

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| Ref. | Contact Name, Organisation. Sections Commented on where mentioned | Comments | Response | Reg 15 X Ref |
|------|--|--|----------------------------------|--|
| 1 | Milton Abbot Grouped Parish Council | Milton Abbot Grouped Parish Council (MAGPC) fully support the draft Neighbourhood Plan for the area. We are confident that once adopted, it will play an integral role in the planning process for future developments within the area. The draft plan outlines how new housing requirements can be accommodated whilst protecting the surrounding countryside and many of our historic buildings. We thank the Mackplan team for their hard work over the years and we look forward to supporting and reviewing the plan when required. | | |
| 2 | MJP | Absolutely brilliant job on a huge task. Thank you team, it's comprehensive, well constructed and a fantastic yard stick for all applications Really appreciate the hard work | thanks for the positive feedback | |
| 3 | Sarah Squire SPDC Environment Agency | We note that you have taken a strategic approach in your selection of housing sites with regard to flood risk and have decided not to take forward C – Site A, C – Site B and C – Site D, all of which are partly within Flood Zone's 2 and 3 (defined as having a medium and high probability of flooding respectively). We support this approach and confirm that new development should be steered away from areas at risk of flooding. | | Comment included within relevant assessments in Appendix 2-5 Section 3 |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|---|------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | | | |
| 4 | Howard Asbridge | <p>Many congratulations to you and your team on the publication of the draft NP. I'm sure there has been a huge amount of effort needed to get to this point.</p> <p>The Plan comes across as clear, easy to read and focussed on the issues within its remit, whilst flagging up key concerns and values raised by local residents, for other agencies to address.</p> | | |
| 5 | Jeremy Gallow | <p>I'd like to echo Richard's appreciation of the work done by the MACKPLAN team on our behalf and also echo Richard's concern about dangerous and / or careless drivers using the Felldownhead road. It is worth considering that those who drive badly on our road will be the same people who drive dangerously or carelessly in Milton Abbot – i.e. this is not just our problem at Felldownhead, but an extension of the problem well-discussed in Milton Abbot. (edited)</p> | <p>It is well worth highlighting your concerns to the Parish Council (MAGPC) – as you know they have tried to tackle traffic issues many times before with limited success. But there is a renewed effort again, particularly because of the recent formation of an active Road Safety Group in Milton Abbot who are making determined efforts to gather evidence to promote action. We would strongly advise that you and Richard join this group and its activities.</p> | <p>Formation of the Milton Abbot Road Safety Group referred to in Section 8, Transport</p> |
| 6 | Cora Edwards | <p>There has been a lot of talk in the village (Milton Abbot) about parking problems. Everyone seems to share this concern. It would be good if any new housing development could include additional parking for near by houses who do not currently have their own off street parking, to elevate this concern/issue.</p> | | <p>Following discussion with the Highways Dept, sufficient parking to meet the needs of any</p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | development is required but it was pointed out that the on-street parking along Fore Street is forcing traffic to slow down. Provision of alternative parking was discouraggeg by DCC as it would increase the amount of speeding. |
| 7 | Richard Felton | <p>I understand that the road safety at Felldownhead where myself and Jeremy live would not be a major speedbump (no pun intended) in the road to securing the housing needs of the village. It is however a problem, and a problem that you have raised well in your draft.</p> <p>We have lived at Pevans now for just over two years and there doesn't seem to have been any real push to come up with a solution, admittedly it must be difficult as I believe to really make a difference the road layout would probably need to change which i'm sure is not the cheapest exercise.</p> | There is now a recently formed and very active Road Safety Group in Milton Abbot who are determined to build evidence on the problem and use it to seek action. We recommend that you join this group which could result in the use of the speed gun to deter speeding at Felldownhead. | Formation of the Milton Abbot Road Safety Group referred to in Section 8, Transport |
| 8 | JHRH | Whilst I fully understand the rationale and hence the recommendations on the location of the proposed future development, I remain disappointed that there are to be no new homes in Chillaton. | Whilst the resident's survey in 2017 did record some support for development in Chillaton, all agreed any proposal would need to enhance the | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|--|
| | | | sustainability of the village by delivering some tangible additional community asset (eg shop, community infrastructure). In addition, the evidence of need for affordable homes across our communities was insurmountable and is most effectively delivered through the recommended sites. | |
| 9 | Chystele Garnier-Kusiak Highways England | Highways England is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the strategic road network which in this instance comprises the A30 which runs to the north of the proposed NP area. We are keen to support the development of neighbourhood plans and the delivery of local growth and has no objection in principle to the plan. Although proposals in this location are unlikely to impact on the A30, we would still welcome an opportunity to comment on the plan as it develops. | | |
| 10 | SC | <p>Just to say big thank you, we received our MACK Plan report via the post and can appreciate how much hard work the volunteers have put to it.</p> <p>All the issues and observations you discuss are still valid and in some cases getting worse by the day.</p> <p>My concerns are the standard of driving through Milton Abbot, hence us forming the Milton Abbot Community Road Safety and taking part in Speed Watch Volunteering. Especially concerned with the plight of parents walking to MA village school.</p> | We have discussed the Milton Abbot and Chillaton, Parking and Road Safety problems with Devon County Council. Their recommendations on what actions could be taken are now included in the revised MACKPlan. | Formation of the Milton Abbot Road Safety Group referred to in Section 8, Transport |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|---------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>The road and road markings in front of the school are very run down, the yellow lines almost disintegrated completely. The lack of maintenance carried out by some landowners to some of the footpaths and bridle ways. Most important during lockdown. The older land owners regularly maintained ditches and unblocked drains currently now not being done. This knowledge will be lost.</p> <p>The deterioration of the Milton Abbot village hall. During lockdown many villagers have expressed a wish to make more use of the Village Hall, I believe this can be encouraged but my experience of attending Yoga in the hall, it is cold, damp and expensive to heat. I think more Villagers and people working from home are now interested in attending the drop in or meeting up for a coffee but again the village hall needs to be more welcoming.</p> <p>Milton Abbot hall has some interesting books on its shelves but the last time I took one off the shelf there was a nasty looking green powdery mould behind the books. Again a huge need for funding to update, preserve and maintain our village hall facility.</p> <p>I wonder how the community can come together to work on these issues?</p> <p>cc MA Parish Council</p> | <p>The question of utilising our existing village hall, with its long history, or pursuing an alternative has been raised before and we will certainly look again at it once this consultation period is over and we can look across all comments</p> | <p>The potential for the MA Village Hall to benefit from any development has been introduced in Section 9, Housing (paragraph 9.12.1)</p> |
| 11 | Hilary Winter | <p>On behalf of the Devon Countryside Access Forum, a statutory local access forum, I am attaching the Forum's</p> | | <p>Trying to source an appropriate</p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|-----------|---|--|--|---|
| | Devon Countryside Alliance Forum | <p>position statements on Neighbourhood Plans and Disability Access to inform the development and implementation of your Plan.</p> <p>The statements and community action 4.2 on Public Rights of Way are noted. It would be helpful for the Plan to include a map of public rights of way and the route of the Tamar Discovery Trail.</p> <p>If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> | | <i>map!!</i> |
| 12 | KB | I totally support and agree with the MACKplan report and thank all those who worked so hard to produce it. | | |
| 13 | RMI | <p>It is an impossible task to produce a plan which will please all members of the community but I am fully supportive that the information put forward for Milton Abbot is this plan provides a result which is in the overall best interests for the village. I fully endorse it and I hope WDBC adopt it swiftly and that it is at the heart of decision making for planning applications in the area.</p> <p>Thanks to all involved for all the hard work putting this together.</p> | | |
| 14 | Andy Harrap | I fully support this plan, it is well researched and thought out. I think the report on the planning for the area behind the Edgcumbe Arms is particularly good, visually and access wise this is a poor application and would not fit well into this historic village. Thank you to all the MACKplan committee for | | Comments on the Higher Edgcombe Lane Site have been collated and included within |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|-----------|------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | their sterling work on this well thought out and presented plan. | | relevant assessments in Appendix 2-5 Section 2 |
| 15 | Mrs C Harrap | The amount of time and effort that has gone into this Plan is masterful. I applaud you all. It has covered every point that was needed and is clear and concise. All points are relative to the Village and area. I sincerely hope that it goes forward as is and that it is referred to on all matters appertaining to the village. | | |
| 16 | Christine Youds | I have read the MACK Plan and been extremely impressed with the hard work and excellent output. Being a resident of Bradstone my primary interest has been for the plans for the development of Milton Abbot which is our nearest village. Milton Abbot clearly has the potential to become a more significant community centre and would benefit with the re-establishment of a local shop/Post Office and improved village facilities. Developing the planned housing here will help feed that rejuvenation. However, the road through the village needs straightening, speed limits need enforcing, pavements need widening and the parking problem needs addressing. The proposed site identified for development, MA Site E and part of MA Site B, does seem to meet the criteria for increased housing without worsening these problems, and also will not detract from the beauty of the village & its immediate surroundings and should have good access from the main road (even if I am not fond of roundabouts!) On this basis it has my support. I would like to add a big thank you to the comments with regard to style & diversity of the proposed development "identical white boxes will not be supported". Sorry Launceston! | We have discussed the Milton Abbot and Chillaton, Parking and Road Safety problems with Devon County Council. Their recommendations on what actions could be taken are now included in the revised MACKPlan. | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | <p>I am disappointed to read that, despite the existence of this Plan which is close to completion, the WDBC Planning Officer is expected to recommend the planned development at MA Site D: Land to the North of Edgcumbe Terrace & Higher Edgcumbe Lane. The proposed development at this site would clearly exacerbate the access/parking issues in the centre of the village, be an eyesore in terms of views from around the valley, and cause water supply problems to existing residents. I confess that I am extremely disappointed if WDBC use the lack of finalisation of the MACK plan as a means to approve such a highly unpopular proposal. It leaves me wondering how much notice they will apply to the recommendations of this report in the future. It would be scandalous if all the time and energy spent in putting this plan together has been a waste!</p> | | <p style="color: red;">Comments on the Higher Edgcumbe Lane Site have been collated and included within relevant assessments in Appendix 2-5 Section 2</p> |
