

Report to: Cabinet



Date of Meeting 7 September 2022

Document classification: Part A Public Document

Exemption applied: None

Review date for release N/A

Response to the Broadclyst Neighbourhood Plan Submission

Report summary:

The purpose of the report is to formally agree the response by this Council to the submission consultation for the Broadclyst Neighbourhood Plan. Broadclyst Parish Council has formally submitted their Neighbourhood Plan to the District Council. The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (Regulation 16) require the District Council to formally consult on the Plan for a minimum of 6 weeks. As part of this consultation, the District Council has the opportunity to comment on the Neighbourhood Plan. Officer observations are set out at the end of this report and members are asked to endorse these as the formal representation on the plan. The comments of this Council and all other comments received during the consultation will be submitted to an independent Examiner who will inspect the Plan against a series of conditions that must be met in order for it to proceed to a referendum.

Is the proposed decision in accordance with:

Budget Yes No

Policy Framework Yes No

Recommendation:

- (1) That Cabinet note the formal submission of the Broadclyst Neighbourhood Plan and congratulate the producers of the plan on their dedicated hard work and commitment throughout the process.
- (2) That Cabinet recommend that the proposed representation set out at paragraph 1.21 in this report is made in response to the consultation.

Reason for recommendation:

To ensure that the view of the District Council is formally recorded and informs the consideration of the Neighbourhood Plan by the independent Examiner.

Officer: Angela King, Neighbourhood Planning Officer. Email: aking@eastdevon.gov.uk Phone: (01395) 571740

Portfolio(s) (check which apply):

- Climate Action and Emergency Response
- Coast, Country and Environment
- Council and Corporate Co-ordination
- Democracy, Transparency and Communications
- Economy and Assets

- Finance
- Strategic Planning
- Sustainable Homes and Communities
- Tourism, Sports, Leisure and Culture

Equalities impact Low Impact

Neighbourhood Planning is designed to be inclusive and extensive consultation is a fundamental requirement. The Neighbourhood Plan has gone through wide consultation with the community and has been advertised in a variety of formats to increase accessibility. All electors are invited to vote in the referendum.

Climate change Low Impact

Risk: Low Risk; There is a risk that the Neighbourhood Plan could fail the examination if it is considered to conflict with the Basic Conditions to which all plans must comply.

Links to background information [The Localism Act](#); [Plain English Guide to the Localism Act](#); [National Planning Policy Framework \(2021\)](#); [Neighbourhood Planning Regulations](#); [Neighbourhood Planning Roadmap Guide](#); [East Devon Neighbourhood Planning webpages](#); [Broadclyst Neighbourhood Plan documentation](#).

Link to [Council Plan](#)

Priorities (check which apply)

- Better homes and communities for all
- A greener East Devon
- A resilient economy

Report in full

Background to the Broadclyst Neighbourhood Plan

- 1.1 Broadclyst Parish Council commenced work on their Neighbourhood Plan in following the Neighbourhood Area being designated as the whole of parish of Broadclyst on 20 July 2017.
- 1.2 Since then, the Parish Council and volunteers from the local community have spent considerable time and effort consulting with residents of the parish and other stakeholders to produce a plan which endeavours to reflect the aspirations of the community. Due to the ambitious nature of the plan, the community have also received significant technical support package via a grant from Locality and engaged an independent examiner to undertake a 'health check' on the draft plan as an additional step in the process.
- 1.3 The Broadclyst Neighbourhood Plan aims for the parish to continue to "continue to develop and thrive", 'meeting the changing and diverse needs of its rapidly growing community and its responsibility to tackle national and global issues including climate change, whilst preserving and enhancing its distinctive character and landscape'. To this end, the Plan contains 38 policies related to: community facilities and services, design and climate change, economy and employment, housing, infrastructure and access, and, the natural environment. Significantly, the Plan proposes a total of seven development sites for allocation. These comprise: 3 sites for residential development for up to 44 dwellings in total; 3 sites for regeneration / re-use for employment uses, and a site for a new community

sports hub. In addition, it lends support to the development of tourist/holiday facilities, self-build housing, live-work units, and work-hubs.

