. Principal Residency Policy would also be difficult to manage and enforce. With only 8% of the homes in the plan area being second homes or holiday lets, we do not consider this approach to be justified or in conformity with the Local Plan.
21.	Policy 22	<i>'All new developments should conform to the 'Secured by Design' principles...'</i>  This seems onerous for the developer, suggest editing to 'should illustrate how they have considered and, where possible, implemented 'Secured by Design' principles'.
22.	Policy 24	Missing policy detail in blue box – check formatting. <i>'Any development of Eastern Town will be expected to demonstrate via an access strategy how the scheme will improve the cycle pathway linkages with the town centre and the wider area'</i> – Seems onerous on a private developer of an already well connected space.  <i>'Vehicular access to and from the Esplanade turning circle should be restricted to service vehicles, coaches and boat trailers.'</i> This seems to be a highway consideration and should be deleted.
23.	Policy 26	Policy seems over prescriptive in terms of final outcome from redevelopment. Eastern Town contains multiple buildings and spaces serving a variety of functions. Replacement of existing assets should be proportionate to the proposed development impact.

Yours sincerely

Phil Twamley

**Neighbourhood Planning Officer**