

## Annex 2 Policy Schedule Clyst St Mary & Sowton (Bishops Clyst) Neighbourhood Plan (First Review, Modification Proposal)

### Submission Version Policy Extract with EDDC Comments

Theme / Policy	Policy Wording	Change from existing Made Neighbourhood Plan Policy (with reference to <a href="#">2017 Made Plan</a> and submitted <a href="#">Modification Statement</a> )	EDDC Policy Comments
<b>Policy BisC01: Protecting and Enhancing Geodiversity, Biodiversity and Wildlife</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development proposals should: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>avoid development on local wildlife sites, and habitats of principal importance, unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated, and appropriate mitigation measures provided;</li> <li>protect and enhance where possible the network of habitats, species, sites of importance and wildlife corridors;</li> <li>minimise impacts on biodiversity; and</li> <li>unless exempt, deliver a net gain in biodiversity in compliance with national legislation and the requirements of the LPA.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Development proposals that would result in the loss of, or which would create significant harm to, wildlife sites and other areas of ecological or geological significance, will not be supported.</li> </ol>	<p>Revision and update of all clauses to made Policy BiC01, particularly intended to recognise legislative changes regarding biodiversity net gain.</p> <p><u>Modification Classification:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BPC view – Minor (non-material)</li> <li>EDDC – Material but does not change nature of Plan, given the extent of changes</li> </ul>	<p>The requirements in this policy are largely provided for in national/strategic policy and statute. However, this is also largely true of the existing Made policy. Notwithstanding this, to strengthen the modified policy, suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clause a) – removing the caveat, so this simply protects these areas from development</li> <li>Making the whole policy a 'must' not a 'should'</li> <li>Clause b) – notwithstanding this reflects comment made by EDDC at Reg 14, rephrase or insert punctuation so that enhance is 'where possible' but protect is mandated.</li> <li>Clause b) – clarifying in supporting text what is meant by/defined as 'sites of importance' and adding this to the glossary or removing/replacing the term.</li> <li>Clause d) - given supporting text (paragraphs 7.13 and 7.14) refer to wanting mitigation to be on site wherever possible, adding this to this part of the policy.</li> </ul> <p>Clarity is also needed to aid implementation on whether all the areas sought to be protected by the policy are then shown on Maps 3a and 3b in the supporting text, and if not, to direct to where this information can be found.</p>
<b>Policy BisC02: Protecting Trees and Woodlands</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Areas of predominantly native woodland (including, but not limited to, the woodlands shown on map 4) are regarded as important natural features. Any development proposals that would result in the loss, damage or deterioration of these woodlands will be resisted, unless there are exceptional reasons, and a suitable compensation strategy exists.</li> <li>Development proposals that will cause the loss of or damage to trees, woodland, or species rich hedgerows that contribute positively to the character and amenity of the area must provide for appropriate replacement planting together with a method statement for the ongoing care and maintenance of that planting where deemed necessary by the Local Planning Authority.</li> <li>New development within the proximity of existing mature trees will be expected to have a tree protection plan in place before any development commences, prepared in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012.</li> </ol>	<p>Amended and extended made Policy BiC02 to align with similar policies in other nearby NPs and in response to suggestions from consultees at earlier stages. Adds requirements re. tree protection during in works and more detail on replacement / compensation for loss.</p> <p><u>Modification Classification:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BPC view – Material, but does not change nature of Plan</li> </ul>	<p>Generally supportive, however, suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clause 2 – the starting point should be retained first, moving on to then deal with 'unavoidable loss'. To some extent suggest this could be addressed by amalgamating clauses 2 and 4 which are in part repetition. In addition, notwithstanding this relates to an EDDC Officer comment at the previous stage, suggest change 'species rich hedgerow' to 'native species hedgerow'.</li> <li>Clause 4 – update references to the tree replacement methodology to reflects that in emerging new policy PB08 in the Reg 19 new local plan, which is considered a non-contentious proposal of the new Local Plan, underpinned by latest good practice. Also, as currently worded, 'local' should read, 'locally'.</li> </ul>