- 1.4 Prior to submitting the Plan to East Devon District Council, Broadclyst Parish Council have held their own public consultation on a draft version of the plan; a step which is also required by the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (Regulation 14). Due to the restrictions related to the Covid-19 pandemic and the Christmas period, this ran for an extended period of nearly 13 weeks, from December 2020 through to end February 2021. The comments made during this consultation, including informal comments by District Council officers, have been considered and the plan updated prior to formal submission to East Devon District Council. As well as comments from this first formal stage of consultation, the final Submission has been influenced by further testing of and refinement of policies through the expert input received through the Locality-funded technical support package (including further evidence gathering), and the findings of the 'health check' by an independent examiner.

Submission of the Broadclyst Neighbourhood Plan

- 1.5 The District Council accepted formal submission of the Neighbourhood Plan from Broadclyst Parish Council in June 2022. The Plan and its supporting documents are available to view on the [planning pages](#) of the District Council website. It should be noted that the Plan was previously submitted in December last year but was subsequently withdrawn following discussions with Officers which highlighted areas where further work was considered likely to be required to enable the submission to be deemed legally compliant, in particular to ensure the Basic Conditions Statement met the requirements of the Regulations. At that time, Officers also shared informal observations on some aspects of the plan where concerns remained about the adequacy of the evidence base and justification for a number of the planned allocations. The intention of this being to enable the plan producers to have the opportunity to consider these ahead of re-submission, given the likelihood for formal objections to be raised by the District Council at that stage.
- 1.6 This is the twenty-sixth neighbourhood plan to progress to submission stage consultation in the District. The Parish Council has received regular support from the District Council and additional financial support from the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities.
- 1.7 The statutory regulations require that the District Council organise and undertake a minimum 6 week consultation on a plan when a compliant Submission is received. This is commonly referred to as the submission or 'formal' consultation. The public consultation period is running for a total of 10 weeks from 30 June 2022 to 8 September 2022. The extended period for the consultation reflects both the volume of the plan documentation and the timing over the summer holiday period.
- 1.8 The Plan proposal has been publicised through notices on the District Council website, a press release, emails sent to all Members, adjoining authorities and statutory consultees, including Devon County Council, Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency, and in liaison with the Parish Council, notifications sent to all who made comments at the previous stage. Hard copies of the Plan are available on request and to view at

EDDC Honiton office and Clyst Vale and Pinhoe libraries, as well as local venues in Broadclyst.

- 1.9 One of the statutory roles of the District Council is to consider whether the Plan meets the legislative requirements, in production process terms. Cabinet has previously endorsed a protocol for District Council involvement into neighbourhood plans and in accordance with this protocol an officer review has been completed. Officer assessment is that legislative requirements are met.
- 1.10 Anyone may comment on a neighbourhood plan. It is particularly important that the District Council comments. This is because the plan will eventually (if adopted) form part of the statutory Development Plan for East Devon, and should conform to the strategic policies of the Local Plan. It will also have increased weight as a material consideration in planning decisions, the more advanced it is through the stages of plan preparation. This report provides the recommended representations on the Plan, made by officers of this authority, to be formally submitted to the Examiner undertaking the Plan examination.

Neighbourhood Plan Examination and Referendum

- 1.11 In preparation for the examination that will follow the current consultation period, the District Council must appoint an 'appropriately qualified and independent examiner' agreed with Broadclyst Parish Council. We have requested proposals for the examination, including examiner profiles, and will appraise these and liaise with the Parish Council once quotes are available.
- 1.12 All responses from the consultation (including any made by this Council) are forwarded to the Examiner who will consider them, by either written representations or at an oral hearing (if the Examiner decides one is necessary). The District Council is responsible for paying the costs of the examination but can recoup these expenses by claiming funding from Central Government of £20,000 once a date has been set up for referendum following a successful examination.
- 1.13 The Neighbourhood Plan examination is different to a Local Plan examination. The Examiner is only testing whether the plan meets the Basic Conditions and other relevant legal requirements – they are not testing the soundness of the plan or looking at other material considerations. The Examiner will be considering whether the plan:
- has appropriate regard to national policy and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
 - contributes to the achievement of sustainable development;
 - is in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan for the local area (in this case the adopted East Devon Local Plan 2013-2031);
 - is compatible with human rights requirements;
 - is compatible with any retained EU obligations.