| <p>17</p> | <p>Mr and Mrs Williamson</p> | <p>Firstly, thank you to all those involved with the MACK plan. We would like to state that we are fully supportive of the Milton Abbot, Chillaton and Kelly Neighbourhood Plan up to 2034.</p> <p>The sensitivity with which the volunteers have worked on the plan is a shining example of how village plans should be put together and the depth of knowledge used and work done is a credit to all.</p> <p>It is quite clear that nearly all villagers agree with this plan although I fear not all have commented yet. Villages must have a say in how they grow. No one is against growth, indeed growth is a good thing, especially for small villages. However, if local planning departments ignore villagers views they are indeed going against what the government is trying to achieve- which is getting communities working together and giving them a voice in the future of the community they</p> | | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|-----------|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| | | live in. Our voices should not be ignored – money must not be the priority !!! | | |
| 18 | JTP | Thanks for all the hard work, as a Milton abbot resident I recognise this plan as the right way forward for development within the village. It's impartial and not judged or decided by those who profit from land values. Please move it ahead as soon as possible | | |
| 19 | ALP | Thank you for the Mack plan! The village will thrive and benefit from well chosen development that is not detrimental While we know we have to have more houses, this way is by far the best because it's impartial and has wide acceptance | | |
| 20 | MP | Thank You Mack Plan we wholeheartedly support the package and agree that the chosen sites are the very best options for the area. we desperately need affordable housing, so the approach and independent way this plan is constructed is absolutely the way to go. we also agree that it was fair to look at other sites, but that they are clearly ruled out as unsuitable for very credible and clear reasons and that by doing so, the villages and the beautiful environment surrounding us is protected for future generations. Could affordable housing constructed have a covenant on it so that they cannot be used for second homes? thereby protecting the exact reason they are built?? | | |
| 21 | Angus Mckenzie | I would like to commend the entire team who dedicated themselves to the production of the MACK plan. The MACK plan is both a visionary tool and a fundamental record of community voice to be used in all future developments , under the Localism Act (2011) which exists to give more | | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>rights and power to communities, the reform to make the planning system more democratic and reform to ensure that decisions about housing are taken locally.</p> <p>I must thank also all the very many residents who took time to voice their opinions and consider thoughtfully the potential development areas within the village even if they were resistant to increased housing. This selfless input has given the village direction and structure for future developments. The plan is welcomed and supported by the village. The document recognises both the historical significance of our village (Milton Abbot), and the importance of protecting our environment, heritage and character moving forward.</p> <p>I am hopeful that the generous feedback and thought, delivered during the initial phases of the plan, will indeed manifest once again during this vital final consultation stage. Only with this stage completed can we truly leverage the MACK plan to defend our expressed wishes and become a lead document in all future planning considerations.</p> <p>I commend the independent unbiased preparation of the report and its far reaching content. I have hope that moving forward, as the MACK plan consultation period is concluded and its acceptance by the community affirmed, we can enforce as a community, as intended by the localism act, that only relevant, required, legal, compliant, majority supported developments can proceed in our community, for the benefit of future generations.</p> | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|-----------|------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | I must thank Councilor Neil Jory for his tenacious support in engaging local level discussion and support for this fine body of work. I support it unreservedly. | | |
| 22 | Karen Gaden | The MACK Plan is thorough, very well constructed and presented and empathetic in it's approach and I fully support the proposed sites for residential housing. I strongly support the recommendation of the plan not to support 'identical white boxes'; as a village proud of it's heritage/architecture it is vital that the proposed housing estates compliment the existing village and it's history. In addition the village must also be supported by the Highways and Council to invest in protecting all residents of all ages/abilities with road safety/traffic calming. The current 30mph signs are ineffective, there are huge risks to pedestrians safety, pavements need widening. Building on any potential sites would result in the same comments – road safety must feature as a high priority. Milton Abbot also needs a local shop and improved village facilities i.e. a regular bus service to Tavistock/Launceston. Finally parking is an issue, I would propose any 106 grants available be used to invest in adequate parking to the benefit of all residents. | We have discussed the Milton Abbot and Chillaton, Parking and Road Safety problems with Devon County Council. Their recommendations on what actions could be taken are now included in the revised MACKPlan. | Following discussion with the DCC Highways Dept, sufficient parking to meet the needs of any development will be stipulated. |
| 23 | Karen Carpenter | We support the independent process by which the recommended sites were identified and unsuitable sites were considered and assessed then discounted We strongly support the suggested sites assessed as most suitable for development | | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|-----------|------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | We agree it's vital that any permitted building projects have the inclusion of the right level of affordable housing that the evidence has determined is needed by the local community. | | |
| 24 | Susan Champion | <p>Thank you to all who have worked so hard in developing the MACK plan it has been thoughtfully put together and clearly represents the views of the villagers</p> <p>I agree the village must grow and the proposed site is the best solution , the design of the houses are important the last buildings at Lutyens fold were built to blend in with the houses of the parade and venn hill and I think this should be continued</p> <p>I can only add to the concerns of many that the parking in the village is a major problem and if not addressed could cause harm</p> <p>Only this past year have parking started on the main road resulting in poor visibility for other drivers</p> <p>The loss of the village shop was a sad loss for the village and I wonder if the local pub could be used more as a community centre and coffee hub</p> | <p>Thank you for your helpful comments. We agree about the importance of the design of future new homes and trust that our section on design reflects that. A number of residents have raised concerns about the current parking problems in Milton Abbot and we will consider if there is anything that we can put into the draft plan to cover that. Parking for new homes is covered in the design statement.</p> <p>We have now discussed the Milton Abbot and Chillaton, Parking and Road Safety problems with Devon County Council. Their recommendations on what actions could be taken are now included in the revised MACKPlan.</p> | <p>Following discussion with the Highways Dept, sufficient parking to meet the needs of any development will be stipulated.</p> |
| 25 | Rebecca Ambrose | I strongly support the outcome and suggested sites for development in Milton Abbot and applaud the thorough nature of the review. Especially in regards to the site behind Edgcumbe lane not being suitable whatsoever. | | <p>Comments on the Higher Edgcombe Lane Site have been collated and included</p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>However, I agree it's vital that any permitted building projects have the inclusion of the right level of affordable housing that the evidence has determined is needed by the local community.</p> | <p>We agree affordable housing is our highest housing priority to meet the needs of young families in the area.</p> | <p>within relevant assessments in Appendix 2-5 Section 2</p> |
| 26 | Craig and Laoni Gardiner | <p>We are extremely thankful for the hard work that has gone into the MackPlan and the response from villagers so far.</p> <p>The sites and types of housing recommended by it as a result of consultation and independent assessment have our strong approval.</p> <p>We now hope that WDBC will support the democratic nature of the Mackplan by calling upon its findings when making future planning decisions.</p> | | |
| 27 | Geoff Cox | <p>Many thanks to all that have worked so hard to complete a MACK Plan to get it to this stage.</p> <p>I feel it represents the wishes of residents in the Milton Abbot area in terms of the recommended sites for development and clearly identifies the issues of other sites which simply do not work. It is good to see the plan findings are clearly backed up by the independent party (AECOM) and thus far it has received so much positive feedback.</p> <p>The suggested sites definitely seem to be the best proposals for any appropriate development and the fact they should be</p> | | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>able to provide the level of affordable houses is a positive for the needs of the area.</p> <p>Hopefully, the plan is taken notice of and the community wishes are listened to.</p> | | |
| 28 | Emily Cox | <p>The MACK Plan puts forward positive resolutions for the future housing needs of Milton Abbot and protects residents from development in unsuitable locations. It also provides the opportunity for affordable housing to come into the development equation.</p> <p>MA Site B & MA Site E (which are supported by the independent consultants utilised in the plan) will more than cover the needs for development for many years and offer minimal safety fears in terms of access and will also have the least number of detrimental factors for established residents of the village.</p> <p>Many thanks to those who have dedicated their time to this.</p> | | |
| 29 | Tim Stapleton M Phil ,BSc,FRICS | <p>Thankyou for the Comprehensive Report I agree that Chillaton lacks the necessary facilities for residential development and hence none of the potential sites are suitable for development .</p> <p>I live in Chillaton and am a retired Chartered Surveyor</p> | | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|------------------|---|---|--|--|