Theme / Policy	Policy Wording	Change from existing Made Neighbourhood Plan Policy (with reference to <a href="#">2017 Made Plan</a> and submitted <a href="#">Modification Statement</a> )	EDDC Policy Comments
	<p>This will detail tree protection strategies to be employed during construction. An arboriculture method statement will also be required to cover any proposed works to trees or other works within their root protection areas.</p> <p>4. Where development results in the unavoidable loss of trees or hedgerows, proposals must provide for appropriate replacement planting on the site, or as close as possible to it, together with a management plan for the ongoing care and maintenance of that planting. Such replacement planting should use native and or local appropriate species with an expected mature size similar to those removed and be in the ratio of three trees for the loss of a large tree, two for a medium sized tree and one for a small tree. (See the Glossary for a definition of tree sizes.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EDDC view – Agree due to additional requirements</li> </ul>	
<b>Policy BisC03: Minimising Flood Risk</b>	<p>1. Wherever practical and appropriate, development proposals for the Clyst St Mary and Sowton Neighbourhood Plan Area should show how they will incorporate Sustainable Drainage System (SUDS) principles to minimise flood risk and, in particular, reduce the need for runoff into the surface water drainage system in Clyst St Mary village and at the bottom of Winslade Park Avenue.</p> <p>2. Proposals to improve the management of the river and other water courses and construct new defences in the neighbourhood area to reduce flooding will be supported.</p> <p>3. In improving flood defences, opportunities must be taken to enhance biodiversity and aid local delivery of biodiversity net gain.</p>	<p>Result of amalgamation of 2 Made policies (BiC03 Improving Flood Defences and BiC04 Minimising Flood Risk).</p> <p><u>Modification Classification:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BPC view – Minor (non-material)</li> <li>EDDC – Agree – little change to Made policy</li> </ul>	Note suggested amendments made by EDDC at Reg 14 have largely been incorporated. In addition, we would encourage inclusion of a reference to supporting and encouraging natural flood management, and also, suggest deletion of, “for the Clyst St Mary and Sowton Neighbourhood Plan Area”, as this is the case by default and therefore superfluous.
<b>Policy BisC04: Development Outside the Clyst St Mary Settlement Boundary</b>	<p>1. Other than where proposed through strategic allocations or provided for by strategic policies of the Local Plan, development proposals on land outside the confines of the Clyst St Mary settlement area (as defined on Map 8) will be supported if they are necessary for the purposes of agriculture, or outdoor recreation, or farm diversification without harming the countryside, or conform to other policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>2. Where planning permission is required, farm diversification schemes will be supported where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>existing buildings are reused wherever possible but without substantial rebuilding or disproportionate extension</li> <li>new buildings are sensitively sited amongst or adjacent to existing farm buildings, unless operationally necessary to be sited elsewhere</li> <li>the design of any new building reflects the scale of existing buildings and respect landscape features.</li> </ol>	<p>Incorporates, revises and replaces Made Policy BiC12 Farm Diversification. Broadens policy seeking to reinforce the settlement boundary and protection of the countryside.</p> <p><u>Modification Classification:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BPC view – Material, but does not change nature of Plan</li> <li>EDDC view – Agree.</li> </ul>	<p>Overall support the policy intent and the indicative link to the proposals in the emerging new Local Plan. However, have some concern that the policy is trying to do too many things and there may be some confusion in its interpretation and risk of unintended consequences.</p> <p>Suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clause 1 – suggest this clause be deleted on the basis it would appear to need a lot more clarification about what is necessary and what they mean by farm diversification and outdoor recreation. Outdoor recreation risks broad interpretation – the NP Group may well mean walking, cycling, football etc but it could equally mean a kart track or other likely inappropriate development. This is all considered to be more clearly defined and set out in the local plan.</li> <li>Clause 2b) – delete 'unless operationally necessary to be sited elsewhere' to avoid instances of new agricultural buildings being</li> </ul>

Theme / Policy	Policy Wording	Change from existing Made Neighbourhood Plan Policy (with reference to <a href="#">2017 Made Plan</a> and submitted <a href="#">Modification Statement</a> )	EDDC Policy Comments
	<p>3. Development proposals should demonstrate no significant adverse impact, or that any adverse impacts are satisfactorily mitigated, on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) landscape, geodiversity, biodiversity, habitats, and wildlife corridors</li> <li>b) existing agriculture and other land-based activities;</li> <li>c) the rural character of the area and its setting;</li> <li>d) local transport network and road safety;</li> <li>e) heritage assets; and</li> <li>f) residential amenity.</li> </ul>		<p>deliberately located away from the main farm to facilitate future residential conversion under the new 10 year permitted development rules, in favour of leaving this for an applicant to justify on an individual case basis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Suggest amendment to the allocation diagram (or inclusion of a separate diagram) to show the cycle and pedestrian connectivity. EDDC can provide.</li> </ul>
<b>Policy BisC05 Green Wedge</b>	Development proposals in the designated Green Wedge area (shown on map 5), within the neighbourhood area, will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that no harm to the character or purpose of this area will occur.	<p>New policy intended to recognise the concept of the green wedge and the Local Plan designated area.</p> <p><u>Modification Classification:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BPC view – Minor (non-material)</li> <li>• EDDC – Material but does not change nature of Plan on the basis this a new policy and was therefore not previously subject to examination on the made Plan.</li> </ul>	<p>No need for this policy to be included as it is duplication of the Local Plan. However, no objection as whilst it is a slight variation on the Local Plan policy (both adopted and emerging), it is not significantly different to be considered in conflict with the strategic policy, and we understand the desire to emphasise the designation given the development pressure in this location.</p>
<b>Policy BisC06: Heritage Assets</b>	Development proposals affecting designated and non-designated heritage assets should be accompanied by an appropriate assessment which sets out the significance of the asset(s) (including setting) and the impact of the proposal upon significance and experience of the asset(s). Applications will be determined strictly in accordance with national policy and guidance and the development plan.	<p>New policy intended to ensure value of heritage assets is recognised and safeguarded appropriately.</p> <p><u>Modification Classification:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BPC view – Material, but does not change nature of Plan</li> <li>• EDDC view – Agree, on the basis this a new policy and was therefore not previously subject to examination on the made Plan.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted this is a new policy. Whilst other made neighbourhood plans in east Devon contain similar policies, we do not consider there is a need for this policy which effectively duplicates national policy, without the identification of non-designated heritage assets which would add local specificity. However, we appreciate the community desire for the policy, the development pressures in the area and the wealth of heritage assets, particularly at Sowton Village.</p> <p>Whilst we do not therefore object to its inclusion and note amendments to wording suggested by our Conservation Officer have been fully incorporated, should this policy be retained, it would be helpful to add locally specificity by reference to the Sowton Conservation Area and the Grade I Bishops Court and add '(including any identified on the Local List)' after 'non-designated heritage assets', to reflect the intent set out in the supporting text to identify assets to put forward for local listing.</p>

