



Intelligent Plans
and examinations

Report on Newton Poppleford and Harpford Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2020-2031

An Examination undertaken for East Devon District Council with the support of the Newton Poppleford and Harpford Parish Council on the January 2020 submission version of the Plan.

Independent Examiner: Jill Kingaby BSc (Econ) MSc MRTPI

Date of Report: 30 September 2020

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, 29 Monmouth Street, Bath BA1 2DL
Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

Contents

	Page
Main Findings - Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction and Background	3
• Newton Poppleford and Harpford Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2020–2031	3
• The Independent Examiner	4
• The Scope of the Examination	4
• The Basic Conditions	5
2. Approach to the Examination	6
• Planning Policy Context	6
• Submitted Documents	6
• Site Visit	7
• Written Representations with or without Public Hearing	7
• Modifications	7
3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights	7
• Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area	7
• Plan Period	7
• Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation	7
• Development and Use of Land	9
• Excluded Development	9
• Human Rights	9
4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions	9
• EU Obligations	9
• Main Issues	9
• General Issues of Compliance	10
• Specific issues of Compliance of the Plan Policies	12
- Strategic Transport Network Policies	12
- Environmental Protection Policies	14
- Housing, Heritage and Design Policies	15
- Education, Community Facilities and Leisure Policies	17
- Local Green Space Policies	18
- Local Medical Facilities Policy	19
- Employment and Business Policies	19
5. Conclusions	20
• Summary	20
• The Referendum and its Area	20
• Overview	20
Appendix: Modifications	22

Main Findings - Executive Summary

From my examination of the Newton Poppleford and Harpford Parish Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan/NHNP) and its supporting documentation including the representations made, I have concluded that subject to the policy modifications set out in this report, the Plan meets the Basic Conditions.

I have also concluded that:

- The Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body – the Newton Poppleford and Harpford Parish Council;
- The Plan has been prepared for an area properly designated – Newton Poppleford and Harpford Parish as shown on Map 1a, Appendix 6 of the Plan;
- The Plan specifies the period to which it is to take effect – 2020-31; and
- The policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood area.

I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to referendum on the basis that it has met all the relevant legal requirements.

I have considered whether the referendum area should extend beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates and have concluded that it should not.

1. Introduction and Background

Newton Poppleford and Harpford Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2020-2031

- 1.1 Newton Poppleford and Harpford is a rural parish with the principal village of Newton Poppleford at its core. Smaller outlying villages in the Parish, referenced in section 2 of the Plan, are Harpford, Venn Ottery and Southerton. The hamlet of Burrow, immediately west of Newton Poppleford, is also located in the Parish. The busy A3052 road links Sidmouth (some 3 miles east of Newton Poppleford) to the M5 and Exeter (some 8 miles to the west). The A3052 runs through the centre of the village of Newton Poppleford, and the B3178 extends from the western edge of the village southwards to Budleigh Salterton, alongside the River Otter. Though an attractive feature, the river brings the challenge of flooding to the Parish. With 57 listed buildings and many non-designated heritage assets, the Parish has a distinctive historic environment. The entire Parish lies within the East Devon Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), designated as having landscape and scenic beauty with the highest status of protection.¹ Beyond the villages, attractive

¹ National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 172.

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, 29 Monmouth Street, Bath BA1 2DL

Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

countryside with farms, narrow lanes with high hedges, footpaths (notably the East Devon Way), hills and woodlands characterise the Parish.

- 1.2 The Steering Group was formed in 2015 to prepare the NHNP on behalf of the Parish Council. A Parish Plan had been produced earlier in 2012, and the Parish Council was engaged in preparation of the East Devon Villages Plan, which was adopted by East Devon District Council (EDDC) in July 2018. This Villages Plan defined the Built-up Area Boundary (BUAB) for villages including Newton Poppleford. Neighbourhood Plan preparation work, community consultation and liaison with EDDC took place between 2016 and 2018. A draft NHNP was produced, based on community feedback, in early 2019, and an updated Plan in late 2019. Consultation on the January 2020 submission version of the Plan, in accordance with Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, was undertaken between March and May 2020, prior to its examination.

The Independent Examiner

- 1.3 As the Plan has now reached the examination stage, I have been appointed as the examiner of the NHNP by EDDC, with the agreement of the Newton Poppleford and Harpford Parish Council (the Parish Council).
- 1.4 I am a chartered town planner and former government Planning Inspector, with previous experience examining Neighbourhood Plans in Devon and other parts of England. I am an independent examiner, and do not have an interest in any of the land that may be affected by the draft Plan.

The Scope of the Examination

- 1.5 As the independent examiner, I am required to produce this report and recommend either:
- (a) that the neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum without changes; or
 - b) that modifications are made and that the modified neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum; or
 - (c) that the neighbourhood plan does not proceed to a referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.
- 1.6 The scope of the examination is set out in Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)('the 1990 Act'). The examiner must consider:
- Whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions;
 - Whether the Plan complies with provisions under s.38A and s.38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) ('the 2004 Act'). These are:

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, 29 Monmouth Street, Bath BA1 2DL

Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

- it has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body, for an area that has been properly designated by the local planning authority;
- it sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land;
- it specifies the period during which it has effect;
- it does not include provisions and policies for 'excluded development';
- it is the only neighbourhood plan for the area and does not relate to land outside the designated neighbourhood area;
- whether the referendum boundary should be extended beyond the designated area, should the Plan proceed to referendum; and
- Such matters as prescribed in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended)('the 2012 Regulations').

1.7 I have considered only matters that fall within Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act, with one exception. That is the requirement that the Plan is compatible with the Human Rights Convention.

The Basic Conditions

1.8 The 'Basic Conditions' are set out in Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act. In order to meet the Basic Conditions, the neighbourhood plan must:

- Have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
- Be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area;
- Be compatible with and not breach European Union (EU) obligations; and
- Meet prescribed conditions and comply with prescribed matters.

1.9 Regulation 32 of the 2012 Regulations prescribes a further Basic Condition for a neighbourhood plan. This requires that the making of the neighbourhood development plan does not breach the requirements of

2. Approach to the Examination

Planning Policy Context

- 2.1 The Development Plan for this part of EDDC, not including documents relating to excluded minerals and waste development, is the East Devon Local Plan 2013-31, adopted in January 2016, and the East Devon Villages Plan, adopted in July 2018.
- 2.2 The planning policy for England is set out principally in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Government Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) offers guidance on how this policy should be implemented. A revised NPPF was published on 19 February 2019, and all references in this report are to the February 2019 NPPF and its accompanying PPG.³

Submitted Documents

- 2.3 I have considered all policy, guidance and other reference documents I consider relevant to the examination, including those submitted which comprise:
- the draft NHNP 2020-2031, January 2020;
 - Map 1a in Appendix 6 of the Plan which identifies the area to which the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan relates;
 - the Consultation Statement, January 2020;
 - the Basic Conditions Statement, January 2020;
 - all the representations that have been made in accordance with the Regulation 16 consultation;
 - the Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report prepared by EDDC, October 2019 ; and
 - the requests for additional clarification sought in my letter of 1 July 2020 and the response dated 31 July 2020 from Newton Poppleford and Harpford Parish Council.⁴

² This revised Basic Condition came into force on 28 December 2018 through the Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018.