- 1.14 As part of the Development Plan used in future planning decisions, it is in the interests of the District, Town and Parish Councils to produce high quality neighbourhood development plans.
- 1.15 Following the examination, the Examiner's Final Report will set out the extent to which the draft plan proposal meets the Basic Conditions and what modifications (if any) are needed to ensure it meets the Basic Conditions. The Examiner has 3 options for recommendation:
- A. That the Plan proceeds to referendum as submitted.
 - B. The Plan is modified by the District Council to meet Basic Conditions and then the modified version proceeds to referendum.
 - C. That the Plan does not proceed to referendum.

If the Examiner chooses A or B above they must also consider whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the boundaries of the Plan area (this could be applicable if plan proposals could impact on a larger area). The report must give reasons for each recommendation and contain a summary of its findings. It is the responsibility of the District Council decide what action to take in response to the recommendations of the Examiner.

- 1.16 Once the Plan has been finalised it will be subject to a referendum where everyone on the electoral roll (for the defined area) will have a right to vote for or against it. If at least half of votes cast support the Plan then it can be brought into legal force.

The Broadclyst Neighbourhood Plan Response

- 1.17 As part of the current consultation, the District Council can comment on the Plan. In terms of meeting the Basic Conditions, the Parish Council has produced a statement setting out how the Plan complies with the conditions which the Examiner will assess.
- 1.18 Officers have reviewed the Neighbourhood Plan contents, and recommend that the following representation of East Devon District Council be formally submitted to the examiner. It should be noted that comments we make at this stage are primarily restricted to land use planning policy matters rather than other content on the Plan including supporting text or community actions and are made on the basis of:
- Do Broadclyst Neighbourhood Plan policies comply with strategic policies in our adopted Local Plan and have appropriate regard to National Planning Policy?
 - Do we have concerns about policy given the wider objectives of the Council?
 - Are the policies workable and enforceable - could they be reasonably applied through the Development Management process? and
 - Are they otherwise appropriate or desirable?
- 1.19 Overall it is noted that the extensive District Council comments made on draft policies at the previous Regulation 14 consultation in particular, and informal guidance from Officers at various points since that time, have been given consideration by the Parish Council and numerous amendments made to the Plan as a result. In view of this, together with the input to the final Submission arising from the Locality technical support package, the independent 'health-check' and following withdrawal of the previous Submission (with resultant delays, it is intended that comments will focus on highlighting key areas that we would wish to see

considered further through the examination, and where policy wording is likely to be difficult to implement.

- 1.20 In terms of the planned replacement of the adopted Local Plan with a new Local Plan for east Devon, this remains at too early a stage for conformity with emerging strategy and policy to be formally assessed. However, Members should be aware that this neighbourhood plan proposes one site for allocation for housing at Broadclyst (NP Policy H3) which is also currently included within the early working draft Local Plan as a preferred site for allocation. This will need to be re-considered as part of the continued work to prepare the Local Plan in due course, further to the outcome of the neighbourhood plan examination.
- 1.21 East Devon District Council comments on the Regulation 16 Submission Version of the Plan are proposed as follows (a full schedule of the Plan policies is provided in Annex 1 for reference):

Policy Comments

General Observations on Policy

- i. The reduced number of policies compared to the Regulation 14 version, and the more recent removal of several allocations to which Officers had raised concerns about justification/rationale, is welcomed. The determined and holistic approach to endeavour to address matters important to the community, including climate change and local employment opportunities, are also notable.
- ii. In some cases there does however appear to be somewhat of a disconnect between the evidence cited in supporting text and the decisions on aspects of the policies, including the mix of uses within the employment allocations, which the Examiner may wish to consider.
- iii. Many of the policies also continue to give very limited or loose locational requirements for development, which may still result in proposals (e.g. live-work units, holiday accommodation) being supported in more unsustainable locations.
- iv. In addition, there is a risk in some policy wording of development being supported or even 'strongly supported' for its contribution towards infrastructure improvements or other desired outcomes, seemingly by giving weight to these matters above all other considerations. In addition, there is some ambiguity (e.g. policies T1 & T2) as to what can be classed as a 'contribution', which could in theory be just a small financial contribution. It is suggested that the Examiner may wish to consider how this could better be addressed in policy wording to provide support for appropriate development as well as for the desired infrastructure / wider outcomes.
- v. More generally, further tightening up (or even removal) of policy/policy clauses may be appropriate to facilitate plan implementation and mitigate unintended consequences.