| <p>30</p> | <p>Mike Cunniffe Mabrake Environmental Group</p> | <p>MABRAKE has been in existence since 2008 and has a core strategy to protect the environment in our area against inappropriate planning and developments.</p> <p>MABRAKE therefore welcomes the development of the neighbourhood plan which will allow the community to formally influence the maintenance of areas of cultural significance, environmental heritage, housing design and development and their location, ensuring that the whole is sympathetic to the existing settlements.</p> <p>The plan was found to be balanced in that it also focuses on the future housing, business and community needs of the local villages and hamlets. Furthermore it is comprehensive in its description of the particular features of the area it covers, is well researched and evidence based and has been subject to independent assessments.</p> <p>MABRAKE has previously submitted a proposal to extend the TVAONB. This proposed extension (already submitted) is well referenced in the Neighbourhood plan (Pages 20-21 4.2.06 and 4.2.07).Moreover it covers an area previously designated "Area of Great Landscape Value" all of which includes the MACKPLAN Area. This together with Milton Abbot's own conservation area (Lutyens designed estate cottages) all adds significantly to protection against inappropriate design/development in the future.</p> <p>Whilst the plan acknowledges the allocation and development of 20 homes in Milton Abbot, we are pleased to see that the design specification in the plan has regard to modern living, sustainability and the infrastructure requirements of the existing settlements yet provides appropriate controls and parameters to inform planning consents and to enable consistency of approach when applications are made .</p> <p>New national planning guidance has been issued for consultation .Without a neighbourhood plan which is well</p> | | |
|------------------|---|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|----------------------|---|--|--|
| | | <p>researched, evidenced and with community involvement, future development proposals may take little account of local views and objections.</p> <p>Therefore taking into account all of the above points MABRAKE strongly supports the MACKPLAN.</p> | | |
| 31 | Diane Jardine | <p>I agree with the sites suggested as being suitable to take forward in this excellently produced MACKPlan. My one concern is that Milton Abbot has a problem with speeding and reckless driving through the village but perhaps, nearer the time, a 'Grampian condition' could be considered which would prevent the start of a housing development until off-site works have been completed on land not controlled by the developers. As an example, some traffic calming measures to safeguard the increased danger posed to young children and parents walking to school. Just a thought after reading https://www.planningofficers.org.uk/uploads/news/UseOfGrampianConditions.pdf</p> | <p>Thank you for drawing the Grampian condition to our attention. We will look at including a reference to this within the draft plan.</p> | <p>Grampian Conditions were discussed with the WDBC who advised they were not appropriate in this instance</p> |
| 32 | Chris Snow | <p>Well done for producing such a document. It can't have been easy to do, but I think this is a credit to the team involved. I support its proposals.</p> | | |
| 33 | Becca | <p>I am very pleased with the findings of the MackPlan in terms of the identified sites for any future development. It provides a much better solution for future housing needs by the fact it has identified safe sites for these houses to be placed instead of a scattergun approach with random large houses (when smaller affordable homes are needed) in places which are not suitable for houses to be placed within.</p> | | <p>Comments on the Higher Edgcombe Lane Site have been collated and included within relevant assessments</p> |
| 34 | K.J.C. | | | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>I am very happy with the MACKPLAN suggestions for where houses could be built and especially the areas it has opposed for housing.</p> <p>Hopefully this comes in time to stop what would be a disaster for many people who live in the village and the five houses behind the pub (which has the potential to grow to 30!) end up being ruled out.</p> <p>Safety and our concerns have to come first and the plan provides reassurances which current planning procedures do not seem to take enough notice of.</p> <p>Please take note and utilise the plan fully.</p> | | <p>in Appendix 2-5 Section 2</p> |
| 35 | Carole Robson | <p>I strongly support the Mack plan for the recommended development sites.</p> <p>I believe a great deal of work and thought has gone into this and the residents of the village have been listened to.</p> <p>I therefore hope that the Mackplan will stop the Proposed site behind Edgcombe lane from gaining planning permission, as the Mackplan more than covers the needs of the village.</p> | | <p>Comments on the Higher Edgcombe Lane Site have been collated and included within relevant assessments in Appendix 2-5 Section 2</p> |
| 36 | Bob Laverty 4.4.1.2 | <p>Other than the observation that the Draft Mackplan Document clearly represents a great deal of work on which the Mackplan Team are to be congratulated, I have only one small point of factual detail to make.</p> | <p>Thank you for bringing this to our attention, we will change the wording when we revise the plan at the end of Regulation 14 Consultation.</p> | <p>Referenced text corrected</p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|----------------------|--|---|---|
| | | At sub-sub-sub-para 4.4.1.2 under “Chillaton Green Spaces” it states that the land at Forda Farm is an arable field (the area used for grazing donkeys being on the other side of the road). To the best of my knowledge this area has never been given over to arable farming and has always been permanent pasture. | | |
| 37 | Keith Jardine | <p>A big thank you to all of the of MACK Plan team for providing such a well compiled easy to read document. I am happy with the sites put forward as suitable in this Plan. My only concern is that the MA Site D ‘Land at the rear of the Edgcumbe Arms’, suggests that the site could provide for 30 dwellings. It is not considered suitable to take forward by the MACK Plan, but part of this site is the subject of a highly objected to planning application</p> <p>Approval of this application would rendered all the major constraints outlined in the MACK Plan of little consequence, which would act as a template for further expansion to the west of the site. Very worrying.</p> | | Comments on the Higher Edgcombe Lane Site have been collated and included within relevant assessments in Appendix 2-5 Section 2 |
| 38 | P.A. | Nice comments for all those people not affected by the proposed sighting of this development | We do recognise that it is a sad consequence of the requirement to build another 20 homes in the village that there will be some residents for whom this is hugely disappointing. We would encourage those who find themselves in this situation to engage with MAGPC (who will be responsible for the adopted plan) and WDBC if and when planning applications put | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | forward to minimise the potential impact. | |
| 39 | Amy | Although I do not live in the village my partner has and I have been made aware of this Neighbourhood Plan. It seems to produce very positive solutions to the fact houses will need to be built in the area and provides the opportunity for more first-time buyers to be able to reside in this rural location which has a positive effect on its economy. It also does what any good neighbourhood plan should – looks after the interests of its community rather than any goals of developers. | | |
| 40 | D&GM | Thank you very much for all your hard work in producing such a comprehensive and well thought out plan. We believe it makes sound common sense to adopt the plan and therefore strongly support it. In our opinion, the plan has been carefully considered to eliminate unsuitable sites and to identify those which are suitable. We hope that WDBC adopt the plan asap and defer to the wishes of the villagers when considering future development in the area. | | |
| 41 | JL 4.4.2.4 and 7.3.0.3 | <p>I would like to thank the MACKplan team for the enormous effort that I can see has gone into creating this document .I feel great effort has been put in to covering many aspects of the neighbourhood plan .</p> <p>I do however need to point out some inaccuracies. 4.4.2.4 references Area D as unused and 7.3.0.3 Site B as 'old allotments'.This area of village allotments is neither old nor unused .Currently all allotments are rented and in regular use .</p> <p>I have lived in the village since 1997 ,during this time these allotments have been constantly in use by a wide range of</p> | <p>Thank you for your comments. We will look at the wording on the Allotments area (site B) we did not mean to imply the area is unused.</p> <p>With regard to smaller developments. In the last 2 years it has become clear that the greatest housing need is for 6 affordable homes and for smaller 2 and 3 bedroomed</p> | Referenced text. amended to show their use. |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| | | <p>different villagers of varying ages who have come and gone .I feel it is such a shame that this wasn't recognised by the team before going to print.</p> <p>Currently the allotments in site B old allotment area are rented by 3 villagers and are kept in good order . They are currently used for growing vegetables and soft fruit and support 6 mature apple trees.</p> <p>In addition this area provides an important habitat for a number of species , including birds (owls,woodpeckers) hedgehogs ,bats foraging bees and insects which has an impact on the biodiversity of the whole of Milton Abbot. It also supports several mature trees providing cover and roosting benefits.</p> <p>I have no objection to the use of site E for building but object to the use of site B on the grounds of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -loss of an existing community and recreational facility -considerable impact on the biodiversity of village wildlife -detrimental visual impact on the exceptional architecture of the Edwin Lutyens estate cottages which are listed and of historic importance and value to the Milton Abbot village. <p>I note from the plan that the 2017 questionnaire from the Milton Abbot residents favoured the development of smaller projects rather than one large site and wonder whether the MACKplan committee would consider splitting the development into 2 sites while retaining affordable stone faced housing and necessary green space .</p> | <p>properties. Affordable homes are subsidised through the sale of the open market properties and the ability to do this relies on the economy of scale savings that are made by building a minimum of 10 homes on a site. We have therefore had to adopt this approach in order to meet the housing needs of the local community.</p> | <p>All additional comments included in the site assessment at Appendix 2-5, para 2-3</p> <p>7.3.0.3 refers to Old Allotments simply to be consistent with the AECOM report not as a reference to their age. It has now been replaced with Allotment Gardens</p> |
|--|--|---|--|---|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|--|
| | | I strongly agree with other comments on this site about the need for improved facilities including extended use of the village hall and better transport links . | | |
| 42 | Milton Abbot Village Hall Committee | <p>We applaud the effort that has gone into this excellent report which has our support.</p> <p>We note that there are references in Sections 5.5,7.1and 7.3 to the construction of a new Community Centre and a Community cafe. The Village already has a Community Centre in the Village in the Village Hall which has all the necessary facilities which are currently being upgraded. Sadly, the Hall is considerably under-utilized and it is difficult to see how two Centres can be justified and be financially viable. Perhaps a new Village Hall which has all the facilities of the existing Hall but with enhancements would be the answer.</p> <p>We fully support the proposal of a public parking provision. It is a frequent complaint by visitors to the Hall that parking within the Village is extremely difficult. Public off-street parking would help to attract more visitors to Village events.</p> | Thank you for your sensible observations. The question of utilising our existing village hall, with its long history, or pursuing an alternative has been raised before and we will certainly look again at it once this consultation period is over and we can look across all comments. As you recognise, finding a solution to the current village hall's lack of parking would make it much more accessible | |