³ See paragraph 214 of the NPPF. The Plan was submitted under Regulation 15 to the local planning authority after 24 January 2019.

⁴ View at: <https://eastdevon.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/neighbourhood-and-community-plans/neighbourhood-plans/neighbourhood-plans-being-produced-in-east-devon/newton-poppleford/#article-content>

Site Visit

- 2.4 I made an unaccompanied site visit to the Neighbourhood Plan Area on 27 August 2020 to familiarise myself with it, and visit relevant sites and areas referenced in the Plan and evidential documents.

Written Representations with or without Public Hearing

- 2.5 This examination has been dealt with by written representations. I considered hearing sessions to be unnecessary as my reading of the submitted NHNP, the consultation responses and background documents, as well as the Parish Council's response to my letter of 1 July 2020, enabled me to identify potential compliance issues with the Plan, consider modifications and assess the Plan's suitability to proceed to a referendum.

Modifications

- 2.6 Where necessary, I have recommended modifications to the Plan (**PMs**) in this report in order that it meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. For ease of reference, I have listed these modifications separately in the Appendix.

3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights

Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area

- 3.1 The NHNP has been prepared and submitted for examination by Newton Poppleford and Harpford Parish Council, which is a qualifying body for an area that was designated by EDDC on 4 June 2014.
- 3.2 It is the only Neighbourhood Plan for Newton Poppleford and Harpford and does not relate to land outside the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.

Plan Period

- 3.3 The Plan specifies clearly the period to which it is to take effect, which is from 2020 to 2031.

Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation

- 3.4 The Steering Group's terms of reference included the mission statement to: *"preserve and enhance the built, natural and historic environment of the local area and the distinctive character of Newton Poppleford & Harpford whilst allowing for sustainable economic and social growth and development"*. Membership of the Steering Group has included Parish Councillors and community members. The Steering Group considered it imperative from the start to engage with the local community in plan-

making, so that the Neighbourhood Plan would accurately reflect the Parish's requirements and wishes. The Steering Group's terms of reference aimed to ensure full transparency about the plan-making process, through regular verbal and written updates to the community. It also sought to approach specifically (a) local businesses, (b) young people's bodies (school, Brownies, Scouts etc), and (c) specialist advisors including EDDC, Devon Communities Together and nearby neighbourhood plan groups, in order to gauge their views.

- 3.5 A community survey in Autumn 2016 followed a number of earlier events to contact local people and identify the key issues for the Plan. The earlier events included Pavilion Open Days, a Village Fair/Fun Day, coffee mornings and club events, and a Queen's Birthday Celebration in June 2016. Some 930 questionnaires were hand delivered to all households in the Parish in Autumn 2016, and a healthy 405 responses were received. An additional survey focussed on local housing needs elicited 276 responses, and a survey on the requirements of people aged over 55 produced 434 responses. In 2017, Newton Poppleford Junior School was contacted, and local businesses were consulted. Subject specific questionnaires were sent out regarding medical facilities, housing styles, business and recent planning applications. I consider that the Steering Group's approach to understanding the community's views was thorough, and well designed to ensure inclusivity of all interests.
- 3.6 A draft NHNP was prepared based on community feedback in 2019, and was subject to consultation between 1 November and 14 December 2019, in accordance with Regulation 14 of the 2012 Regulations. The consultation statement sets out, in section 1.8, the variety of methods used to advertise the consultation exercise and the community events which were held. A number of special measures were adopted to reach disabled or housebound people in the Parish. The Steering Group agreed to accept late representations until January 2020. Some 61 residents provided comments in response to the consultation exercise either individually or during a community event, and just 1 response was received from 40 local businesses who were contacted. Of 51 statutory bodies contacted by email and letter, 12 sent responses with comments.
- 3.7 An updated Plan, which took account of the consultation responses at the Regulation 14 stage and the review by EDDC, was subsequently produced. Consultation on the January 2020 submission version of the Plan, in accordance with Regulation 16, took place between 18 March and 29 May 2020. The consultation period, initially planned for 6 weeks, was extended, appropriately in my opinion given the restrictions on communication surrounding the coronavirus outbreak. I have taken account of the responses received to the submitted NHNP in my examination. I am satisfied that the public consultation process has met the legal requirements, ie. procedural compliance, for neighbourhood planning and has had regard for Government advice in the PPG on plan preparation.

Development and Use of Land

- 3.8 The Plan sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land in accordance with s.38A of the 2004 Act.

Excluded Development

- 3.9 The Plan does not include provisions and policies for 'excluded development'.

Human Rights

- 3.10 EDDC has not alleged that the Plan would breach Human Rights (within the meaning of the Human Rights Act 1998). The Basic Conditions Statement points out that considerable emphasis has been placed throughout the consultation process on ensuring that no sections of the community would be isolated or excluded. From my independent assessment, I am satisfied that Human Rights would not be breached by this Plan.

4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions

EU Obligations

- 4.1 The Neighbourhood Plan was screened for Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) by EDDC, which found that it was unnecessary to undertake SEA. The Plan was further screened for Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), which also was not triggered. It was considered unlikely that the NHNP would result in a significant adverse impact on any European site (as defined by the Habitats Regulations 2017) alone, or in combination with other plans and projects. I note that EDDC consulted Natural England, the Environment Agency and Historic England on these matters. Having read the Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulation Assessment Screening Report, October 2019, produced by officers of EDDC, I have no reason to disagree with the conclusions.

Main Issues

- 4.2 I have approached the assessment of compliance with the Basic Conditions of the NHNP as two main matters:
- General issues of compliance of the Plan, as a whole; and
 - Specific issues of compliance of the Plan policies.