- vi. Finally, also related to implementation, some individual policies in their own right or in combination with others, could place a considerable and potentially unreasonable burden for additional checking and assessment on our Development Management officers, and wherever possible it would be more appropriate to explicitly place the onus on developers to demonstrate compliance, for example in DC2.

Policy-specific Comments

- **CFS1 Community Sports Hub** – no objection in principle to the proposed development, but as flagged at Regulation 14 stage, we would query deliverability of the scheme, particularly in terms of the lead body to take this forward, the significant funding package required etc. We are also seeking confirmation from the Highways Authority that the access can be achieved, including for cyclists and pedestrians. On policy wording, we would suggest that to increase certainty, the policy requires “all” of the facilities listed to be included, rather than ‘including’. Also, in respect of a ‘reserve site’, given that there is no longer an identified reserve site in the Plan, this would be better described as an ‘alternative site’ and to consider extending the period in which development starts beyond 3 years which appears to be very short.
- **CFS2 Sport & Community Facilities** – it could prove difficult in implementation to assess whether a ‘demonstrable community need’ exists. Therefore suggest making it clearer that the development to be supported is floorspace for sports / recreation / community use.
- **D1 High Quality Design** – overall, welcome the efforts to make this policy more implementable, but suggest some further changes are required:
 - Clause 2 - as there should not be any “significant impact on visual amenity”, suggest this clause needs revising to avoid/minimise impact.
 - Clause 6 - to be aware that whilst we support the intention, we cannot currently insist or enforce that the lighting is powered by renewable energy.
 - Clause 8 - could be strengthened by making linking into existing networks and connections to sustainable travel options an absolute, with enhancement and facilitating future connectivity, ‘wherever practicable’.
 - Clause 11 on signage – to be aware we can only consider highway safety and visual amenity, and only then where consent is required.
- **DH1 and DH2 Heritage** – Ahead of sight of comments from Historic England which will be key, and in line with our previous comments, we would prefer to see these 2 policies combined. Also suggest further revision may be necessary to avoid duplication and possible conflict with strategic policy. We would suggest as a minimum that the requirement in clause 1 should be to conserve OR enhance in line with national policy. Also, whilst supporting the principle of making heritage assets more energy efficient, we would raise a concern about the blanket support given in the final policy clause, which we would suggest needs to be more caveated to avoid harm to significance of the asset.
- **DC1 and DC2 Energy efficiency & renewable energy in new and existing buildings** – suggest that DC1 and DC2 be combined as the split between new and existing development seems somewhat unclear here as aspects of each policy would appear to be applicable to both. This may also be a more appropriate place to incorporate a clause (currently in DH1) regarding renewable energy in historic buildings. Suggest also that a clause is added to paragraph 1 in DH2 to allow for the role of trees, shrubs and other vegetation in cooling and shading buildings.