| 43 | Robert and Hilary Tucker | <p>First of all congratulations to you all on the plan, it is very impressive and thorough. We read with interest comments on the website which are positive.</p> <p>We write concerning 4-4.2.5 Milton Abbot green spaces. We were quite alarmed to read that Milton Abbot cricket field was listed as its attributes could be associated with a local green space. We feel that anyone reading the draft MACK plan could now interpret that the field is a local green space to use as they feel.</p> | We have reviewed your concerns about the Milton Abbot cricket field and that the entry in the draft MACKPlan being interpreted as a local green space. We would like to point out that the draft plan does not identify any local green spaces (LGS) but does propose a community action for MAGPC to | Referenced text deleted in its entirety. |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>To put you in the picture, the field is currently owned by Hilary's dad BJ Balsdon, purchasing it two years ago from PD Tuckett and shortly to be passed over to Hilary. The Cricket Club rent part of the field (2.5 acres) and the pavilion for the season, for the purpose of playing cricket only, paying a peppercorn rent under the rules of a signed tenancy agreement. To give us legal protection and to allow the club a pitch to play cricket. As they have done for a long time.</p> <p>To address our concerns, we would not want the cricket field to be considered a green space for the village, it should not be considered any more of a green space than anyone's back garden or privately owned field. As written in the MACK plan under 4.2.2.2 with regards areas A and C, "these are not public spaces rather are rear gardens to private dwellings and hence not suitable as designated green spaces", the same would apply to the cricket field. As we farm the cricket field, it being where we make part of our livelihood in fattening lambs, we need to ensure a safe and secure location for our livestock, and make a fair return on our investment. Therefore we would appreciate that 4.4.2.5 The Cricket Field be removed from the MACK plan as a local green space. We trust you understand our concerns and a satisfactory outcome can be resolved.</p> | <p>explore potential LGS allocations.</p> <p>However to avoid any misunderstanding about the status of the Milton Abbot cricket field we agree to your request to remove it from the draft plan. This will be done at the end of consultation period when all comments are reviewed and changes to the plan made.</p> | |
| 44 | Alan Clarkson | <p>Thank you for the above draft and for all the hard work you and the team have put in, especially over these last few difficult months.</p> <p>I am still going through the draft plan and other docs on the MACK website but have got a few quick questions I hope you can help with please. Sorry if I have just missed the answers somewhere or just misunderstood something I read quickly.</p> <p>Q1 A critical point in the consultation process was when the five NEW sites were identified in June/July 2020. Why was</p> | <p>Q1 response: Having witnessed the huge amount of ill feeling that development in Lamerton has caused, and after careful consideration, we decided that it was better to present the residents with proper unbiased assessment of each site that incorporated all the data that we</p> | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>the decision (it appears) taken to not identify these sites to residents then and ask for their comments (post or electronically) <u>before</u> all the potential sites were assessed for the plan by AECOM and the MACK Team in the autumn?</p> <p>Q2 Were AECOM told about residents comments on the 'old' five sites that related to the SHLAA ?</p> <p>Q3 Where is the SEA document (footnote 23 Page 57), its not on the references list?</p> <p>Q4 Why does AECOM/the plan describe Site E as just hardstanding farmyard/buildings etc with no reference to the pasture land round it which is all included in the red boundary lines(Page 68 AECOM report). In fact AECOM classify it as a Greenfield site (page 72).</p> <p>Q5 Are the proposed houses only for the 'hardstanding' bit?</p> <p>Q6 What does (para 7.3.0.7) "...the overall appearance of the site in its existing form detracts from the public realm and the rural setting of the village" mean; and who decided this and on what (evidence) basis?</p> <p>Q7 At 5.5.0.4. there are a list of possible S106 funded projects. Could you confirm who chose these and when? (It seems to state they were "ideas from the community...." but I can't find the relevant resident consultation this was taken from).</p> <p>Q8 Are S106 funding/projects only allowed if they are ON/NEXT TO the new site or can money be used elsewhere in the village?</p> <p>Q9 How much money will actually be available (to the village) to spend on any of the listed projects and how strong is the legal requirement on the developer to provide this money? (I assume it's any money left after the subsidies for the affordable homes – if that's how it works, sorry!)</p> <p>Q10 What document reflects the resident consultation that 'led' to the statements at 7.3.0.8 and 7.1.0.6?</p> | <p>were still gathering, so that they can see all the facts before making a personal judgement. There seemed little point for instance allowing people to get deeply upset at the prospect of a particular development for several months, only for AECOM to recommend that it is not pursued.</p> <p>Q2Response: AECOM had access to all publicly available data on all sites.</p> <p>Q3 response: The requirement for completion of a formal SEA was not identified until after the AECOM Site Assessment. A SEA Scoping Study has been completed and distributed to the three statutory consultees, Historic England, the Environment Agency and Natural England for comment.</p> <p>Q4 response: The AECOM Report suggests "The provisional agricultural land classification map for South West England produced by Natural England indicates that the field within the eastern section of the site is underlain</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>Para 7.3.0.8. says "...there is a desire in the community to deliver <i>new</i> (my italics) community facilities alongside new development areas." 7.1.0.6. it states "...our residents made it clear through our community engagement that any development would <i>only</i> (my italics again) would be supported if it delivered some tangible return to the community".</p> <p>I couldn't work it out from the summary of the 2017 survey or 2020 drop in events and wanted to know the actual response figures (i.e. a clear breakdown of how many people said this and where they live). I thought what most people said (2017 survey/drop ins) was more of a desire for better SERVICES not facilities?</p> <p>Q11 Have you had formal WDBC feedback yet from Duncan Smith on how the new Government White Paper - Planning for the Future could affect the MACK plan and will you publish this on the website?</p> <p>Q12 Where is the 'Possible Developments Sites' section on the MACK website? The March 2020 newsletter said the Call for Sites supporting guidance would be there but I can't find this section or the guidance.</p> <p>Q13 Who made the decision outlined at para 7.3.0.14 (its not in the AECOM conclusion) and is the basis for this decision just what is written in paras 7.3.0.12 – 7.3.0.13?</p> <p>Q14 An easy one I hope - What is the maximum number of characters that will fit in the comments box for the actual consultation? If responses are beyond the limit is there a way to send/attach longer documents please?</p> | <p>by Grade 3 agricultural land." "Nonetheless, redevelopment of the western section of the site would support the efficient use of land".</p> <p>Q5 response: It is for the future developer to propose a design and layout guided by the policies of the MACK Plan and its design statement.</p> <p>Q6 response: AECOM Report suggests "Given the relatively poor quality of the existing buildings on site, new development also presents an opportunity to enhance the visual appearance of the site and the rural setting of the village on approach from the west" and "Whilst the site has an agricultural character, the overall appearance of the site in its existing form detracts from the public realm and rural setting of the village".</p> <p>Q7 response: Section 106 funding cannot be determined until further ahead. The ideas for possible projects came from the team members engaging with residents at public events such the drop-in events of January</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>2020, attendance at the Kelly Flower Show in 2019 in addition to private conversations. The Parish Council members were also lobbied for potential ideas.</p> <p>Q8 response: We cannot determine what if any section 106 funding will be available and where it might be used.</p> <p>Q9 response: See responses to Q7 and Q8.</p> <p>Q10 response: This view of the MACKPlan team came partly from the Residents Survey of 2017 and partly from the drop-in events of January 2020. It has also been reviewed by the Parish Council and clearly we will take into account any views on this and any other aspect of the draft plan during Regulation 14 Consultation.</p> <p>Our view is that their concerns are for better facilities and services</p> <p>Q11 response: At the moment this White Paper is still under review following the consultation period any potential impact on the MACKPlan should wait until</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>a final form is passed by Parliament.</p> <p>Q12 response: The website was updated in Dec 2020 and as all the site related data was then available in the AECOM report or the MACK Plan, this part of the website was deemed redundant and was removed.</p> <p>Q13 response: Justification is included in the proceeding paragraphs which includes reference to community opinion, the JLP and previous LPA decisions. "7.3.0.12 Whilst the proposed site did carry some support from the local community it was on the basis that any development be limited to small scale (to 7 homes). In addition, the submission does not support the need for affordable homes, the provision of formal local green space nor additional community resources".</p> <p>7.3.0.13 There can be no dispute that the site falls within the 4th tier of the hierarchy – Smaller Villages, Hamlets and the Countryside. In such</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|--------------|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>locations, JLP Policy TTV1 states that development will be permitted only if it can be demonstrated to support the principles of sustainable development and sustainable communities. Indeed, Chillaton is considered as countryside and development should be avoided and only permitted in exceptional circumstances. Recent applications for development in the village (APP/Q1153/W/19/3241853) have been rejected accordingly.</p> <p>Q14 response: Please use the email address garyvanstone@btinternet.com for any further comments. Comments are not only being collected through the website comment box, we are also receiving them through this email address and by post.</p> | |
| 45 | David Denton | <p>Congratulations on an excellently developed and presented plan. Thank you for all your hard work on the village's behalf. I fully support the plan which deals extremely well with the</p> | | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| | | <p>proposed location and types of housing needed in the village. It is extremely important that when development goes ahead that the houses are built to a style that is in keeping with the rest of our lovely village and are not just standard boxes. What the village does not need is large expensive houses built either in the village or on the borders.</p> | | |
| 46 | Joss Handy | <p>The MACKplan team have produced a well thought out and considered report. I fully welcome the unbiased process by which the recommended sites were identified and unsuitable sites were considered and then discounted</p> <p>I strongly support the short list of those sites most appropriate for development</p> <p>I agree it's vital that any permitted building projects have the inclusion of the right level of affordable housing that the evidence has determined is needed by the local community.</p> | | |