General Issues of Compliance

- 4.3 The first six sections of the NHNP follow a clear structure and set out basic background information for the policies, which are addressed under topic headings in section 7. Section 1: Introduction gives an overview of the English planning system, and the EDDC Development Plan. This should be very helpful for readers of the Plan, especially for those unfamiliar with planning law and practice. However, in paragraph 1.2, a reference should be made to the East Devon Villages Plan, as this is part of the statutory development plan for the area, having been adopted by EDDC in July 2018. The Villages Plan is also important for the future development of Newton Poppleford because it defines the BUAB for the village, as explained and illustrated in section 2 of the NHNP.
- 4.4 I have considered the criticism of the BUAB made by a representor that the boundary is too tightly drawn at the western end of the village. The representor observes that a new purpose-built footpath link, part of the King Alfred Way development scheme, significantly improves pedestrian access between the Old Toll House and the centre of the village. Section 3 of the NHNP provides information on the "wider context" of the Parish, beginning with two significant characteristics, (i) the whole Parish is within the East Devon AONB (a nationally important landscape designation), and (ii) Newton Poppleford is dissected by the "heavily trafficked A3052" which has a negative impact on pedestrian travel across the village. Paragraph 3.1 states that the majority of services and facilities are located at the east of Newton Poppleford village and are not easily accessible to those living to the west.
- 4.5 The Parish Council, responding to my letter of 1 July 2020, pointed out that it continues (as recently as July 2020) to receive criticism from local residents of the footpath network through the village. It drew my attention to paragraphs 12-16 of the Inspector's report on the planning appeal which was refused in 2015 for residential development on land at Down Close (APP/U1105/A/14/2229080). The Inspector considered in detail the likely impact of the proposed new footpath on accessibility and the environment for pedestrians. He concluded that Down Close at the western end of the village would remain a substantial distance (1,250 or 1,450 metres) from the Post Office and convenience store, primary school and medical centre; a new footpath at King Alfred's Way would not be an entirely satisfactory alternative route to the A3052. From my site visit, I recognise the ongoing difficulties for pedestrians travelling from the western parts of the village to community facilities in the east, especially along the heavily trafficked main road with an absence of pavements in places and safe crossing-points, as illustrated on Map 3c.
- 4.6 The Villages Plan was adopted relatively recently in July 2018 by EDDC, with the BUAB for Newton Poppleford as illustrated on Page 7 of the NHNP. In my opinion and on the evidence before me, there are insufficient grounds for the NHNP to put forward changes to the BUAB. However, I consider that sections 1, 2 and 6 of the Plan should be

modified so that the status of East Devon Villages Plan, as part of the development plan for the area, is made clear. **PM1** should be made to achieve general conformity with strategic policies for this part of East Devon. In response to my letter of 1 July, the Parish Council provided a 'new Map 11' (sic)⁵ showing the principal facilities and services within the Parish. I consider that this should be included in the Plan, as recommended in **PM2**, to assist readers of paragraphs 3.1 and 3.3, as well as subsequent policies for transport. **PM2** should contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.

- 4.7 Section 3 also includes a short history of the Parish and an overview which refers to the challenges of flooding from the River Otter and the presence of the East Devon Way for ramblers. Map 4 of the NHNP shows the footpath infrastructure across the Parish, and it was criticised by the Devon Countryside Access Forum for being indistinct and "*not particularly comprehensible*". In response to my letter of 1 July, the Parish Council submitted a revised Map 4 which shows the footpath infrastructure more distinctly with a new key designed to explain the status of paths accurately. A reference to the revised Map 4 should also be added to Page 22, as in **PM3**. This modification is needed so that regard is had for the national footpath hierarchy, and to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Paragraphs 3.4 and 7.3 (on Page 27) give conflicting figures for the number of households recorded in the 2011 Census, for the Parish. The Parish Council confirmed that it should be 928 households, and I recommend that this figure is used throughout the Plan. **PM4**, to modify paragraphs 3.4 and 7.3, is needed for consistency with the 2011 Census.
- 4.8 Section 4: Key issues begins by explaining that these were established through public consultation exercises, and helpfully gives a brief overview of the consultation process. Important topics are then described as Education, Employment, Environment, Future development, Health and care, Transport and Social leisure & communications. Paragraph 4.3, Employment, refers to "*weaknesses of the public transport provision serving the village*". This was queried by a representor to the Regulation 16 consultation, but I agree with the Forum that the bus timetables submitted by the representor were dated. I accept that bus fares for those not eligible for free travel could be high, that access to Ottery St Mary (with the main health centre) could be problematic for those without a car, and that residents of the outlying villages of Venn Ottery, Southerton and Harpford would not have safe and convenient access to bus services. Therefore, I consider the reference to "*weaknesses*" with public transport in paragraph 4.3 to be reasonable, and the summary of transport conditions in 4.7 to be justified. Paragraph 4.5 builds on the statement made in 1.2 that the Parish Council commits to 5 yearly reviews of the Plan, to ensure that it remains fit for purpose. I consider this to be indicative of good planning procedures, and reflects the spirit of

⁵ New Map 10.

paragraphs 31-33 of the NPPF on Preparing and reviewing plans (albeit these do not apply directly to neighbourhood plans).

- 4.9 Section 5: Vision and Objectives gives an overall vision for the future, with seven objectives which, in my opinion, (i) follow from the vision (ii) reflect the results of community engagement, and (iii) are appropriate given the character, setting and context of Newton Poppleford and Harpford Parish. Section 6: Strategic planning issues helpfully reminds readers that the NPPF has a presumption in favour of sustainable development and emphasises the importance of the Development Plan for planning decision-making. It then refers to East Devon Local Plan with its policy for small towns and villages, and to policies in the East Devon AONB Partnership Plan. Providing PM1 is made, to add a reference to the adoption date for the East Devon Villages Plan, I consider that section 6 provides a good overview of strategic planning issues for the Parish.
- 4.10 Section 7: Neighbourhood Plan Policies sets out all the Plan policies related to each of the seven objectives defined in section 5. Policy Overviews provide explanations for each policy, and references are made to the Plan's appendices which contain maps and other supporting evidence. Policies also include footnotes referring the reader to strategic policy, notably in the NPPF, East Devon Local Plan and East Devon AONB Partnership Plan. I comment on the specific policies in the following section of my report but consider overall that the structure and layout of section 7 of the Plan is easy to read and comprehensible. The first Appendix, setting out the membership of the Steering Group, and the last Appendix, a glossary of terms, are also helpful to readers. I conclude that the NHNP is well written and clearly structured, and meets the general compliance issues for neighbourhood planning, providing PMs 1-4 are made.

Specific Issues of Compliance of the Plan Policies

Strategic Transport Network Policies

- 4.11 Policies T1, T2 and T3 concern transport (parking, traffic management and rights of way for walking and cycling). As confirmed at my site visit, traffic movement and impact are major issues for the Parish. The Parish has a rural location some 8 miles from Exeter, 3 miles from Sidmouth and 5 miles from Ottery St Mary, meaning that most residents are reliant on travel by car for access to work and facilities and for social purposes. The A3052 is a very busy route, the rural parts of the Parish are not well-served by public transport, and walking and cycling are constrained by poor infrastructure (including narrow, steep-sided country lanes often with tall hedges that reduce visibility; lack of continuous pavements on main roads and pinch points at road junctions). Off-street parking is limited in many residential areas in Newton Poppleford, leading to parking on roads and pavements which is unsightly and may be a hazard for pedestrians. I consider that Pages 15-20 of the NHNP set out the local problems surrounding transport appropriately.