Theme / Policy	Policy Wording	Change from existing Made Neighbourhood Plan Policy (with reference to <a href="#">2017 Made Plan</a> and submitted <a href="#">Modification Statement</a> )	EDDC Policy Comments
			In addition, suggest a reference to the Prayerbook Rebellion, as the setting of Clyst St Mary was key to this event, as well as Bishop's Court should be included in the supporting text to aid the consideration of 'experience'.
<b>Policy BisC07: Maintaining Local Character</b>	<p>Development should be well designed to fit in with the local area and contribute to creating a strong sense of place.</p> <p>New development will be required to demonstrate a high quality of design, use of materials and detail that are appropriate for the area and have regard to the prevailing scale, massing, density and plan form in the locality.</p> <p>Extensions and alterations to buildings will be supported so long as they complement and enhance the main building and its setting.</p> <p>Replacement of any building will only be supported if the proposed development makes an enhanced positive architectural contribution to the location.</p> <p>Boundary treatments for new and amended curtilages should reflect that prevailing in the surrounding area.</p> <p>Development proposals should accord with the Clyst St Mary and Sowton Design Codes.</p>	<p>Extension of made Policy BiC05 (also 'Maintaining Local Character') to emphasise design and refer to newly produced Design Code, in place of the previously referred to Design Statement document.</p> <p><u>Modification Classification:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BPC view – Material, but does not change nature of Plan</li> <li>EDDC view – Agree</li> </ul>	<p>Support the modifications and the addition of a new Design Code and note that the amendments to the policy previously suggested by our Conservation Officer have been fully incorporated.</p> <p>We generally welcome the Design Code document, but we feel there is an opportunity missed for greater use of images of good design / details and annotated plans, in place of text and to illustrate e.g. related to content on pages 30-34, and there would be benefit to clarifying some vague statements such as how extensions being 'in proportion' would be defined, with examples (p.28). We also observe that the example depicted as good design on page 55 appears to include aspects we would question such as lack of pavement, timber cladding (which is not vernacular) and some blank facades fronting the highway.</p>
<b>Policy BisC08: Local Green Space</b>	<p>The following area is designated as a Local Green Space:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Queen Elizabeth Field</li> </ul> <p>Inappropriate development on any designated Local Green Space named in this policy will only be supported in very special circumstances.</p>	<p>Replaces Made Policy BiC19 (Local Green Space) and removes LGS designation from 2 sites in that policy in favour of making them subject to policy protection under Policy BisC21 Sports &amp; Recreation Facilities.</p> <p><u>Modification Classification:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BPC view – Material, but does not change nature of Plan</li> <li>EDDC view – Agree</li> </ul>	<p>Note there were two more areas of LGS designated in the existing made plan, and that this policy would remove that designation, in favour of giving them a (lesser) degree of protection through the Sports and Recreation policy (BisC21). Also, that the NPPF expects LGS designation to "be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period". Whilst ultimately, we do not object and will respect the wishes of the community, we are surprised by the removal of the LGS designation from those areas and would welcome clarity on why this was the outcome of the review as this does not appear to form part of the submission.</p>
<b>Policy BisC09:</b>	New development will be supported where it meets relevant policies in this plan and provided:	Incorporates and replaces made Policy BiC07 (Providing	Understand the desire for a policy dedicated to Sustainable Development, however, these aspects are partly covered by more detailed policy

Theme / Policy	Policy Wording	Change from existing Made Neighbourhood Plan Policy (with reference to <a href="#">2017 Made Plan</a> and submitted <a href="#">Modification Statement</a> )	EDDC Policy Comments
<b>Sustainable Development</b>	<p>a) sustainable construction and drainage techniques and energy conservation measures are incorporated within the development proposals;</p> <p>b) provision is made wherever possible for connection to the latest high-speed broadband and other communication networks;</p> <p>c) opportunities to further safe and secure pedestrian and cycle links are incorporated wherever possible;</p> <p>d) it does not result in the loss of land of local amenity or recreational importance, unless an alternative space of equal or greater size, quality and convenience is included as part of the proposal;</p> <p>e) natural habitats are protected during construction, and measures to improve biodiversity are incorporated including, but not limited to, bee bricks, bat and bird boxes and hedgehog highways; and</p> <p>f) the need to design out crime, disorder, and anti-social behaviour to ensure ongoing community safety and cohesion, has been taken into account.</p>	<p>Space for New Dwellings), Policy BiC09 (Increasing Connectivity) and broadens scope to address wider sustainability (in its broadest sense) including areas not currently specifically within any part of the made Plan policies or not in this form (sustainable construction methods, designing out crime, protection of outdoor public spaces, sustainable travel.)</p> <p><u>Modification Classification:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BPC view – Various ranging from ‘Minor (non-material)’ re. connectivity to ‘Material, but does not change nature of Plan’.</li> <li>EDDC view – Agree introduction of this policy considered a Material Modification, but not to the extent it changes the nature of the Plan.</li> </ul>	<p>elsewhere in the Plan and may be better served within the topic-based policy e.g. on biodiversity, flood risk, design, footpaths and cycleways.</p> <p>In addition, we would advise against the use of the term “Land of Local Amenity Importance” as this is used in both the adopted and emerging Local Plan to relate to specific designated areas of LLIA, none of which are located in this neighbourhood area, which may therefore cause confusion. Suggest this could be rephrased as land of local amenity or recreational ‘value’. However, more generally, without identification on plan or any criteria, we would query how this is to be defined and whether it gives sufficient guidance / certainty for developers/decision makers. For this reason, we would suggest in order to be retained in the policy, these areas need to be identified otherwise if developers come forward with development on an area that the community consider to be LLIA and it is not obvious this is the case, we will not be able to defend it.</p>
<b>Policy BisC10: Infrastructure</b>	<p>All proposals for new development must deliver the necessary provision for physical and social infrastructure to offset its impacts. Applications for residential development will be required to demonstrate how the infrastructure needs of the development are addressed.</p> <p>Proposals for new development that cannot demonstrate adequate measures to deliver appropriate infrastructure provision to offset its impacts will not be supported.</p>	<p>New policy intended to emphasise the importance of adequate local infrastructure provision to this community.</p> <p><u>Modification Classification:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BPC view – Material, but does not change nature of Plan</li> <li>EDDC view – Material changing the nature of the plan, if the intent is that all new developments meet</li> </ul>	<p>Understand the motivation for including this policy and whilst we do not disagree with the principle that the impacts of new development on physical and social infrastructure need to be addressed it is not always down to the development itself to deliver this. Residential developments will pay Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which addresses the costs of delivering elements of infrastructure particularly where these are to be delivered off-site. Responsibility for delivering infrastructure in these cases will rest with other bodies utilising CIL and other funds and so it is not appropriate to require new development to deliver this. To address this, we would suggest that the first sentence is amended to read “All proposals for new development must make provision for physical and social infrastructure to address its impacts.”</p>