| 47 | Paul Turner | <p>Mackplan is well thought out. It has taken into account the views of residents regarding development within the villages. I strongly recommend that the Mackplan is used when decisions are made regarding any development.</p> | | |
| 48 | Helen Foster | <p>I wholeheartedly support the methodology used by the MACK plan to gather and present local opinions on future planning developments in the village of Milton Abbot. There is clear integrity in the expert insights within the MACK plan, supported independently by AECOM, that can be relied upon as expert trusted views to support, drive and shape the future of our village. I support the unbiased process deployed and believe that planning decisions can be best achieved using this format.</p> | | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|------------------|---|---|--|---|
| | | <p>I understand the many stages that the MACK plan has gone through and will continue to do so until finally completed. I do hope however, that its' clear insight will be considered in any pending planning decisions given the considerable public expense thus far in the process. As a tool to deliver the visions of the earlier 2011 Localism Act (England) it can be a decisive reference document to help all parties balance out the needs of the village and the clear requirement of future/low cost housing for the village to grow and accommodate growing families and new villagers. During lock down we have witnessed and experienced a strong village community that must be encouraged and respected with a thoughtful , transparent and accountable future planning process balancing our heritage with a sustainable community and rural village life. It has also been encouraging to have local insights on the unique spring water sources both recorded and ratified by independent experts, one might hope the fragility of these will be protected and respected in perpetuity.</p> | | |
| <p>49</p> | <p>Devon County Council</p> <p>What is a neighbourhood Plan' Paragraph 1.1.0.3 (Page 4) Minerals and Waste</p> | <p>Devon County Council has a role as Waste & Mineral Planning Authority, and consequently has produced the 'Devon Waste Plan' 2011-2031, and the 'Devon Minerals Plan' 2011-2031, which function as the 'local plan' in legal terms for mineral and waste development in Devon. The document in this case should comply with these plans. The MACK NP doesn't currently refer to the Minerals and Waste Plans as forming part of the development plan. This should be added to paragraph 1.1.0.3 where other planning policy is discussed. Devon Waste Plan – https://www.devon.gov.uk/planning/planning-policies/minerals-andwaste-policy/devon-waste-plan/ Devon</p> | | <p><i>Reference to these plans included at para 1.1.0.3, 7.2.3,</i></p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|---|----------------------|--|--|--|
| | | Minerals Plan - https://www.devon.gov.uk/planning/planning-policies/minerals-andwaste-policy/devon-minerals-plan | | <i>and 4.0.4 of the Plan.</i> |
| About the MACK Designated Area' Paragraph 1.4 (Pages 6-7) The document as a whole | Historic Environment | <p>The reference to and recognition of the significance of various aspects of the MACK area's archaeological heritage, notably prehistoric hillforts/hilltop enclosures, mining and 'ancient' field systems and field boundaries is welcomed.</p> <p>Although the sections on heritage/landscape do not refer to the range of non-designated heritage assets of which there are many hundreds within the MACK area. Also, associations between designated sites and extensive undesignated setting. In outline this could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of prehistoric settlement in the form of scatters of prehistoric stone tools and several prehistoric enclosures (in addition to the Scheduled ones). • Bronze Age Barrows – some SM, marking the later parish boundary between MA and Lamerton near Quither, and some ploughed level, undesignated, but with below ground archaeology. • Designed landscapes – such as the Bradstone Obelisk and Kelly House and Park, as well as Endsleigh. • Extensive evidence of medieval settlement and field systems. Including Listed farmsteads, evidence of shrunken | An additional list of non-designated heritage assets is now in the Regulation 15 Plan. | <p><i>Introduced in Section 5, Our Heritage</i></p> <p><i>Referenced at 5.1.15</i></p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>and deserted medieval farms (Uppaton, Poflett, Dunterton), large areas of intact or still legible enclosed medieval strip fields. Also, former orchards (mostly lost from the north MACK area).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post-medieval mills and waterpower (e.g. Bradstone). • Mines and mining landscapes (e.g. the setting of the Cornwall & West Devon Mining Landscape World Heritage Site (WHS)). • Historic Transport – from the medieval Greystone Bridge to early modern turnpike toll houses and milestones. <p>In terms of setting out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment (NPPF 2019: 185) the above range of designated and undesignated heritage assets could therefore be brought out within the Plan, particularly in Sections 5 and 5.1. Also, the historic nature of field systems and farms could be brought out within Section 5 as well as within Section 4 (on Nature). These assets could also be considered as positive opportunities in the NP sections that discuss the Tamar Discovery Trail and wider Public Right of Way network. The section on conversion of agricultural buildings to residential and other uses does refer to the traditional nature of these buildings and the contribution that they make to local character, but could also recognise that</p> | | <p><i>Policy 5-1, Protecting our Heritage, and Community Action 5-1 Non- designated heritage assets introduced</i></p> |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|-----------------------|---|
| | | <p>they are irreplaceable heritage assets (designated or not) and may also have archaeological interest within and around them.</p> <p>The Introduction also mentions Scheduled Monuments (SM) and Listed Buildings, but it could also usefully mention the Registered Historic Park & Garden at Endsleigh (this is referred to later in the document).</p> | | |
| | 1.4 'About the MACK designated area' Paragraph 1.4.0.4 (Page 7) (Section 4 & 5) Historic Environment | Section 1.4.0.4 refers to Castle Park Camp as one of only a dozen in Devon. This is not factually correct, there are many more than this. For example, there are three other Scheduled prehistoric enclosures within the MACK area (Two at Dunterue Wood and one at Lucy Cleave) and some undesignated enclosures (e.g. Cleave, Kelly) | We will include these | <i>Amended</i> |
| | Our Built Environment Section 5 Historic Environment | Section 5 could refer to the additional significance of Milton Abbot Conservation Area, its component Listed Buildings and Endsleigh House and Gardens because of their contribution to the setting of the Cornwall & West Devon Mining Landscape World Heritage Site (WHS). Archaeological/landscape evidence of mining is mentioned, but again its significance as part of the setting of the WHS could be noted. | | <i>5.1.6 already refers but is now expanded to include reference to WHS</i> |
| | Policy 5.1 'Sustaining Local Infrastructure' (Page 33) | <i>'Developments must demonstrate that there will be no reduction in water supply and quality and that sewage and waste management implications have been assessed in order</i> | | <i>Noted</i> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p><i>to ensure that existing networks have the capacity to manage increased demands’.</i></p> <p>I would draw your attention to policy W21 of the Devon Waste Plan, which sets out a requirement major development to make provision for waste management –</p> <p><i>Policy W21: Making Provision for Waste Management Proposals for major non-waste development will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that:</i></p> <p><i>(a) the development includes adequate provision for the management of its anticipated waste arisings; or</i></p> <p><i>(b) the development makes financial or other provision for the off-site management of its anticipated waste arisings; or</i></p> <p><i>© the existing waste management infrastructure serving the development is adequate.</i></p> | | |
| | <p>Policy 5.1 ‘Sustainable Local Infrastructure’ (Page 33)</p> | <p><i>Policy 5-1. Sustaining Local Infrastructure Any new development (including change of use and conversion) within the plan area should: • Demonstrate that there would be no material adverse impact on the safe and efficient operation of the local road network, including residential roads, rural lanes and parking.</i></p> <p>The County Highway Authority is concerned that this policy does not have regard to National Planning Policy Guidance. (National Planning Policy Framework 2019). In particular Paragraphs 108 – 111 which detail, for example, when it may be appropriate to refuse planning applications on highway safety grounds. (Paragraph 109 – Development should only be</p> | <p>We have discussed the Milton Abbot and Chillaton, Parking and Road Safety problems with Devon County Council. Their recommendations on what actions could be taken are now included in the revised MACK Plan.</p> | <p><i>Recommendations included in Section 8, Transport</i></p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---------------------------------|---|
| | | <p>prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.) This policy would not allow development with less than severe impacts. In this case there is concern that this would not be defensible at an appeal against refusal of planning permission.</p> | | |
| | 5.1 'Officially Designated Sites' Paragraph 5.1.0.7 – 8 (Page 27) | <p>This section does not refer to the Scheduled Monument (SM) prehistoric sites at Dunterue and Lucy Cleave or the Scheduled Monument barrows that mark the later parish boundary between Milton Abbot and Lamerton south of Quither Common. Although just outside the MACK area the SM at Brent Tor is a significant landmark and therefore has an extensive setting. Developments, such as solar PV, wind turbines and some digital communications infrastructure, could affect this with the NP area.</p> | We will include in revised plan | <i>Introduced at 5.1.7 – 5.1.10</i> |
| | Policy 5.2 'Parking' (Page 38) | <p><i>New developments do not rely on on-road parking but provide enough off-road parking spaces to ensure that pressure on existing parking is not increased. New housing needs to include a minimum of two off-road parking spaces for dwellings with 1 or 2 bedrooms and a minimum of three off-road parking spaces for dwellings with 3 bedrooms. Off-road parking spaces are in addition to garages, if present, and should be constructed of permeable materials to reduce the risk of run off flooding.</i></p> | Possible change to plan | <i>Recommendations included in Section 8, Transport</i> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>Stipulating a minimum number of off-road parking spaces can have a negative impact upon the appearance of areas. This would also conflict with parking standards set out in Local Plan Policy. This can create new development that is out of character with the area, that do not follow the existing design/appearance of settlements or its historical development. Having a mix of approaches to parking allows greater flexibility to achieve development that better reflects the appearance of existing settlements.</p> <p>Textphone: 0345 155 1020 www.devon.gov.uk The South Hams and West Devon Joint Local Plan sets out specific guidelines for numbers of parking places allowed according to the size of the house– the plan will need to align with these. https://www.plymouth.gov.uk/sites/default/files/JLPSPD2020_FINALred.pdf you can find these on page 156 (DEV29.3 – Parking provision: residential)</p> <p>The Plan requests off-road parking spaces to be constructed with permeable materials.</p> <p>The Plan could highlight that infiltration tests should be completed to demonstrate the suitability of permeable parking.</p> | | <p style="color: red; text-align: center;"><i>Introduced at Policy 8-1 Parking</i></p> |