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, 29 Monmouth Street, Bath BA1 2DL

Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

- 4.12 Concerning Policy T1 – Adequate Parking, I asked the Parish Council, in my letter of 1 July 2020, whether this policy was out of general conformity with Policy TC9 of the East Devon Local Plan, and contrary to the promotion of sustainable development, as it seeks higher levels of parking provision for new housing developments than the Local Plan. The Parish Council replied that Policy TC9 was non-strategic, and its local experience was that reduced car parking requirements had not reduced car ownership. Following my site visit, I appreciate the negative impact (for pedestrian movement and visual amenity) which limited parking provision in residential areas can generate. I also note that Local Plan Policy TC9 puts forward its car parking space standards only “as a guide”, and therefore I support the thrust of Policy T1. EDDC sought a modification to the policy’s wording to replace “eg.” with “this means that” so that the subsequent criteria are specific requirements. I agree that the wording of Policy T1 should be modified, as in **PM5**, to secure this and ensure that the requirement to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development is satisfactorily met.
- 4.13 Policy T1 supports the provision of bicycle parking and provision for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles. I agree with these measures, which should encourage more sustainable transport to and from new housing developments. Policy T2 also puts forward a series of measures to secure safe and more sustainable travel, including the provision of Transport Statements and use of Travel Plans for developments of 10+ houses and employment sites. Whilst fully supporting this policy aim, I agree with EDDC that Transport Statements must be signed off by the local authority and not the Parish. Policy T2 should be modified, as in **PM6**, to achieve this and to include the other wording changes to criteria a) and c), which EDDC and the Parish agreed. I was advised that 20mph zones have been created in Exeter to slow down traffic, and create a more pleasant and safer environment, but these restrictions have all been used on minor roads. Nevertheless, I support the ambition in Policy T2 for the introduction of a 20mph speed limit on the A3052 through Newton Poppleford. With PM6 in place, Policy T2 should contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.
- 4.14 Policy T3 – Rights of Way puts forward a number of requirements to protect existing public rights of way and improve facilities for walking and cycling. Devon Countryside Access Forum proposed that the policy should be re-written to describe public rights of way more accurately, and the Parish Council proposed new wording for the Policy Overview, which I propose should be added. EDDC also suggested that the aspiration for a future Parish “Footpath and Cycling Strategy” should be taken out of the policy and moved to an objective. I agree with the Parish Council that rights of way are an important local feature but agree that the aspiration should be separated from the policy. A new heading on Page 20 would give prominence to the “Footpath and Cycling Strategy”, as I recommend in **PM7**. A cross-reference to Appendix 6, Maps 3b – Parking & Problem Junctions, and 3c – Lack of Pavements and Crossings, should also be added. In addition to revised wording to take account of the Devon

Countryside Access Forum's proposals, I also recommend amendment to the wording of the fourth sentence in Policy T3 regarding roads being sufficiently wide to allow two vehicles to pass without mounting the pavement. It seems to me that other schemes, such as vehicle passing points, may be more appropriate in some cases than the addition of wide roads. Small developments (eg. for single dwellings) may not justify two-way roads to be built in all cases. PM7 includes revised wording of the fourth sentence to give more flexibility and ensure that sustainable development is not impeded.

- 4.15 Page 20 of the NHNP refers to the planning appeal for new housing off Down Close, details of which are given in Appendix 8. The reference on Page 20 should be altered so that the correct appeal number is used (APP/U1105/A/14/2229080). **PM8** should be made to satisfy the Basic Conditions.

Environmental Protection Policies

- 4.16 The issue of environmental protection is covered by Policies EP1 – EP9 inclusive. Policy EP1 addresses the important topic of conserving and enhancing the AONB and natural environment. It also expresses support for the creation of a new National Park, and Appendix 7 refers to the Glover Review 2019 which identified Devon/Dorset as one of only two candidates in England for new National Park status. The Parish Council advised me that EDDC supported further investigation of the matter but acknowledged that designation of a National Park would be a matter for the Secretary of State rather than a neighbourhood plan. I agree, therefore, that the creation of a new National Park should be addressed in the supporting text rather than in Policy EP1, with the addition of information provided in the Parish Council's letter to me of 31 July 2020. I also propose modifications to Policy EP1 and Map 9 to refer to "cherished public views" and add numbers to each viewpoint; to qualify the reference to The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) taking over management of the Old Quarry; and to modify the wording of criterion (f), as proposed by EDDC. **PM9 & PM10** should be made to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.
- 4.17 EDDC recommended that Policies EP2 Development on designated Flood zones and EP4 Flood Risk Assessment should be combined to fully reflect the sequential test described in the NPPF, paragraphs 155-164. The supporting text on Page 24 indicates that the Parish has been badly affected by flooding on a number of occasions over the last 23 years. Appendix 6, Map 6 shows that a significant part of the Parish is at risk of flooding, at the 1 in 100 chance level. It is therefore essential, in my view, that the NHNP includes robust policies to deal with flood risk. I recommend that Policies EP2 and EP4 should be combined to form a new Policy EP2, as proposed by the Parish in its letter of 31 July, so that regard is had for national policy. EDDC proposed a change to the title of Policy EP3 from "Minimise damage to existing properties" to "Minimising damage ...", which I also support. **PM11** should be made so that new

Policy EP2, and EP3, meet the Basic Conditions. Policies EP5 – Surface Water Run-off and EP6 – SuDS Design and Management should contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and should be retained.

- 4.18 Policy EP7 - Local Amenity supports development which would “not cause a nuisance”, and EDDC proposed that this wording be revised. I agree that the meaning of “nuisance” could be debateable and note that the Parish Council supports the proposed modification. In order to assist the decision-making process and the achievement of sustainable development, **PM12** should be made. Policy EP8 – Protect agricultural land repeats Policy EN13 – Development on High Quality Agricultural Land in the EDDC Local Plan. The Parish Council advised that loss of high quality land is an important local issue, but accepts that there is duplication. I recommend that Policy EP8 is removed from the NHNP, but that the text on Page 26 is expanded to include a cross-reference to the Local Plan policy, to the NPPF definition of agricultural land values and to Appendix 6 - Map 7, which shows the agricultural land classification for the Parish. EDDC pointed out that Map 7 is based on provisional classification data held by Natural England. I agree that the Plan should make that clear. Having regard for national policy, **PM13** should be made. Policy EP9 – Development on Farmland for Agricultural Purposes, relevant to this rural Parish, need not be modified as it meets the Basic Conditions.