- **DC3 Sustainable Drainage** – support this policy, but clarification would be useful as to whether this would apply to householder extensions, and changes of use - perhaps by insertion of ‘wherever applicable’. Suggest that ‘usually covered with grass’ is removed from the definition of swales in favour of ‘sloping, vegetated sides’ to reflect that alternative natural vegetation will have greater benefits for biodiversity than amenity grassland.
- **DC4 Residential storage** – Support this policy, but as per our previous comments, we would suggest that the requirement be strengthened by quantifying a minimum no. of cycle storage spaces to be provided according to dwelling size (for example, this is 1 per bedroom in the Cranbrook plan). Moreover, it would be appropriate to require rather than simply ‘encourage’ the cycle storage.
- **DC5 District Heating Schemes** – aware this policy has had technical input from consultants providing support to the Plan, but for clarity and to aid implementation, suggest the first sentence should be revised to read, “Across the neighbourhood plan area, including but not limited to the LDO District Heating Area (Figure 27), proposals for new development that demonstrate that they will produce less than 150kg of CO2 per kWh from heating systems will be supported”.
- **DC6 Community-led Renewable Energy** – as some of the examples of benefits fall outside statutory planning/land-use matters, suggest these are moved to the supporting text.
- **EC1 Beare Farm** – query whether the addition of a cross-reference to the heritage policies of the NP are sufficient to address the questions we raised at Regulation 14 regarding whether the suitability of, and impact on, these listed buildings has been sufficiently considered. We are seeking the views of Historic England through the current consultation. Also, suggest that the final bullet under point 2 of this policy is a listed as a standalone criteria, and that a point of reference is given for the ‘Killerton Estate objectives’.
- **EC2 Crannaford Crossing** – as per previous comments, whilst we consider that a light industrial use could be suitable at this location, we have serious reservations (which the plan proposers are aware of) about the generation of additional traffic (vehicular, pedestrian and cyclist) over the level crossing of the uses proposed, in relation to rail safety in particular. In contrast to the explanation on page 90 regarding our earlier request to remove the playpark and children’s nursery uses, we wish to clarify that this was solely based on our safety concerns. We are seeking the views of Network Rail through the current consultation. In terms of the policy wording itself, it is considered unclear what ‘selective development’ means in practice.
- **ET1 Tourism** – there is a risk of this policy being open to abuse / wide interpretation with proposers of development likely to argue they are responding to one or more of the listed themes, which may not necessarily be in the way the community envisages. Also suggest that although it is a broad definition, the reinstatement of the term ‘Sustainable Tourism’ used in earlier versions could help to clarify the expectation.
- **T2 Holiday Accommodation** – a part-duplication, part-conflict with Local Plan policy E16 has been noted. This Local Plan policy does not permit new builds and places greater locational control on conversions, whilst encompassing the majority of the other criteria in ET2. Whilst not a strategic policy, it seeks to promote sustainable development – a principle which the NP seeks to also embed and must demonstrate as a matter of compliance with the basic conditions. It is suggested that reliance or

cross-reference to the Local Plan policy here would be adequate, with the addition of the local requirement for the accommodation to be for 'holiday purposes only' and for support for new build accommodation to be removed.

- **ET3 Campsites** – notwithstanding previous discussions, we would wish to see a definition being given to 'small scale' within the policy to increase the control it would provide and aid effective implementation.
- **H1 Blackhorse Gardens** – the policy infers that the development sits within the 57dB-60dB airport noise contour. However, it has been noted in reviewing this version of the plan, that this is incorrect. The sites in fact lies entirely within the 60-63dB noise contour where more sensitive uses such as residential are not normally considered suitable, or at least not without further evidence on noise mitigation and viability. In such a situation, any development should be acoustically designed to achieve the lowest practicable internal noise levels in order to meet with the standards set within BS8233 and recommended by the World Health Organisation. We would not normally support the allocation of the site unless it can be demonstrated that noise levels within any residential area will not exceed those recommended by the World Health Organisation due to concerns about noise. On other aspects, if the policy is retained, as well as reflecting this, we suggest replacing 'include the following' with 'for' to avoid ambiguity and also that the plan producers clarify why live-work units are restricted to less storeys than the dwellings.
- **H2 Broadclyst Station site** – Whilst this is not considered to be the most logical location for new housing, it is acknowledged that this will have a close relationship with the Cranbrook Blue Hayes development as this develops out. We would however query whether the flood risk and ecological constraints have been adequately assessed to underpin the principle of the allocation. Related to this, we would question the inclusion of the triangular area of the land within the allocation as it is entirely in flood zone 2/3. The definition of self-build should also be explicitly linked to the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended by the Housing and Planning Act 2016) or the latest version, as cited in the self-build policy.
- **H3 Broadclyst Village Site** – we welcome the addition of a footpath link to the allotments, but would also wish to see footpath connections made through the site to the wider footpath network (an illustrative map can be provided).
- **Policy justification to housing allocations** – this should refer to Strategy 27 of the Local Plan, rather than Strategy 35, which relates specifically to Rural Exception Schemes for up to or around 15 dwellings only. Although the allocation at Broadclyst (policy H3) could have been suitable for a Rural Exception Scheme, it is immediately adjacent to the Built Up Area Boundary within which 50% affordable housing threshold applies and the larger allocation at Broadclyst Station (policy H2) does not meet the rural exception scheme criteria (n.b. for accuracy - the affordable housing requirement under Strategy 35 is 66%, not 70% as stated on p.126 of the plan. Also, suggest as stated previously that the reference to housing at Old Park Farm Phase 3 should be deleted from Figure 41 as the land is not allocated and planning permission has been refused)
- **H4 Affordable Housing** – Whilst we are not averse to supporting the 50% level for affordable housing on the two allocations, we do not consider much of the rationale for this in the supporting text to be relevant or accurate and should be revised. We would also question the evidence for the 50:50 tenure split as the Housing Needs Assessment showed a need for 16 homes (14 rent and 2 shared ownership) and the