| | <p>Section 5.3.2.1 'Utilities' & Section 6.8.0.1</p> | <p>The Plan refers to existing surface water drainage (5.3.2.1) and also highlights the need for developments to improve surface water drainage (6.8.0.1). However, the Plan could refer to new developments managing surface water</p> | | <p style="color: red; text-align: center;"><i>Included at 4.3.2</i></p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>'Changing Environment Flood Risk</p> | <p>appropriately so that flood risk is not increased downstream. The Plan could also highlight Sustainable Drainage Systems and The SuDS Manual.</p> <p>https://www.devon.gov.uk/floodriskmanagement/planning-and-development/sudsguidance/</p> | | |
| | <p>5.3 'Infrastructure' Paragraph 5.3.2.3 Page 32) Waste</p> | <p>5.3.2.3 refers to Policy DEV31 of the Joint Local Plan. Devon County Council is the waste planning authority for this area, and therefore policies of the Devon Waste Plan are relevant here, in this context notably Policy W4: Waste Prevention and Policy 21: Making Provision for Waste Management. (See above)</p> <p><i>Policy W4: Waste Prevention</i></p> <p><i>5. Sustainable construction, procurement and waste management in Devon will achieve a reduction in the waste generated through all forms of development.</i></p> <p><i>2. Planning applications for major development must include a waste audit statement demonstrating how the demolition, construction and operational phases of the development will minimise the generation of waste and provide for the management of waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy. Each statement</i></p> | | <p><i>Noted, however both references relate specifically to "major developments" which are not being considered within the MACK Plan</i></p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | <p><i>should include the following information where relevant to the development being proposed:</i></p> <p><i>(a) sustainable procurement measures to minimise the generation of waste during the construction process, including avoidance of over-ordering and reduced use of hazardous materials;</i></p> <p><i>(b) the types and quantities of waste that will be generated during the demolition and construction phases and the measures to ensure that the waste is managed in accordance with the waste hierarchy including: • the segregation of waste materials to enable their separate reuse, recycling or recovery; • the recycling of construction, demolition and excavation waste for use on site or at the nearest suitable facility; and • for any waste materials that are unsuitable for reuse, recycling or recovery, confirmation of the location for their disposal;</i></p> <p><i>(c) the types and quantities of waste that will be generated during the operational phase of the development and measures to ensure that the waste is managed in accordance with the waste hierarchy including: • methods for limiting the generation of waste; • the provision of sufficient storage facilities to enable the segregation of reusable and recyclable waste from waste requiring disposal; and any other steps that are necessary to secure the maximum diversion of waste from disposal.</i></p> | | |
| | <p>5.5 'Additional community funding' Paragraph 5.5.0.4 Highway Safety</p> | <p>Proposed installation of mini-roundabouts: The introduction of mini roundabouts should follow design guidance in DRMB/Manual for streets, the proposed locations would not have balanced flows which can lead to the introduction of a collision issue at these locations.</p> | <p>We have discussed the Milton Abbot and Chillaton, Parking and Road Safety problems with Devon County Council. Their recommendations on what actions could be taken are now included in the revised MACKPlan.</p> | <p><i>Following consultation with the WDBC all references to mini roundabouts have been</i></p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | It is recommended that the detailed design of any junction for the development is assessed at the planning application stage. | | <i>removed</i> |
| | 5.6 'Road Safety' Paragraph 5.6.0.2 Highway Safety | It is not normal practice to install safety barriers alongside a pedestrian footway and it is unlikely the county council would install this.. | | <i>The reference merely highlights that there aren't any. Expanded to include reference to there being no appropriate traffic management.</i> |
| | 5.6 Road Safety' Paragraph 5.6.0.4 Paragraph 5.6.0.8 Highway Safety | Reference to the lack or 30mph repeater sign in Chillaton. It appears Chillaton is mainly street lit, so it is not legal to erect 30 mph repeater signs in street lit areas. | | <i>Reference to repeater signs removed.</i> |
| | Consideration of Sites' Chillaton Paragraph 7.3.0.22 Historic Environment | C Site D 'Forda Farm Land' DCC Historic Environment Team agree with the conclusions on Site D that the allocation would be detrimental to the setting of designated heritage assets at Forda. The Devon County Historic Environment Record (HER) records an intact medieval strip field system within the allocation area. | | <i>Appendix 2-5 Site Assessment annotated Accordingly</i> |
| | Consideration of Sites' Milton Abbot | Proposed allocation sites A, B, C and F are in areas of archaeological potential relating to the medieval settlement of Milton Abbot. Development in these locations would require archaeological evaluation prior to determination. DCC | | <i>Appendix 2-5 Site Assessments</i> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| | Paragraph 7.3.0.16 Historic Environment | Historic Environment Team agree with the conclusions on Site A that the allocation would be detrimental to the setting of designated heritage assets. The area contains an intact enclosed medieval strip field/hay meadow system. It could be considered for designation as Public Open Space and inclusion within the Conservation Area. | | annotated accordingly Appendix 2-5 Site Assessment annotated accordingly |
| | General Comments | | | |
| | Mineral and Waste development Mineral and Waste | <p>The NP could acknowledge that Greystone quarry is located to the west of the NP area, however part of the mineral consultation area (MCA) for this quarry extends within the NP area. As such West Devon is required to consult DCC on proposals in this area in order for us to consider whether they could constrain operations at the quarry. The quarry itself, its mineral safeguarding area (MSA) and wider MCA lies within Cornwall Council's administrative area.</p> <p>From a waste planning perspective the Waste Consultation Zone (WCZ) for Hayedown inert recycling site extends into the NP area near Beechwood. Again there is no particular issue here just something the NP should be aware of and may want to refer to this.</p> | | <p><i>Introduced at 4.0.3</i></p> <p><i>Introduced at 7.2.5</i></p> |
| | Biodiversity Ecology | The plan lacks a biodiversity policy:- the following policy (or something similarly worded) could be added: | We will include in the revised plan | <i>Introduced as Policy 4-1 Biodiversity</i> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|---------------------|
| | | <p>BIODIVERSITY. Development proposals should seek to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conserve local wildlife sites and habitats/species of principal importance, unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated, and appropriate mitigation measures provided; • Where possible, enhance the network of habitats, species and sites of importance including local trees and woodlands, hedgerows and roadside verges; • Minimise impacts on biodiversity; • Where possible, biodiversity enhancements, such as unlit wildlife corridors, hedge banks, bat boxes or bird boxes, and new green spaces, designed to benefit both residents and wildlife, should be provided on site. All new planting shall only be undertaken using native, and locally characteristic, plant and tree species. • Identified ancient and veteran trees shall be protected and appropriate buffer zones around woodlands shall be excluded from development. • Seek to deliver a net gain in biodiversity; if the biodiversity compensation needed to offset losses resulting from the developments cannot be provided on site then it should be provided elsewhere within the neighbourhood | | |
| | Public Rights of Way | <p>For information and guidance in developing the plan please see the following –</p> <p>Devon Countryside Access Forum Position Statement on Neighbourhood Plans</p> | | Introduced at 4.7.5 |
| 50 | Greenslade Taylor Hunt on behalf of Mr and Mrs Williams | <p>1. INTRODUCTION</p> <p>1.1 As part of the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan for Milton Abbot, Chillaton and Kelly Parishes, a draft Neighbourhood Plan document has been published.</p> <p>1.2 The draft Plan outlines the approach taken by the MACKPLAN planning team towards development, whilst also outlining</p> | <p>Overall response</p> <p>Thank you for your comments concerning the suitability, availability and deliverability of the site and for your support of</p> | Noted |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--------------|
| | | <p>proposed development sites in the plan area. Furthermore, the draft Plan sets an indicative number of 20 homes to be built in Plan area in the period to 2034.</p> <p>1.3 This stage of the Plan formation, Regulation 14, follows on from an initial resident survey in 2017, a housing needs survey in January 2020 and a Call for Sites in April 2020.</p> <p>1.4 The current stage, Regulation 14 Consultation on the draft Plan, will run until 20th February 2021.</p> <p>1.5 This representation is submitted on behalf of our clients, Mr and Mrs Hamilton, in relation to their land off Fore Street, Milton Abbot, who are the landowners.</p> <p>1.6 This representation supports the development potential of the land shown edged red on the enclosed plan, also as outlined in the section 7.3.0.6 and 7.4.0.2 of the draft Plan, known as MA Site E.</p> <p>1.7 This representation will outline the sites development potential in-line with its proposed allocation in the draft Plan. The main points raised are that the site offers a sustainable development option for the village, supporting the draft Plans vision of delivering new homes that meet local needs, whilst having minimal impact on the rural character of its surroundings.</p> <p>1.8 The landowner has unencumbered title to the land and there are no legal constraints that would inhibit its development as proposed.</p> | <p>the MACK Plan policies, in particular the positive approach to developer contributions.</p> <p>For the avoidance of any misunderstanding, the JLP figure of 20 new homes is based on the very limited capacity of local infrastructure and the local housing need. There is no requirement or local support for more and development proposals that exceed this figure will not be supported. It is also important to reiterate that 4 bedroom homes are not a local housing need and will only be supported if it can be demonstrated that their inclusion is required in order to subsidise the requisite affordable homes.</p> <p>Sympathetic design that is in keeping with the Lutyens designed cottages to the East of the site and the use of local materials will be fundamental development principles in order to protect the village's rich heritage.</p> | |
| | | <p>2. PLANNING POLICY</p> <p>2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is clear in setting out the criteria for plan-making. Strategic policies should be</p> | | <p>Noted</p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--------------|
| | | <p>identified through up to date Local Plans, with non-strategic policies being delivered through neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>2.2 A Paragraph 28 states: “Non-strategic policies should be used by local planning authorities and communities to set out more detailed policies for specific areas, neighbourhoods or types of development. This can include allocating sites, the provision of infrastructure and community facilities at a local level, establishing design principles, conserving and enhancing the natural and historic environment and setting out other development management policies.”</p> <p>2.3 Paragraph 29 goes on to state that “Neighbourhood planning gives communities the power to develop a shared vision for their area. Neighbourhood plans can shape, direct and help to deliver sustainable development, by influencing local planning decisions as part of the statutory development plan. Neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than set out in the strategic policies for the area, or undermine those strategic policies.”</p> <p>2.4 Paragraph 37 of the NPPF explains that “Neighbourhood plans must meet certain ‘basic conditions’ and other legal requirements before they can come into force. These are tested through an independent examination before the neighbourhood plan may proceed to referendum.”</p> <p>2.5 The Neighbourhood Plan must accord with the general provisions of the Local Plan for the area, which in this instance comprises the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan 2014-2034.</p> | | |