Housing, Heritage and Design Policies

- 4.19 Section 7.3 of the Plan concerns Housing, Heritage and Design. The thrust of Objective 3 and the Overview is that, as the Parish lies wholly within the AONB and the main settlement of Newton Poppleford is tightly encircled by the designated BUAB, there is limited scope for new housing development and it would be inappropriate to allocate sites for further development. Any new housing should meet demonstrable local needs, in particular for small affordable homes within the BUAB. I support Objective 3 and the approach to future housing provision, which is in general conformity with the East Devon Local Plan’s Strategies 6, 7, 27 and 35. I recognise that most affordable housing will be provided on “exception sites” which, by their nature, do not need to be allocated or identified in this Neighbourhood Plan. I note that the Newton Poppleford Housing Needs Report by Devon Communities Together, January 2017, provided useful information about the level of housing need in the Parish. Its survey at the end of 2016 elicited 276 responses, some 28% of all households, so that it provided a good data base. In its conclusions, the Report identified a need in the near future for 14 units of affordable housing but cautioned that “... *this Housing Needs Survey represents a snapshot in time. Personal circumstances are constantly evolving ...*”.
- 4.20 Having regard for the background information, in particular for the definition of “local connection” in the Local Plan’s Strategy 35, I propose some modification of the wording in Objective 3 and the Policy Overview. Rather than referring to the “*requirements of parishioners*”, Objective 3

should refer to "*the requirements of the Parish*", as the definition of people eligible for affordable housing with a local connection in Strategy 35 extends beyond those currently resident in the Parish. Also, the second sentence in the fourth paragraph on Page 27 should read: "*The Local Housing Need to allow people with a local connection to live or continue living in the Parish*". In addition, the Housing Needs Report should be mentioned, and account taken of its warning that the need for 14 units of new affordable housing could change over time. The Parish Council's response to my questions (Pages 8 & 18, Annex A, of its letter of 31 July 2020) acknowledges that there is a high demand for new affordable housing in Newton Poppleford. In these circumstances, the last sentence in paragraph 5 asserting that "*residents requirements have already been exceeded*" should be removed. Similarly, on Page 28, I recommend that the first sentence about imposing further housing on the Parish should be amended, having respect for those in housing need. **PM14**, which also takes account of the Parish Council's proposed wording changes, would achieve necessary modifications and give general conformity with the strategic Local Plan policies.

- 4.21 Policies H1, H2 and H3 concern new housing development for smaller dwellings, for people with mobility issues, and outside the BUAB. The Parish Council agreed that modifications put forward by EDDC to Policy H1, to the title of Policy H3, and to specify how housing need should be established, should be made. Policy H2 should omit the references to Strategy 36 of the Local Plan, as this would be applied to a development proposal anyway. Strategy 36 should, instead, be referenced at the bottom of the policy. **PM15** addresses the above points to provide clarity⁶, to achieve general conformity with Strategy 35, and to contribute to sustainable development. I also agree that the definition of affordable housing as Guidance Note 1 on Page 29 should be updated, as in PM15, having regard for the NPPF. I appreciate the Parish Council's wish to avoid house extensions which are subsequently turned into separate houses and will not therefore recommend modification of the first sentence of Policy H3.
- 4.22 Policies TD1 and TD2 on Type of Development should help with the provision of good quality development in appropriate places. I consider that the first sentence of Policy TD1 should be extended to refer to "*Development on*" previously developed land and infill sites, and I agree with EDDC that Policy TD2 should be re-worded to clarify that it refers to affordable housing and being "*affordable in perpetuity*". These modifications, in **PM16**, should facilitate the application of the policies and contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.
- 4.23 Policy HQD1 – Maintain the built character of our Parish through High Quality Design provides some 24 criteria which new developments should

⁶ A policy should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence. See PPG Reference ID: 41-041-20140306.

take into account. Section 12 of the NPPF emphasises the importance of the creation of high quality buildings and places, observing that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Policy HQD1 has regard for this aspect of national planning policy. The Policy Overview helpfully refers to important local factors, including the countryside setting, the presence of 57 listed buildings and local materials such as cob, thatch and pebble walls, and the AONB setting. It also refers to the Housing Styles Consultation exercise, which is attached to the NHNP Consultation Statement as Appendix 9. Whilst I commend the Parish Council for consulting local people about the detail of good housing design and for incorporating those findings into policy, I consider that criterion a) in Policy HQD1 could overstate the role of the survey findings. I recommend that new development proposals should have regard for the results of the Housing Consultation Survey but should not treat them as absolute “requirements”.

- 4.24 In addition, I support modified wording to criteria g) and t) as proposed by EDDC, and amended wording to the last sentence of the policy, so that the principles set out in Building for Life 12 are referenced. Criterion l) should also be modified so that regard is had for the NPPF, paragraphs 189-202, and the requirement to conserve or enhance heritage assets in a proportionate way depending upon their status (highest protection being given to designated assets). These modifications are included in **PM17**, so that Policy HQD1 has regard for national policy and contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.
- 4.25 In my letter to the Parish Council of 1 July 2020, I queried the references on Page 36 to the Wrexham Neighbourhood Plan. In response, it was explained that there were concerns that infill developments on brownfield land in the BUAB could be promoted, which were inappropriately “squeezed in”. EDDC’s Neighbourhood Planning Officer helpfully pointed out that the Wrexham Plan had used garden size and distance policies to address this issue. I recognise now that these measures should be applicable in Newton Poppleford, and the Guidance Notes should be kept in the Plan.

Education, Community Facilities and Leisure Policies

- 4.26 Appendix 2 of the Plan lists the Parish’s existing community facilities, and Policy CF1 aims to protect and improve their availability. The modified Map 10, as in PM2, should assist readers to locate the facilities in Newton Poppleford and Harpford. Policies CF2 and CF3 are designed to increase sports and recreation and play facilities. These have regard for section 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities in the NPPF, and are in general conformity with policies, as listed, in the East Devon Local Plan.