Theme / Policy	Policy Wording	Change from existing Made Neighbourhood Plan Policy (with reference to <a href="#">2017 Made Plan</a> and submitted <a href="#">Modification Statement</a> )	EDDC Policy Comments
		the physical and social infrastructure needs themselves, which would mean developers bearing the full cost as well as paying CIL.	
<b>Policy BisC11: Clyst St Mary Settlement Boundary</b>	<p>Development proposals on land within the defined settlement boundary of Clyst St Mary (see Map 8 (plan page 31)) will be supported where the development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) benefits from a safe and suitable access for all road users;</li> <li>b) does not impact upon the privacy of any adjoining properties;</li> <li>c) is consistent with the character of the locality; and</li> <li>d) does not increase flood risk or exacerbate existing sewage disposal problems; and</li> <li>e) is generally in compliance with other policies in the development plan.</li> </ul> <p>Areas outside the built-up area boundary will be regarded as countryside and subject to 'development in the countryside' policies in the development plan.</p>	<p>New policy intended to recognise and update the development boundary for Clyst St Mary in the Villages Plan, by using the associated established criteria.</p> <p>Uses the new term 'Settlement Boundary' to reflect that in the emerging new Local Plan (previously built-up area boundary).</p> <p><u>Modification Classification:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BPC view – Material, but does not change nature of Plan</li> <li>• EDDC view – Agree.</li> </ul>	<p>It should be noted that there is a variation of a new settlement boundary for Clyst St Mary included in the current Regulation 19 Local Plan, which would supersede the boundary associated with this policy if adopted subsequently to this NP being made. If the site allocation under Policy BisC12 is retained in the final made version of this plan, it is suggested that we would endeavour to include this in our Local Plan settlement boundary to reflect this, in accordance with our new published methodology. However, we would also be likely to seek to retain the other smaller differences as they are proposed within the emerging Local Plan, including the inclusion of the recreation ground within the boundary and several garden spaces as again, this would align to our new methodology. This would not risk the development of the recreation ground as this would be protected by other policy, not least its designation as 'Local Green Space' in the Neighbourhood Plan. We would suggest it may be appropriate therefore to make reference to the emerging Local Plan in supporting text.</p> <p>In addition, for clarity in application suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Clause b) - inserting "adversely" before 'impact' for clarity</li> <li>○ Clause c) - replacing 'consistent with' the character of the locality, which may stifle innovative design, with 'respects and complements'</li> <li>○ Clause d) as stated at Reg 14, may need to be more positively worded, for example, provide information to demonstrate how the proposed development will be drained and wastewater dealt with.</li> </ul>
<b>Policy BisC12: Land East of Clyst St Mary</b>	<p>Land to the east of Clyst St Mary as shown on Map 9 is allocated for residential development to provide at least 72 dwellings, which cater for local needs and demands.</p> <p>Development should be in accordance with an agreed Concept Plan, which demonstrates a fully integrated and co-ordinated housing scheme that complies with the requirements of this policy.</p> <p>Development proposals for the land shown on Map 9 will be supported, subject to the provision of:</p>	<p>New residential allocation policy intended to allocate land sufficient to meet the expected requirements of the new Local Plan.</p> <p>Policy also incorporates / replaces Made policy BiC06 re. smaller dwellings (albeit for this specific site only rather</p>	<p>Whilst this is a variation on sites that our work on the emerging Local Plan suggested were the most suitable locations for development at Clyst St Mary, we support the Qualifying Body in making this allocation which seeks to achieve certain community benefits that we were unable / unlikely to require through the Local Plan. Linked to the site selection, we note that our queries regarding the Strategic Environmental Assessment in terms of the preferred option and consideration of reasonable alternatives, have all been satisfactorily addressed.</p> <p>We do have some remaining concerns around landscape impact on the Clyst Valley but we do welcome both the potential for the development to</p>