| | | <p>3. THE SITE AND PLANNING HISTORY</p> <p>3.1 The land edged red comprises 1.0 hectare (2.47 acres) of land located to the western edge of Milton Abbot village. The land generally falls away gently to the south away from the B3362. The eastern site is laid to grass and enclosed by native species</p> | | <p>Noted</p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------|
| | | <p>hedgerow and trees. The land has been kept to grass historically. The western yard area contains a number of modern farm buildings and is generally level, with areas of compacted stone and concrete surfacing.</p> <p>3.2 We have undertaken an initial desk based review of the development site, including a review of the planning policy framework for the area, a review of aerial photography, available plans and historic planning applications in the area.</p> <p>3.3 Based upon a combined site area of 2.47 acres and net developable area of 75% a development of 22.5 dwellings is achievable. We believe a more realistic level of development will be in excess of 20 dwelling houses. Section 7.4.0.2 states that the site should be allocated for housing development of 20 homes, which we support but would urge the Neighbourhood Plan Group to consider a flexible approach that may allow for additional dwellings in the region of 30 across the allocation as it is considered that such can be achieved with a suitable design scheme. The benefit of allowing flexibility is the future ability to secure a higher number of affordable homes.</p> <p>3.4 It is our opinion that our clients land should be allocated as a suitable site for development, as clearly outlined within the Proposed Development Plan Section of the draft Plan , para’s 7.4.0.2 and 7.3.0.8. We support the proposed allocation.</p> | <p>3.3 The JLP figure of 20 new homes is based on the capacity of local infrastructure, development proposals that exceed this figure will not be supported.</p> | |
| | | <p>4. SITE CONSTRAINTS</p> <p>4.1 The site is not subject to any land based designations. The land does not present any obvious physical or planning constraints</p> <p>4.2 The entirety of the site falls within Flood Zone 1, the lowest category of risk from flooding, and appears to be relatively free draining. There do not appear to be any local issues with surface water flows that might otherwise prevent development from taking place.</p> | | <p>Noted</p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | <p>4.3 The land has been in agricultural use for many years and there is no evidence on site or in the historic mapping record to suggest that potentially contaminative activities may have taken place in the past.</p> <p>4.4 Ecology should not represent a major constraint to development. The land has been actively farmed over many years and other than the established hedgerow network and possible presence of species within the general area, the land is considered to have limited ecological constraints. Ecological surveys will be required in support of any future planning application.</p> <p>4.5 There appear to be limited heritage sensitivities, with no nearby Conservation Areas, listed buildings or scheduled ancient monuments.</p> | <p>4.5 Site E is actually close to the village conservation area and has a bearing on a number of listed buildings. Sympathetic design that is in keeping with the Lutyens designed cottages to the East of the site and the use of local materials will be required in order to protect the village's rich heritage.</p> | |
| | | <p>5. PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>5.1 The Local Plan is now adopted and is known as the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan (JLP). The JLP identifies Milton Abbot as a sustainable village.</p> <p>5.2 The JLP envisages growth in these sustainable villages to meet local needs, and encourages communities to identify sites to meet these needs through neighbourhood plans. Over the plan period 550 houses are to be delivered across the 33 "sustainable villages".</p> <p>5.3 The land subject of this promotion is located on the western edge of Milton Abbot village. The land is well related to the contiguous built up area of the settlement, adjoining The Old Chapel to the east and being southwest of residential development at Lutyens Fold cul-de-sac.</p> <p>5.4 The site is visible along Fore Street (B3362) and is key gateway site to the rural village of Milton Abbot. The site is currently</p> | | <p>Noted, however the identified principal housing need is for 1, 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings</p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>occupied by a range of modern farm buildings, which vary in scale, means of construction and general appearance.</p> <p>5.5 When approaching the settlement from the west, the site is viewed in conjunction with existing residential development. There is an opportunity to enhance the visual appearance of this gateway site for the benefit of the area as a whole, as well as delivering identified housing for the Parish. This has been highlighted by the independent assessor at in section 7.3.0.7 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan. Development of this site would therefore be in support of Objective 4 of the draft Plan, as it relates well to the existing built form, and could be delivered in a manner that would respect the rural aspect of existing dwellings.</p> <p>5.6 Within Section 7.3.0.8 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan the independent assessors have highlighted that development of the site, at the proposed scale, will help to contribute towards local housing needs. As previously mentioned, development of this site would also support section 1.1.0.5 of the draft Plan, helping to deliver some, or all, of the targeted 20 homes in the plan area over the plan period.</p> <p>5.7 Policy TTV2 of the JLP sets out the policy for delivering development in the town and village areas. The following extract is noteworthy: The LPAs will support development proposals in the Thriving Towns and Villages Policy Area which reinforce the sustainable settlement hierarchy and which deliver a prosperous and sustainable pattern of development. In addition to the provisions of Policies SPT1 and SPT2, specific objectives of rural sustainability to be supported through development include: 1. The location of housing where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. 2. The delivery of affordable homes that enable rural communities to remain vibrant.</p> | | |
|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>5.8 The site occupies an accessible and sustainable location on the edge of Milton Abbot. Residential development of the site offers an opportunity to deliver open market and affordable housing with a range of scales to meet the identified local housing need identified through the recent survey. This clearly supports objective 3 of the draft plan. A mix of 1, 2, 3 and 4 bedroom homes would successfully achieve this.</p> <p>5.9 The site is within walking and cycle distance of services and facilities within the village. Future occupants of the site would have a walk of only 200 metres into the village centre. Pedestrian access is directly available to the northeast corner of the site, where connectivity to the existing pedestrian footway can be made. This therefore demonstrates the sites ability to adhere to objective 5 of the draft Plan, as new dwellings on the site would be located in a sustainable location.</p> <p>5.10 The site is on the edge of the settlement and can deliver up to 25 dwellings in a sustainable and accessible location. Delivering housing need for the settlement on one site is considered to be the most pragmatic 8 P a g e approach as this will enable the community to benefit from maximum developer contributions towards affordable housing, play and recreation, education and other matters of material planning relevance.</p> <p>5.11 The danger of splitting housing delivery across a higher number of smaller sites is that affordable housing will become difficult to deliver. Milton Abbot is within an area classified as a Designated Rural Area under Section 157 of the Housing Act 1985.</p> <p>5.12 Bearing in mind JLP Policy DEV8 if the Neighbourhood Plan is to make a meaningful contribution towards addressing local housing need, a single larger site should be allocated. We support the allocation of our clients land in order to achieve the delivery of affordable housing within the Plan area.</p> | <p>5.8 4 bedroom homes do not meet the local need and will only be supported if it can be demonstrated that their inclusion is required in order to subsidise the requisite affordable homes.</p> <p>5.10 We welcome your positive approach towards developer contributions.</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|----------------------------|
| | | <p>5.13 Based upon the location of the site, its accessibility to village amenities and services and potential to enhance visual amenity and the setting of the village within the landscape, the principle of residential development of the site is acceptable in planning policy terms. This is support within the draft Neighbourhood Plan, as seen in sections 7.3.0.7 and 7.3.0.8.</p> <p>5.14 Section 7.4.0.2 of the draft Plan outlines support for c. 20 new dwellings on the site, 6 of which would be affordable. This is would adhere to the sustainable development objectives outlines within the draft Plan, whilst also adhering to the Joint Local Plan and the NPPF. Accessibility</p> <p>5.15 The site does not present any physical constraints to development, save for the provision of an upgraded vehicular access off Fore Street. Section 7.3.0.7 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan identifies two access points onto the site from the north off Fore Street.</p> <p>5.16 One access is within the 30mph zone and a second is subject to the national speed limit.</p> <p>5.17 Any development would look to secure vehicular and pedestrian access towards the northeast corner of the site where it fronts onto Fore Street. Here, visibility splays of 2.4m x 43m can be achieved such that highway design requirements are satisfied. This is in-line with the Proposed Development Plan section of the draft Plan.</p> <p>5.18 The site has excellent potential to deliver enhanced pedestrian and cycle links to the village centre.</p> <p>5.19 Given the sites size and the proposed density, any scheme would be able to deliver at least 2 off road parking spaces, in-line with objective 4.4 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> | | |
| | | Landscape | | Noted, the introduction of |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| | | <p>5.20 The landscape has been assessed as having a high capacity to accommodate new residential development within the site. The land edged red is well screened and it is considered that a suitably designed scheme that is landscape led can achieve appropriate assimilation into the surrounding area.</p> <p>5.21 The site contains built form already and whilst that is of an agricultural character, the overall appearance of the site is poor and detracts from the rural setting of the village.</p> <p>5.22 A sensitively designed scheme, comprising single storey and two storey dwellings, can deliver a high quality appearance to development that will enhance this gateway to the settlement.</p> <p>5.23 The development will achieve just that. Visually built form will relate well to residential properties on higher ground to the north, as well as those properties to the east, directly in line with Objective 4 of the draft Plan.</p> <p>5.24 Retention and reinforcement of existing planting to the field boundaries, together with open space and play area within the site will provide important green infrastructure. Milton Abbot is currently without a children 9 P a g e play area and the provision of one within the development site will address this local need, whilst delivering active green infrastructure within the development. Development of the site would also ensure the provision of greenspace for the community, in-line with section 7.4.0.2 of the draft plan.</p> <p>5.25 The draft Plan has assessed the ability of our clients site to deliver residential development whilst ensuring there is an appropriate relationship with the natural and built environment. The site has been found to be suitable in both respects and we support the assessment and conclusions of the independent assessors. Drainage and Flood Risk</p> | | <p style="color: red;">bungalows, green space and play area is welcomed</p> |