Local Green Space Policies

- 4.27 Policy GS1 – Protection of Local Green Spaces explains that the named 15 sites have been designated in accordance with paragraphs 99 and 100 of the NPPF. This document paraphrases the requirements of paragraph 100, stating that the designation should only be used where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community, is demonstrably special to a local community and is local in character ie. not an extensive tract of land. Maps 5a and 5b in Appendix 6 of the Plan show the location of the proposed local green spaces, although number 10 should be added so that Shrubbery, Station Road, can be located. From my site visit, it was apparent that these sites are all in reasonably close proximity to the local community and are not extensive tracts of land. Appendix 4 to the Plan explains how each space is special to the local community. From these data and from my site visit, I recognise that the spaces fulfil a variety of purposes from green and quiet churchyards and cemeteries, to allotment gardens and sports/play areas for adults and children. They include areas of tranquil countryside and wildlife, and grass banks/shrubs alongside roads. I support the designations in Policy GS1, but recommend that the first sentence is re-worded, to clarify the respective roles of EDDC and the Parish Council. The title (Land of Local Amenity Importance) to Policy EN1 of the Local Plan should be given in full at the end of the policy. Map 5a should also be modified to include 10 – Shrubbery, Station Road, opposite Oak Tree Villas. **PM18** includes all these modifications and should be made, to give clarity, having regard for national planning policy on local green space designations.
- 4.28 Policy TH1 – Trees and Hedgerows should have regard for paragraphs 174-177 of the NPPF regarding Habitats and biodiversity. I consider that the aim to constrain “*discussions over possible compensation*”, as implied by 1b) could be considered too onerous and unreasonable. I recommend that 1a) and 1b) should be combined and aligned more closely with paragraph 175 c) of the NPPF. It was claimed that the field above Down Close is a redundant apple orchard and should not be described as natural woodland. The Inspector’s report on appeal APP/U1105/A/14/2229080, however, describes the site as having high ecological value. In particular: “*The mature and decaying trees are likely to provide a rich and diverse habitat and food source for birds, insects, invertebrates and fungi*”. In addition, the trees are visually attractive, and the old orchard is arguably an important feature in the AONB, even if there is no public access to it. I am satisfied that Policy TH1 should protect the field from the loss of trees due to future development. Criterion 2 of Policy TH1 should be re-written to refer to “woodland” rather than “natural woodland”, and 3 b) should be modified to add “they” before “should be replaced by an equal or greater quantity”. **PM19** will make these modifications, having regard for national planning policy.

Local Medical Facilities Policy

- 4.29 Policy M1 – Medical Facilities is supportive of a new medical centre within the Parish, and it is clear that there is much public support for one to be provided. I support the policy as written, which meets the Basic Conditions.

Employment and Business Policies

- 4.30 Policies EM1, EM2 and EM3 relate to Employment and Business. The villages in the Parish are mainly dormitory, in the sense that working residents travel outside the Parish to their workplace. Exeter is the principal destination for work. However, the Plan acknowledges that working from home is on the increase and is dependent on good internet technology. Policy EM1 – Conversion from residential use supports the change to small business use, providing there would be no significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area, and the amenity of neighbouring residents. Policy EM2 – Development of Small Business Enterprise supports new development within the BUAB, and Policy EM3 – Superfast Connectivity seeks improvements to mobile phone and broadband infrastructure. I consider that the thrust of these policies has regard for the NPPF’s approach (paragraphs 83 and 84) to building a strong, competitive economy including a prosperous rural economy.
- 4.31 EDDC proposed that Policy EM1 should permit use B1b (light industrial), as long as there would be no conflict with other policies.⁷ Policy EM2, it was suggested, should include a more positive statement about support for opportunities to secure new employment provision locally. Also, Policy EM3 should be re-written to state that suitable ducting to accommodate Fibre to the Premises (FTTP) broadband should be provided in all new development. The Parish Council agreed with the proposed modifications, as do I. **PM20, PM21 & PM22** should be made so that a positive approach to the promotion of new employment is taken, and the policies contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The modified policies will be in general conformity with Strategies 3, 4 and 31 – Future job and employment land provision – in the East Devon Local Plan.
- 4.32 The Plan includes a number of Appendices which provide evidence underpinning many of the policies. I asked the Parish Council if it could explain the source of the Non-designated Heritage Assets listed in Appendix 2, and it replied that these have been selected based on a methodology devised by EDDC. The source of each proposed asset is described and all have been subject to public consultation. I understand that EDDC intends to keep a register of non-designated heritage assets but has not established one yet. I am satisfied that Appendix 2 provides

⁷ From 1 September 2020, Use Class B1b (light industrial), along with B1a and B1c, now effectively fall under new Class E(g), which are uses which can be carried out in any residential area without detriment to the amenity of that area by reason of noise, vibration, smell, fumes, smoke, soot, ash, dust or grit.

reliable information about local assets for Newton Poppleford and Harpford and has regard for national policy in section 16 of the NPPF.

- 4.33 I have proposed a number of modifications, PM5 to PM22 inclusive, to the Plan's specific policies. I conclude that, as long as these modifications are made, the specific policies in the NHNP will meet the Basic Conditions for neighbourhood plans and will assist decision-making for planning applications relating to land in Newton Poppleford and Harpford Parish.

5. Conclusions

Summary

- 5.1 The NHNP has been duly prepared in compliance with the procedural requirements. My examination has investigated whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements for neighbourhood plans. I have had regard for all the responses made following consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan, and the evidence documents submitted with it.
- 5.2 I have made recommendations to modify a number of policies and text to ensure the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to referendum.

The Referendum and its Area

- 5.3 I have considered whether or not the referendum area should be extended beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates. The NHNP as modified has no policy or proposals which I consider significant enough to have an impact beyond the designated Neighbourhood Plan boundary, requiring the referendum to extend to areas beyond the Parish. I recommend that the boundary for the purposes of any future referendum on the Plan should be the boundary of the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.

Overview

- 5.4 I applaud Newton Poppleford and Harpford Parish Council, in particular the Steering Group, for the time and effort which they have given to preparing the NHNP and submitting it for examination. It is clear from the evidential background information that much work has been carried out, over some five years, to research and identify the key issues for the future development of the Parish, and to consult and engage with all sections of the local community so that their aspirations could be addressed. Once adopted the Neighbourhood Plan, as part of the development plan for the area, should assist decision-making on planning applications for sites within the Parish. The Neighbourhood Plan should ensure the realisation of its vision for "*a thriving and village community*

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, 29 Monmouth Street, Bath BA1 2DL

Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

which protects and enhances its [the Parish's] distinctive character, rich heritage and its East Devon AONB setting, an even better place for residents of all ages to live in".