Theme / Policy	Policy Wording	Change from existing Made Neighbourhood Plan Policy (with reference to <a href="#">2017 Made Plan</a> and submitted <a href="#">Modification Statement</a> )	EDDC Policy Comments
	<p>a) a satisfactory vehicular access from the A3052, which includes a signal-controlled crossing to the A3052 to provide a pedestrian and cycle connection to Church Lane;</p> <p>b) an estate road between the A3052 and Bishops Court Lane, constructed to an adoptable standard and a specification to be agreed with DCC Highways, and open to the public before occupation exceeds 80% of the total houses on the site;</p> <p>c) traffic management measures implemented to Bishops Court Lane and Frog Lane to minimise their appeal to and use by through-traffic;</p> <p>d) the Clyst Valley Trail cycle route being incorporated through the development to connect with Bishops Court Lane along with other relevant cycle and vital pedestrian links;</p> <p>e) the provision of safe pedestrian routes through the development which can allow connection to existing or proposed footpaths, to enable residents to walk safely to bus stops, school and village services, and other local facilities and locations;</p> <p>f) adequate play and amenity space with satisfactory arrangements to cover its future maintenance;</p> <p>g) an overall housing density, design and layout in accordance with the Bishops Clyst Design Codes and Guidance;</p> <p>h) a mix of housing sizes, types and tenures that satisfy identified local needs and meet local demand, based on up-to-date local housing needs information;</p> <p>i) affordable housing provision, which satisfies the requirements of the LPA;</p> <p>j) a layout incorporating tree planting and landscape elements which both protects the residential amenity of Greenspire and effects a gradual transition from built area to countryside to reduce landscape and visual impacts on the Clyst Valley;</p> <p>k) landscaping and peripheral boundary treatment, which retains existing trees and hedgerows, providing a minimum 10m wide woodland buffer strip to the boundary with Bishop's Court Lane to give satisfactory screening of the development in views from the Clyst Valley Regional Park, and adequately protects priority habitats in the vicinity of the site;</p> <p>l) a heritage assessment, where relevant, to demonstrate that the significance of any nearby designated or non-designated heritage asset will be satisfactorily conserved or enhanced;</p> <p>m) a water supply, drainage, and sewerage scheme for the whole site, which ensures there will not be any worsening of foul and surface water flooding to existing properties in Clyst St Mary; and</p> <p>n) the development conforming with other relevant policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>than residential development sites generally).</p> <p><u>Modification Classification:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BPC View – Material changing the nature of the plan</li> <li>EDDC view – Agree.</li> </ul>	<p>secure a route for the Clyst Valley Trail and to provide a 10m screening buffer, as requested by EDDC Officers at the previous stage. As raised at Regulation 14 stage, while we understand the community desire for a link road, we remain nervous about how certainty in securing this can be achieved and whether this is viable and deliverable. On this aspect, we are also concerned that with the representation received from the Highways Authority in respect of the highways connection from the A3052 to Bishops Court Lane may impact the rationale for the allocation.</p> <p>We have the following observations on the specifics of the policy as submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Reference to agreed Concept Plan</b> - this requirement follows a similar approach taken in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan where adjoining parcels of land in different ownership are allocated for one co-ordinated scheme. Suggest the wording in the policy could be refined to follow this lead by stating "This allocation will need to come forward on the basis of an agreed masterplan for the whole site that clearly demonstrates how comprehensive development will be undertaken and implemented to deliver a fully integrated and co-ordinated housing scheme that complies with the requirements of this policy. The masterplan must include measures to provide fully for infrastructure requirements and appropriate mechanisms for apportionment of development costs and contributions across separately owned land parcels. Planning permission will not be granted for any individual parcel of land in the allocation in the absence of this Masterplan. The masterplan, for the land shown on Map 9, will be supported, subject to the provision of" and then to continue with the list of the specific requirements.</li> <li><b>Habitat mitigation zones</b> - given it is a fact that the site does lie within the zone for both the Exe Estuary and East Devon Pebblebed Heaths and payments would therefore apply, suggest greater clarity/certainty is provided by replacing this paragraph with, "The site lies within the Zone of Influence for the Exe Estuary SPA and the East Devon Pebblebed Heaths SPA and SAC. All new residential development is required to accord with the requirements set out in the current South-East Devon European Site Mitigation Strategy or any successor document."</li> <li><b>Housing mix</b> - the plan suggests smaller (1 and 2 bed homes) are needed but the policy leaves the mix open, whilst the policy in the Made plan supporting smaller dwellings is lost.</li> </ul> <p>In supporting text, to aid interpretation and implementation of the policy:</p>