Local Plan tenure split is 70:30. It has also been noted that the local connection criteria deviate from that set out in our Local Plan Strategy 35 more than is supported in the justification. We are happy to support the additional step in the cascade for parish grouping, but other than this would suggest it should align to the model set out in the Local Plan.

- **H5 New Housing** – whilst this policy has also been subject to substantial beneficial revision, as worded this would apply to developments of single dwellings upwards (to around 15 dwellings). It is suggested that in fact what is meant is that any development on unallocated sites which are brought forward as exception schemes should be supported by an up to date Housing Needs Survey.
- **H6 Self-Build** – rephrasing required to remove the reference to ‘The Broadclyst NP supports’ to the type of development being supported.
- **H7 Live-work** – Given that, as highlighted in the supporting text the new E Use Class means live-work units can be converted to residential dwellings without planning consent, suggest a clause is added to withdraw permitted development. Furthermore, notwithstanding the improvements made to the Regulation 14 version, given the rise in home working and the loose definition, suggest there is a risk of this allowing residential development ‘by the back door’ e.g. a large house with a home office would appear to qualify, whereas live-work units are better described by a ratio of workspace:residential (e.g. 50:50) which is controlled by condition. The policy would also appear to allow development in unsustainable locations without further criteria.
- **T3 Parking Provision** – to be aware that as advised previously, EDDC does not have published parking standards as such currently, although guidance is given in LP Policy TC9 which could be tailored to local requirements.
- **NE2 Green Corridors** – the starting point for this policy should be protection and retention, with any damage being accepted (with mitigation) where this is unavoidable only.
- **NE3 Tree Replacement** – The policy to be made applicable specifically for ‘unavoidable’ removal of trees, to reinforce that retention and protection is the starting point. Suggest the second paragraph of this policy be deleted at the request of our Landscape and Green Infrastructure officers, with reliance on national policy.
- **NE5 Landscape and Biodiversity** – whilst we understand that an exception is made for householder applications being for proportionality, suggest this could be more positively worded. For example, “Development proposals should seek to contribute to a high quality and biodiversity-rich natural environment, Applications except for residential extension and alterations should demonstrate how they address the following matters:” Regarding net gain, given the early working draft Local Plan looks to require 20% suggest the future proofing in the policy should read “unless exceeded by strategic policy”.

Other non-policy specific comments:

- Formatting and Referencing:
 - Paragraph numbering is incomplete/inconsistent - it would be good practice and assist with referencing in Officer reports for paragraphs to be numbered throughout in continuous sequential order.