Jill Kingaby

Examiner

Proposed modification number (PM)	Page no./ other reference	Modification
	Page 22	<p><i>in Appendix 6</i>, and is a popular draw ...</p> <p>3rd paragraph: This Parish lies in a valleyfrom the East Devon Way. Map 4 in Appendix 6 shows the extent of the East Devon Way.</p> <p>New map with revised Legend should be added to Appendix 6.</p>
PM4	Pages 10 and 27	<p>3.4 Facts and Figures</p> <p>In the 2011 censusrecorded as 2095 in 930 928 households.....</p> <p>7.3 <u>Housing, Heritage and Design – Policy Overview</u></p> <p>At the time of the 2011 censuswas 2095 in 978-928 households. ...</p>
PM5	Page 16	<p>Policy T1 – Adequate Parking</p> <p>Developments must provide adequate off-road parking. eg. This means that: ...</p>
PM6	Pages 17 - 19	<p>Policy T2 – Traffic Calming</p> <p>Proposals for new development ...</p> <p>a) be designed with road safety as will be a priority in design terms, in particular ...</p> <p>c) not lead to an increase in existing generate new HGV movements ...</p> <p>Developments of 10+ houses infrastructure will be mitigated, and parish council sign it off, including a Travel Plan</p> <p><u>T2 – Policy Overview</u></p> <p>Add a final sentence as follows:</p> <p>When a Transport Statement or Assessment is submitted and/or a Travel Plan put forward with a development proposal, the Parish</p>

Proposed modification number (PM)	Page no./ other reference	Modification
		<i>Council would wish to be consulted on its content and delivery.</i>
PM7	Pages 19 and 20	<p>Policy T3 – Rights of Way</p> <p>Development proposals....</p> <p>The improvement and enhancement of existing public rights of way (Public Footpaths, Pavements, Bridleways and Cycleways<i>footpaths and bridleways</i>), <i>the National Cycleway and pavements</i> will be supported.....</p> <p><i>To enable safe walking and cycling,</i> Roads on new developments must be sufficiently wide to allow two vehicles to pass <i>well-designed to allow convenient vehicle access, movement and parking,</i> without mounting the pavements. <i>In addition, developments of 10+ houses and employment sites must have roads sufficiently wide to allow two vehicles to pass.</i></p> <p>Proposals to improvebe supported.</p> <p>A future Parish “Footpath and Cycling Strategy” will be supported, subject to consultation and agreement....</p> <p><u>T3 – Policy Overview</u></p> <p>New opening sentences:</p> <p><i>Devon County Council defines a public right of way as follows: “A public right of way is a right by which the public can pass along linear routes over land at all times. Although the land may be owned by a private individual, the public have a legal right across that land on a specified route”. The Parish Council will seek to work positively with landowners to ensure that access</i></p>

Proposed modification number (PM)	Page no./ other reference	Modification
		<p><i>for all users is encouraged where practically possible.</i></p> <p>Add at the bottom of Page 19:</p> <p><i>Maps 3b – Parking & Problem Junctions and 3c – Lack of Pavements and Crossings on A3052, in Appendix 6 illustrate these difficulties.</i></p> <p><i>Some roads on recently built new housing developments have been too narrow to allow two vehicles to pass without mounting the pavement. This creates risk for pedestrian safety and must be avoided in the layout and design of future developments.</i></p> <p>Modify last paragraph on Page 20:</p> <p><u><i>Future Parish Walking and Cycling Strategy</i></u></p> <p>As a result of these deficiencies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new footpath in front of the Toll House. <p><i>Improvements should allow for the maximum number of different users and, wherever possible, should be multi-use (walkers, cyclists and horse-riders), and take into account the needs of disabled users.</i></p> <p><i>Consultation with landowners and land managers will be carried out at an early stage of planning and discussion.</i></p>
PM8	Page 20	<p>Modify the appeal reference in the first paragraph on this page:</p> <p>....appeal for new housing off at Down Close (appeal reference APP/U1105/W/15/3032502 A/14/2229080 Appendix 8),</p> <p>....</p>

Proposed modification number (PM)	Page no./ other reference	Modification
PM9	Pages 20 and 21	<p>Policy EP1 – Conservation and enhancement of the East Devon AONB and Natural Environment</p> <p>Criterion f): not protrude above, or appear dominant when viewed against, existing lines or groups of trees skylines or significant lines or groups of large, mature trees.</p> <p>Penultimate sentence: There is support for the RSPB to take over Proposals to facilitate the RSPB taking over management of the Old Quarry in Venn Ottery will be supported, subject to compliance with other policies.</p> <p>The creation of a new National Park which covers this parish would be supported.</p>
PM10	Pages 21 and 22	<p><u>EP1 – Policy Overview</u></p> <p>Add a new paragraph: <i>The Landscapes Review by Julian Glover reported to Government in 2019 and identified two AONBS that were strong candidates to become new National Parks. One of these was the combined Dorset and East Devon AONB. At its special meeting on 25 February 2020 EDDC agreed that further investigation of the benefits and drawbacks of becoming a new National Park should be pursued, with all meetings open to the public. Residents have indicated how much they wish to preserve the AONB, and uniqueness of our area, and the aspiration of National Park status would be to put more emphasis on rural employment and local housing for families who wish to remain in the area. The creation of a new National Park which covers the parish would be supported. The photographs and Map 9 in Appendix 6 show "Cherished Public</i></p>

Proposed modification number (PM)	Page no./ other reference	Modification
	Appendix 6	<p>Views” and illustrate the beauty of the AONB within the Parish.</p> <p>Appendix 6, modify Map 9 by changing the title to <i>Cherished Public Views</i>; number the viewpoints on the map and the photographs so that the locations can be identified.</p>
PM11	Page 23	<p>Delete Policy EP2 and modify Policy EP4:</p> <p>Policy EP42 – Flood Risk Assessment</p> <p>A sequential approach...</p> <p>Residential developments within ... (over 1 hectare in size), and or in areas identified as wet spots due to <i>affected by other sources of flooding (for example surface water flooding)</i>, as identified <i>at risk of flooding</i> by the most recent <i>in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the area, or other more recent information</i>, (from EDDC and the relevant bodies with statutory responsibility for such assessments), should be subject to a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment that demonstrates that <i>establishes whether</i> the development will be safeand where possible will reduce flood risk overall <i>whether it is possible for flood risk overall to be reduced.</i></p> <p>The findings of tThe Flood Risk Assessment will determine <i>be required to fully demonstrate that the</i> Exception Test can be satisfied. The Exception Test also ...the community <i>that outweigh the flood risk.</i></p> <p>Policy EP3 – Minimiseing damage to existing properties</p> <p>The Environmental Protection policies should be renumbered accordingly as a result of the deletion of EP4 (and the further, subsequent deletion of EP8 – see PM13 below).</p>