Theme / Policy	Policy Wording	Change from existing Made Neighbourhood Plan Policy (with reference to <a href="#">2017 Made Plan</a> and submitted <a href="#">Modification Statement</a> )	EDDC Policy Comments
	To protect the Exe Estuary SPA / Ramsar, Dawlish Warren SAC, East Devon Pebblebed Heaths SAC and East Devon Heaths SPA from in-combination recreational pressure, all residential developments within 10km of these European sites must make adequate financial contributions to identified strategic mitigation measures, as per the latest iteration of the South-East Devon European Sites Mitigation Strategy (SEDESMS). Developers should consult the SEDESMS in determining their geographic location in relation to the mitigation zone and pay the required financial tariff as per the latest strategy guidelines.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Suggest it is clarified that the Concept (or 'Master') Plan should be developed in liaison with / subject to agreement with Devon County Council as Highways Authority – as well as the LPA and Parish Council already stated, and</li> <li>○ for clarification and to aid enforcement, the source of evidence for the requirement for the new road to be open before occupation 'exceeds 80%' is cited (if it is retained), particularly in view of the representation made at Regulation 16 by DCC.</li> </ul>
<b>Policy BisC13: Community Facilities</b>	<p>1. Proposals for the redevelopment or change of use of community facilities will only be supported where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) there is no reasonable prospect of viable continued use of the existing building or facility which will benefit the local community;</li> <li>b) they have been subject to consultation with the local community; and,</li> <li>c) it will provide an alternative community use.</li> </ul> <p>2. Proposals for new community facilities that meet a local need will be supported provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) they will not result in an adverse impact on the amenity of any existing neighbours, including businesses;</li> <li>b) there are safe and satisfactory pedestrian and vehicular access arrangements; and</li> <li>c) adequate servicing and parking arrangements.</li> </ul>	<p>Policy incorporates, replaces and broadens Made policies BiC08 re. safeguarding community facilities and BiC10 re. provision of local health services, extends support for 'new community facilities' generally in place of the current specific and sole support for a health service facility.</p> <p><u>Modification Classification:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BPC View – Material, but does not change nature of Plan</li> <li>• EDDC view – Agree.</li> </ul>	<p>Notwithstanding this applies equally to the existing Made Policy (BiC08), there appears to be a conflict in the first part of the policy between criteria a) and c), in that both could not be satisfied. Suggest this may be resolved by inserting an 'and' between criteria a and b and replacing the 'and' with an 'or' between criteria b and c. Or perhaps c) is intended to refer to provision of an alternative replacement facility – in which case the wording needs to make this clearer.</p> <p>We would observe that there is strategic and non-strategic policy along similar lines to this policy in the adopted Local Plan that already gives a high degree of protection against loss of community facilities and support for new ones. This is strengthened further in the emerging local plan and given this plan is running ahead it could seek to align more closely to this non-controversial emerging to also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ guard against 'partial loss' of facilities;</li> <li>○ specifically require an assessment, over at least 12 months that demonstrates that a need no longer exists, and a financial viability assessment and demonstration of active marketing that clearly shows that there is no viable community use, even in a different format, and</li> <li>○ Where a facility is lost, to requires an alternative facility to be provided in a pedestrian accessible location to the local community (of equivalent or better accessibility as that to be lost) and is of equal or higher community value and is being provided as an explicit replacement for the lost facility.</li> </ul> <p>In respect of new facilities, notwithstanding that the plan should be read as a whole, we would suggest there are other pertinent aspects that should be added to the criteria in part 2, namely, local character and heritage and a pedestrian accessible location.</p>



Theme / Policy	Policy Wording	Change from existing Made Neighbourhood Plan Policy (with reference to <a href="#">2017 Made Plan</a> and submitted <a href="#">Modification Statement</a> )	EDDC Policy Comments
<b>Policy BisC14: Primary School Provision</b>	<p>Development proposals to improve existing primary school facilities will be supported where it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) would not have an adverse impact on the character of the area's natural and built environments;</li> <li>b) can be safely accessible by pedestrians and cyclists;</li> <li>c) has appropriate vehicular access and does not adversely impact upon traffic circulation;</li> <li>d) would not result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents or other adjacent uses; and</li> <li>e) does not conflict with other policies in the development plan.</li> </ul>	<p>New policy intended to facilitate improvements and additions to primary school provision to cope with future demands.</p> <p><u>Modification Classification:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BPC View – Material, but does not change nature of Plan</li> <li>• EDDC view – Agree – is an entirely new policy area as the made plan only supported retention of the school as a community facility in general terms and supported development of new health rather than educational facilities. However, whilst this is significant it is not considered be to an extent that the nature of the plan is changed.</li> </ul>	Support, subject to any comments from the Local Education Authority.
<b>Policy BisC15: Existing Business Space</b>	<p>Proposals for change of use of existing business premises away from employment activity will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that the existing use is no longer economically viable, and all reasonable steps have been taken to let or sell the site or building for employment purposes for a period of at least 12 months.</p>	<p>Replaces Made policy BiC11 and adds 12-month period requirement.</p> <p><u>Modification Classification:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BPC view – Minor (non-material)</li> <li>• EDDC – Material but does not change the nature of the Plan – on the basis that the second part of the policy relating to the 12 month marketing period</li> </ul>	<p>Understand the inclusion of this policy for completeness and that it features in a less robust form in the made plan. However, we consider that the Local Plan policy is more robust. The adopted Local Plan requires marketing of at least 12 months (and 2 years in some instances) and the incoming Local Plan sets out detailed marketing and viability criteria.</p> <p>Given that most business space in the Neighbourhood Area is outside the Clyst St Mary settlement boundary and there are not many non-residential alternatives to business use, we also have a concern that this policy would allow re-use for residential use in the countryside if the viability/marketing requirements show business use is no longer viable.</p>