- Many parts of the document are well written. However, corrections need to be made for editing and typographical errors throughout the plan, including figure/page number referencing. These combined with a significant number of acronyms and abbreviations (not all of which are in the list of abbreviations), some unclear wording, wording relating to earlier versions, and/or assuming a high level of prior knowledge, inhibits flow/legibility/clarity in places. This is not reflective of the considerable hard work that is known to have gone into preparing the plan.
- Consistent referencing is needed throughout to the 2021 version of the NPPF 2021 and to a consistent name for the adopted East Devon Local Plan (2013-2031).
- Ensure correct version of the Local Plan West End Inset Map should be used throughout (the version on p.8 and p.27 appear to be an earlier draft)
- Consistent referencing to the latest Use Classes Order is needed throughout, and suggest clearer within allocation policies to state the use as well as give the use class reference.

It is suggested that many of the above issues could be overcome by 'minor amendments' agreed between the Qualifying Body and the Local Planning Authority.

- Length and Tone:
 - Notwithstanding work that has been undertaken since Regulation 14 stage, this has focused on number and wording of policies, and plan text would still benefit, if the opportunity was afforded, from greater brevity and focus on relevant factual information and referencing to supporting evidence. This could be achieved by removing unnecessary repetition and statements of opinion where they do not add to the justification of policies or are not substantiated, and moving some detailed findings or matters relating to earlier stages on plan making to appendices and cross referring to that information where relevant.
 - Whilst it is recognised this is the community's plan, and that the community are fully entitled to express differing views to that of the District Council, there are a number of statements within the plan text in relation to our strategy and delivery which are not considered to be accurate and/or relevant and/or necessarily appropriate in a statutory planning document. This includes much of the supporting text to policy H4 on affordable housing delivery for example. Other areas can be highlighted as required if the Examiner affords the opportunity for this to be considered during the examination.
 - For the reasons above, we would therefore respectfully ask the Examiner to consider whether and how supporting text can be amended ahead of adoption, should the Plan be recommended to go forward to referendum.
- Climate Change –
 - We welcome the focus on the climate change agenda in this neighbourhood plan as a cross-cutting theme throughout. We would however advise that whilst having wider aspirations, the EDDC Climate Change Strategy target of being zero carbon by 2040, which is referenced throughout the plan is not

legally binding and is primarily focussed on the operation of the Council itself, rather than the district of east Devon as a whole. As a result the status/force of this strategy has been overstated in the plan as currently presented, but if Broadclyst Parish Council has not already done so, a climate change emergency could be declared and/or an aim included for net zero to be achieved in all development within the parish by 2040.

- The plan should consistently promote an access hierarchy to favour first pedestrians, then cyclists, then public transport and lastly private motor vehicles, including in the allocations, in order to align with the intent to address climate change, health and wellbeing.
 - Figure 19 of the supporting text for the Community Hub – justification should be provided for the assertion that the allocation will reduce greenhouse gas emissions in (note this is an example of detail in the plan that would be more appropriate in an appendix).
- Objectives:
 - We are generally supportive of the vision, aims and objectives of the plan. Notwithstanding biodiversity net gain is reflected in the draft policies, we would highlight that the Natural Environment objective as currently worded to, ‘ensure development does not have an adverse impact on the natural environment or mitigation is provided if impact is unavoidable’ is not compatible with Government policy to enhance the natural environment.
 - Terminology - Noted that some of the smaller communities/clusters of dwellings in the parish are referred to in text and in policy as ‘settlements’ and to ask the examiner to consider if the implications of the use of this term for places that under strategic policy are not defined as such, means an alternative term would be preferable throughout.
 - Relationship to new emerging Local Plan
 - Ensure the plan is clearer about the status of the emerging Local Plan and the relationship with this plan (p.7 of the NP)
 - Amend the text on p.95 to make it clear that the possible preferred site for allocation at Broadclyst in the early working draft of the emerging new Local Plan is not an ‘allocation’.
-

Financial implications:

Central Government funding is available for Neighbourhood plans. This income covers not only examination fees but also all other associated costs such as employment and all other supplies and services. Any residual funds are placed into an earmarked reserve and utilised to cover funding gaps in subsequent years.

Legal implications:

The legal implications are fully set out within the report. It is important that EDDC comment on the content of the submitted Broadclyst Neighbourhood Plan (given that it will form part of the Development Plan and therefore help guide decision making on planning applications) to ensure it sits within the strategic requirements of the East Devon District Council’s Local Plan.