Proposed modification number (PM)	Page no./ other reference	Modification
PM12	Page 25	<p>Policy EP7 – Local Amenity</p> <p>Delete first sentence and substitute:</p> <p><i>Development proposals that adversely impact on residential amenity will not be supported.</i></p>
PM13	Pages 25 and 26	<p>Policy EP8 – Protect agricultural land</p> <p>This policy should be deleted. The text on Page 26 under EP8 – Policy Overview should be modified as set out below and placed as part of the Overview to Policy EP9.</p> <p><i>Planning permission will be refused for development on the best and most versatile agricultural land, meaning land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification, unless it involves development for the purposes of agriculture and forestry. East Devon Local Plan Strategy 6 and Policy EN13 will be applied to safeguard the best and most versatile land.</i> The Parish of Newton Poppleford and Harpford is surrounded by <i>contains much</i> agricultural land which gives it much of its character make development permissible.</p> <p>Appendix 6, Map 7, shows the agricultural land classification <i>for the Parish. This map is based on the provisional agricultural land classification data held by Natural England. The NPPF Annex 2: Glossary defines Best and most versatile agricultural land.</i></p>
PM14	Pages 13 and 27	<p>Objective 3. Make sure future development delivers the demonstrable needs and requirements of parishioners <i>the Parish,</i> in particular smaller affordable homes</p>

Proposed modification number (PM)	Page no./ other reference	Modification
		<p><u>Housing, Heritage and Design – Policy Overview</u></p> <p>At the time of the 2011 census 2095 in 978928 households</p> <p>Modify the 4th paragraph to read: Any new housing will be required to meet the needs of the Parish. The Local Housing Need to allow localpeople with a local connection to live or to continue living in the Parish</p> <p>During the Community Survey,local connection. However, as 67 houses have been authorised since the 2013, residents requirements have already been exceeded.</p> <p>For all the above reasons,</p> <p>If further housing is imposed onpermitted within the Parish then this should meet</p>
PM15	Pages 28 and 29	<p>Policy H1 – Meeting Demand for Smaller Dwellings</p> <p>Residential development will be supporteddefined as 93 square metres* internal space (Gross Internal Area), and have with no more</p> <p>Policy H2 – Housing which caters for those with mobility issues</p> <p>Any development which ...</p> <p>Strategy 36 must be adhered to. There is a need....</p> <p>Housing with level access and complying with Local Plan Strategy 36 which facilitates wheelchair access....</p> <p>Modify reference to East Devon Local Plan – H2 at bottom of the policy by adding a reference to Strategy 36.</p>

Proposed modification number (PM)	Page no./ other reference	Modification
		<p>Policy H3 – Housing Outside the Built-up area boundary</p> <p>Any residential development outside the BUAB:</p> <p>a); b); ...outside the AONBs; c);</p> <p>d) must meet the needs of the Parish community taking figures from Devon Home Choice or other choice based letting scheme as demonstrated by a Housing Needs Survey.</p> <p>Subject to <i>the criteria above and</i> the other policies of this Plan, there is particular need in the Parish for <i>proposals that help meet the following particular needs will be more favourably considered: ...</i></p> <p>Guidance Note 1 – Affordable Housing</p> <p>Modify the existing note by substituting the following:</p> <p><i>The affordable housing element of a development, comprising housing for sale or rent, for those whose needs are not met by the market and which complies with one or more of the NPPF categories:</i></p> <p><i>a) Affordable housing for rent;</i></p> <p><i>b) Starter homes;</i></p> <p><i>c) Discounted market sales housing;</i></p> <p><i>d) Other affordable routes to home ownership.</i></p> <p><i>Affordable housing within this parish will additionally be restricted to a person(s) who is in housing need and is a resident of the parish of Newton Poppleford and Harpford or has a local connection with the parish because of</i></p>

Proposed modification number (PM)	Page no./ other reference	Modification
		<i>family ties or a need to be near their workplace, according to Local Plan Strategy 35.</i>
PM16	Pages 30 and 31	<p>Policy TD1 – Infill and garden developments and extensions within the Built-up area boundary</p> <p><i>Development on p</i>Previously developed land</p> <p>Policy TD2 – Affordable homes to meet Local Need through a Community Land Trust</p> <p>In suitable locationspermission may be granted for Community Land Trusts <i>may be supported</i> to bring forward .. up to 5 <i>affordable and/or</i> self-build dwellings</p> <p>To <i>assist in</i> ensure<i>ing</i> that these dwellings remain relatively affordable</p>
PM17	Pages 33	<p>Policy HQD1 – Maintain the built character of our parish through High Quality Design</p> <p>Development within ...</p> <p>a) they are of high quality design, in line with <i>the results of the</i> Housing <i>Styles</i> Consultation Survey requirements... ..</p> <p>g) services, such as power and telephone land lines, should<i>would</i> be underground;...</p> <p>l) they conserve or enhance heritage assets in the parish, whether they are<i>having regard for their status as</i> designated or non-designated <i>assets</i> and their settings ...</p> <p>t) they provide adequate, well-designed off-road parking garages;.....</p> <p>Remove second sentence in t) and create a new criterion y) as follows:</p>

Proposed modification number (PM)	Page no./ other reference	Modification
		<p>y) Modern design will be supported or enhanced provided the local character is respected or enhanced.....</p> <p>Modify last sentence in the policy:</p> <p>All major developments ...standard of design as defined by reflecting the principles set out in BfL(12) (Building for Life 12).</p>
PM18	Page 42	<p>Policy GS1 – Protection of Local Green Spaces</p> <p>The following Local Green Spaces include local amenity spaces identified by EDDC and have been are designated</p> <p>Modify the reference at the bottom of the policy to East Devon Local Plan – EN1 (Land of Local Amenity Importance), RC3</p> <p>Modify Map 5a in Appendix 6 to show the location of LGS10. Shrubbery, Station Road, opposite Oak Tree Villas.</p>
PM19	Page 43	<p>Policy TH1 – Trees and Hedgerows</p> <p>Trees and hedgerows are valued</p> <p>2. The natural woodland in the field above Down Close</p> <p>3. b) where trees/hedgerows do notremoval, they should be replaced by an equal or greater</p>
PM20	Page 47	<p>Policy EM1 – Conversion from residential use</p> <p>The change of use to small business scale employment-generating uses: including E(g)(i) B1a (offices); and E(g)(ii) (Research and development); and E(g)(iii) (industrial process) will be supported, provided proposals ensure that they do not have a significant adverse</p>

Proposed modification number (PM)	Page no./ other reference	Modification
		<p>impact on the character and appearance of the area and are not detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring residents.</p> <p>In addition, consideration should be given to additional parking requirements due to the change of use. Anticipated parking requirements and sufficient off-street parking space should be identified within any change of use application.</p> <p><i>*This modification includes an update to reflect The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020 (SI 2020 No.757), which came into effect on 1 September 2020.</i></p>
PM21	Page 48	<p>Policy EM2 – Development of Small Business Enterprises</p> <p>Remove the last sentence of the policy and substitute: <i>Opportunities to secure the provision of new employment locally will be supported, providing all other criteria can be met.</i></p>
PM22	Page 49	<p>Policy EM3 – Superfast Connectivity</p> <p>Modify second sentence to read:</p> <p>Suitable ducting to accommodate FTTP broadband is a construction requirement of <i>should be provided in</i> all new development.</p>