Theme / Policy	Policy Wording	Change from existing Made Neighbourhood Plan Policy (with reference to <a href="#">2017 Made Plan</a> and submitted <a href="#">Modification Statement</a> )	EDDC Policy Comments
		adds clarification as to how the first part should be demonstrated/assessed, but this is beyond a correction or update of a reference.	Overall, we would suggest that the NP would be better leaving this matter to the more robust LP policy or at the least, explicitly stating that residential use will not acceptable.
<b>Policy BisC16: Business Areas</b>	<p>Development proposals on the business areas listed below (and identified on Map 10) will be supported provided they are in keeping with those uses and business activity already on the sites and do not lead to the outward expansion of the sites.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Langdon Business Park</li> <li>2. Little Bridge Business Park</li> <li>3. Westpoint</li> <li>4. Winslade Park</li> </ol> <p>All business/commercial development should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) respect the character of its surroundings by way of its scale and design;</li> <li>b) not harm the surrounding landscape;</li> <li>c) not adversely affect the significance of any listed building, heritage asset or setting;</li> <li>d) not have an adverse effect on its neighbours;</li> <li>e) not have an adverse impact on the transport network and parking conditions;</li> <li>f) safeguard residential amenity and road safety;</li> <li>g) be accessible by a range of modes of sustainable transport including on foot, by bicycle, or by public transport;</li> <li>h) mitigate any adverse effects of noise, air pollution light pollution and water pollution; and</li> <li>i) ensure the development will be safe from flood risk and not increase the flood risk elsewhere.</li> </ol>	<p>In combination with Policy BisC17, replaces and extends Made Policy BiC13 (Business Development) and updates to reflect the new operational business use at Winslade Park.</p> <p>Removes policy coverage specific to Bishops Court Business Park and adds Winslade Park. Adds a restriction to preclude outward expansion and extends the list of requirements for business/commercial development proposals.</p> <p><u>Modification Classification:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BPC View – Material, but does not change nature of Plan</li> <li>• EDDC view – Material changing the nature of the Plan on the basis in combination with BisC17 this is a very different approach to employment spaces overall to the Made Plan.</li> </ul>	<p>Given the emerging Local Plan is proposing a 1ha allocation at Langdon's Business Park, the policy should acknowledge this – by stating ‘other than where permitted elsewhere in the development plan’. There is also a likely conflict as flagged at Reg 14 with adopted policy E7 which would allow small scale expansion of sites where they are at or near full capacity. However, this is not a strategic policy.</p> <p>Suggest that adverse impacts on neighbours and the transport network should be qualified as not having “any <b>significant</b> adverse impact on”.</p>
<b>Policy BisC17:</b>	1. Proposals to provide small-scale employment opportunities on major new residential developments, or through the change of use of an existing	In combination with Policy BisC16 replaces and extends	Generally supportive. However, would raise that:

Theme / Policy	Policy Wording	Change from existing Made Neighbourhood Plan Policy (with reference to <a href="#">2017 Made Plan</a> and submitted <a href="#">Modification Statement</a> )	EDDC Policy Comments
<b>Business Development</b>	<p>building, or the redevelopment of a brownfield site will be supported provided that the proposals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>do not involve the loss of a dwelling;</li> <li>contribute positively to the character and vitality of the local area;</li> <li>do not impact detrimentally upon designated or non-designated heritage assets and their settings;</li> <li>do not significantly harm residential amenity; and</li> <li>do not adversely impact upon road safety.</li> </ol> <p>2. Proposals for new development that combines living and small-scale employment space will be encouraged provided there is no significant adverse impact on residential amenity and character.</p> <p>3. Where planning consent is required, small-scale, home-based businesses will be supported provided it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>residential amenity and the character of the location will not be unacceptably harmed by virtue of noise and disturbance, smell, traffic generation, scale, design, appearance, or nature of operations;</li> <li>the operation of the business activity can be contained within the existing curtilage of the premises; and</li> <li>the operation of the business activity does not require substantial external modification of the premises.</li> </ol>	<p>Made Policy BiC13 (Business Development). Adds reference to supporting employment on major new residential developments, 'live-work' type proposals, and home-based businesses. Adds further / differing criteria for the consideration of proposals.</p> <p><u>Modification Classification:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BPC View – Material, but does not change nature of Plan</li> <li>EDDC view – Material changing the nature of the Plan on the basis in combination with BisC16 this is a very different approach to employment spaces overall to the Made Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Criteria 1.a) - as a blanket restriction against loss of a dwelling, is considered overly restrictive/inflexible. The local employment benefits may well outweigh the harm from losing a dwelling. Suggest this criterion is deleted.</li> <li>Clause 2 – As advised at Reg 14, we are not generally convinced by live-work units and consider these a risk to isolated residential development in the countryside 'by the backdoor'. If retaining such support, it needs to be qualified in terms of location to ensure an appropriate degree of control i.e. limited to locations within or immediately adjacent to the built up area of the village of Clyst St Mary.</li> </ul>
<b>Policy BisC18: Footpaths and Cycleways</b>	<p>Appropriate improvement and enhancement of public rights of way will be supported as long as their value as wildlife corridors is not harmed.</p> <p>The appropriate creation and improvement of footpaths and cycleways to form a coherent, connected, and safe network in and around the neighbourhood area and to onward destinations, including the Clyst Valley Trail, will be supported provided there is no negative impact on designated habitats.</p>	<p>Incorporates, replaces and extends Made Policies BiC16 (Improving Footpaths and Links) and BiC17 (Improving Cycle Routes and Facilities). Updates to include specific reference to the Clyst Valley Trail and adds consideration of impact on habitats/biodiversity.</p> <p><u>Modification Classification:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BPC view – Minor (non-material)</li> <li>EDDC – Agree on basis no change to the intent.</li> </ul>	<p>Notwithstanding this is a more specific requirement in the allocation policy (BisC12), and features in the Sustainable Development Policy (BisC09), suggest this could go further than 'will be supported' by including an expectation that new developments take the opportunity to make appropriate links to connect / further foot and cycle links.</p>

Theme / Policy	Policy Wording	Change from existing Made Neighbourhood Plan Policy (with reference to <a href="#">2017 Made Plan</a> and submitted <a href="#">Modification Statement</a> )	EDDC Policy Comments
<b>Policy BisC19: Parking Provision</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Development proposals should provide off-road vehicle parking and servicing spaces commensurate with the level and intensity of the proposed use and the accessibility of the location, to facilitate unimpeded road access for other road users, including motor vehicles and pedestrians.</li> <li>2. New residential development should provide a minimum of one off-street parking space for dwellings with 1-2 bedrooms, and a minimum of two off-street spaces for dwellings with 3 or more bedrooms. Proposals for housing developments of four or more dwellings should provide one further off-street visitor parking space per four dwellings.</li> <li>3. New residential development should provide parking and storage space for cycles in accordance with the requirements of the Local Plan.</li> <li>4. Proposals to provide additional off-road parking spaces in Clyst St Mary and Sowton villages will be supported where they do not have an adverse impact on: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) local character;</li> <li>b) residential amenity;</li> <li>c) highway safety; and,</li> <li>d) flood risk (including local surface water flooding)</li> </ol> </li> <li>5. Wherever practicable, permeable materials for surface parking areas shall be used and facilities for charging plugin and other ultralow emission vehicles should be incorporated into the proposal.</li> <li>6. For public parking areas, as a minimum, the provision of electric vehicle charging points should be in accordance with the prevailing requirements of the development plan.</li> </ol>	<p>Incorporates and replaces Made Policies BiC14 (Off-road Parking Spaces for Existing Facilities), BiC15 (Off-Road Parking Spaces for New Development). Adds specific parking standards and references to cycle parking and electric vehicle charging.</p> <p><u>Modification Classification:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BPC view – Minor (non-material)</li> <li>• EDDC – Material but does not change the nature of the Plan on the basis of the additional requirements that do not appear in the made policy.</li> </ul>	<p>No objection. Aware there are similar policies on parking standards in other neighbourhood plans and that the plan states that car ownership is high and there are issues related to traffic movement. However, we would observe that this would slightly at odds with the proposed incoming parking standards in the new Local Plan, which is based on latest evidence of good practice, of a flat rate of 1.7 spaces per dwelling flat rate (irrespective of bedrooms) and that this policy will in due course supersede the NP policy. It may therefore be prudent to consider making the NP standards a specific requirement within the housing allocation site policy (BiSC12).</p>
<b>Policy BisC20: Vehicular Access to Sowton Village</b>	Proposals for improved alternative vehicular access to Sowton Village with walking and cycling lanes will be supported.	<p>New policy intended to support improved vehicular access to Sowton village.</p> <p><u>Modification Classification:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BPC View – Material, but does not change nature of Plan</li> <li>• EDDC view – Material changing the nature of the</li> </ul>	<p>The strategic Clyst Valley Regional Park is likely to improve cycling/pedestrian access in this area, but probably not vehicular access other than for occasional maintenance. Notwithstanding policy protection elsewhere, it may be prudent to include a criteria state this support would be subject to ensuring there is no harm to the historic character and significance of heritage assets. Overall, note this an aspirational policy and no objection, subject to comments of the Highways Authority.</p>

Theme / Policy	Policy Wording	Change from existing Made Neighbourhood Plan Policy (with reference to <a href="#">2017 Made Plan</a> and submitted <a href="#">Modification Statement</a> )	EDDC Policy Comments
		Plan - whilst this is a very aspirational /high level policy, improving vehicular access is quite significant and potentially controversial and therefore should be subject to local referendum.	
<b>Policy BisC21: Sports and Recreation Facilities</b>	<p>1. Development which would result in the loss of the following public sports facilities to a non-sports use on the following sites:</p> <p>A. Clyst Valley Football Ground</p> <p>B. Winslade Park Sports and Recreation Area</p> <p>will not be supported unless:</p> <p>a) the applicant satisfactorily demonstrates that there is no continuing demand for the facility, and it is not possible to use the facility for other sports; or</p> <p>b) alternative provision of at least an equivalent quality, size, suitability, and convenience within the Neighbourhood Plan Area is made.</p> <p>2. Development which would result in the change of use of the following private sports facility to a non-sports or recreation use on the following sites:</p> <p>C. Clifford Hill Training Ground</p> <p>D. Exeter Youth Rugby Ground at Oil Mill Lane</p> <p>will be resisted. If there is no continuing demand for sports or recreation use of the facility, the site should revert to its former use.</p> <p>3. Improvements and extensions to existing sports and recreation facilities that meet a proven need and/or increase opportunities for local people to participate in leisure, recreation, play and associated social activities will be supported provided that:</p> <p>a) they do not create unacceptable disturbance to neighbouring properties by way of noise, light spillage, and unsociable hours;</p> <p>b) the use of any floodlighting has mitigation measures in place to protect nearby residential property and areas of nature conservation; and</p> <p>c) access and sufficient off-road parking can be satisfactorily provided without harming existing residential and other uses and highway safety is maintained.</p>	<p>Incorporates / replaces Made policies BiC20 (Protecting Existing Sport Facilities), BiC21 (Increasing Sports and Recreation Opportunities) and (in part) BiC19 Local Green Space by merging policy and naming specific sites to be subject to it. Adds differentiation between the treatment of public and private spaces in the event of a lack of continued demand and addition of highway safety as a consideration of proposals for improved facilities.</p> <p><u>Modification Classification:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BPC view – Ranging from ‘Minor (non-material)’ re. Made Policy BiC20 to ‘Material, but does not change nature of Plan’ for BiC19 and BiC21.</li> <li>EDDC view – Material but does not change the nature of the Plan</li> </ul>	Support – no comments.