|--|--|---|--|---|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--------------|
| | | <p>5.26 The site is located within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore at low risk of flooding from fluvial and tidal sources.</p> <p>5.27 The principle consideration for development will be the means of capturing and disposing of surface water from a residential development. At present surface water is returned to the ground through soakaways and natural runoff/percolation.</p> <p>5.28 Ground conditions have not yet been investigated, however, records of the underlying geology suggests that the use of soakaway systems within any development may be feasible.</p> <p>5.29 Notwithstanding, any development is to make use of Sustainable Urban Drainage systems (SUDs) wherever possible. The initial surface water drainage strategy is to attenuate flows from impermeable surfaces into a basin within the site and for water to be released at greenfield runoff rates (accounting for climate change) into either soakaways or the watercourse to the west and southern boundary.</p> <p>5.30 Foul drainage will be connected to mains, with the South West Water sewage treatment works for the settlement being located immediately south of the site and accessed via our clients land.</p> <p>5.31 Overall, matters relating to flood risk and drainage can be appropriately accommodated within the development and local infrastructure.</p> | | |
| | | <p>6. CONCLUSION</p> <p>6.1 The land owners Mr and Mrs Hamilton are proposing the land known as Land off Fore Street, Milton Abbot for inclusion within the emerging MACK Neighbourhood Plan as a site for residential development.</p> <p>6.2 The land owners have unencumbered title to the land, there are no legal constraints to that would inhibit development for housing, and the land is available for development.</p> | | <p>Noted</p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|---------------|--|--|--|
| | | <p>6.3 Based upon our work and the independent assessment carried out on behalf of the Neighbourhood Plan Group, we support the allocation of our clients land under MA Site, we consider the land to be deliverable and developable and compliant with Local Plan policies for housing delivery within villages such as Milton Abbot. Furthermore, development of the site also adheres to the policies laid out within the draft Plan.</p> <p>6.4 We wholly support its inclusion within the new Milton Abbot Village boundary. We also wholly support the draft Plans' decision to support development on the site, known as MA Site E within the Plan.</p> <p>6.5 Development on the site would be delivered with all of the draft Plan's objectives in mind.</p> <p>6.6 In conclusion, the land is considered to be suitable, available and deliverable for housing development within the Plan period. We therefore ask that the land is taken forward as an allocated site within the Neighbourhood Plan as outlined at para 7.3.0.8 and within the MA Site E assessment.</p> | | |
| 51 | Alan Clarkson | <p>1) Consultation on Sites/AECOM Assessments</p> <p>There was a progress report given (by Richard Allen) to MAGPC on 15 July 2020. By then there were ten sites, including two added since May. The MAGPC were told (by Gary Vanstone in May) that the (at that time) EIGHT sites were scored by the MACK team using the JLP matrix, additional info including the Residents Survey and previous planning judgements. And would LATER be additionally scored by feedback from public meetings (when possible). The MAGPC minutes don't indicate which were the eight sites in May and which were the two added by July. The July minutes just give a breakdown of four JLP/two new sites in Milton Abbot and two JLP/two new sites in Chillaton.</p> | | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>The July 2020 minutes also record that ALL ten were now with WDBC to review – this is all long before AECOM were involved in the autumn. They also state “...once the (WDBC? – see below) process is complete...” and “...it would be the right time for the PC to be briefed on the options to be presented to the residents for their views”.</p> <p>Q15 Am I am correct that the reference to the ‘process’ means the WDBC one?</p> <p>Q16 If it does mean WD I am right that this infers there was originally an intention for ALL potential site options to be given to residents BEFORE they were passed to AECOM?</p> <p>Q17 (OR), if the ‘process’ refers to AECOM (confusing because WD and AECOM both mentioned together in preceding sentence) then does this mean a decision was taken (at this point) to ONLY consult residents on ALL potential sites AFTER the assessment by AECOM in the autumn? (I apologise for asking ‘both ways’ but the sentence in the July2020 minutes is ambiguous.)</p> <p>Q18 Exactly when last year were all the NEW sites (MA sites D, E F and Chillaton C and D) added to the original five?</p> | <p>Q15: The WDBC involvement at this stage was purely to check if any of the sites should be discounted immediately as having no possibility of being developed.</p> <p>Q16: No. The intention has always been to present residents with all potential sites along with all the relevant data. The opportunity to have a funded independent review of all sites was not known at this stage and once known was clearly vital information that needed to accompany the sites whenever they were considered.</p> <p>Q17: See above</p> <p>Q18: The order that sites were received has no bearing on their suitability for development. It must be recognised that the UK went into lockdown the same week as the call for sites was advertised. For this reason the end deadline for submissions was more flexible</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>Q19 Two more sites were added between May and July 2020 both AFTER the April deadline – which two were these please and why were they allowed after the deadline?</p> <p>Q20 If residents were not consulted electronically on all five NEW sites BEFORE they were given to AECOM in the autumn (see first set of questions) why does paragraph 7.2.0.5 seems to infer EVERY site was effectively chosen as a result of community engagement/consultation? (DEPENDING ON THE ANSWER TO THE PREVIOUS TWO QUESTIONS ABOVE)</p> <p>Q21 Is the Reg 14 consultation the FIRST chance for residents to comment/approve/object to the five ‘new’ sites? (I only ask because para 3106 states (re issue of AECOM report) “..this was made available electronically to the community for consideration and comment” and I assume this means now as part of the REG 14 consultation.)</p> <p>Q22 Who was the ‘lead’ person for each site who presented its history and pro/cons to the team? (MACK team meeting 9 July item 5)</p> <p>Q23 Following these presentations which sites did the MACK team favour?</p> | <p>that would otherwise have been the case. Q19: see above</p> <p>Q20: Paragraph 7.2.0.5 states “In addition, an overall assessment of each site considered the feedback provided from the JLP against each site offered under the SHLAA (where applicable), and the comments on them submitted by the MAG PC, and feedback from the local community through the Residents’ Survey and community engagement. Nowhere does it infer sites being chosen as a result of community engagement alone. Q21: yes Q22: This has no relevance to the process as team members were allocated based on their not being impacted by the site they were responsible for. This work was in any event superseded by the AECOM report. Q23: It isn’t about individual or team preferences, it was about collating and presenting evidence. We were careful never to discuss any preferences prior to having collected all the data needed to</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>Q24 Were these presentations the “...factual record..” used as a “...sound basis to work from which AECOM can use”?</p> <p>Q25 Following Duncan Smith’s approval what were the ‘detailed instructions’ given to AECOM about what was sought from them in their site assessments?</p> <p>Q26 What access to ‘local knowledge’ were AECOM given?</p> | <p>make a sensible judgement. This data collection phase ended with receipt of the AECOM report and this was the first time we discussed what our views were.</p> <p>Q24 AECOM were rightly protective of their independence. They were provided with all the factual data that was available for each site as a basis from which to conduct their enquiries.:</p> <p>Q25: In addition to their standard process for an independent site assessments we requested that they look at site suitability to enable: the inclusion of 6 affordable homes and generally 2 and 3 bedroomed houses; the inclusion of Local Green Spaces within the development; the opportunity for a new community facility; the inclusion of green technology; minimise the impact of the development on the amenity of existing properties, particularly visually; contribute to modern traffic management; the provision of sufficient off road parking; respect the extensive environmental and heritage assets that characterise these villages;</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>Q27 What was this local knowledge and was it given to AECOM for EACH site?</p> <p>Q28 Did it include any residents comments about sites, either from Statutory (JLP/SHLAA?) consultations (see first questions) or from any planning application objections?</p> <p>Q29 If it included residents comments (eg on the five SHLAA sites) was it made clear to AECOM that there were NO residents comments on the five NEW sites? (I only ask because they may have thought that the absence of any objections implied approval of these sites.)</p> <p>Q30 If AECOM were told there were no residents objections on the five new sites were they told why? (i.e. because there had been none received/no consultation on them)?</p> <p>Q31 Did AECOM get access to every site? (MACK Team 24 September minutes, item 7, said there was an issue with one site.)</p> <p>Q32 If permission wasn't given which site was this?</p> <p>[DEPENDING ON ANSWERS TO ALL THE ABOVE QUESTIONS]</p> <p>Q33 Is there a summary of the detailed discussion the team had (MACK mtg 12 Nov – Item 4) about the AECOM report? (The report was judged as "...fair and balanced.." even though the report appears to be <i>(at that time)</i> based on NO residents comments on the five new sites?</p> <p>2) Actual 2034 Housing targets</p> <p>Q34 Sorry, but what does para 5318 actually mean? Could you explain a bit more please?</p> | <p>suitable for development in light of the certainty of increasingly extreme weather conditions and in particular the increased risk of flooding.</p> <p>Q26: They were provided with a verbal overview of the significant historic, archaeological and environmental elements of the villages. Other than this initial brief prior to their unaccompanied visit to each of the 10 sites, they sought no further information. Their assessment was utterly independent.</p> <p>Q27: see above</p> <p>Q28: all documents that were in the public domain were available to them.</p> <p>Q29: see above</p> <p>Q30: AECOM do many of these site assessments. As can be seen from their report, they took all data that was available into account.</p> <p>Q31: yes</p> <p>Q32: see above</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Q35 Who took the decision to effectively change residents preferences, from both villages, (para 6243, a main response to the 2017 Survey) for smaller development plots to larger ones? As I understand it the JLP doesn't specify this? (but see below). (sorry got confused about the contradictions between paras 6404 and 6503 – 6505)</p> <p>6404 bold section says 3+ Q developments CAN count towards 2034 (JLP?)housing stock targets; 6503 says SHLAA Final Report para 3-9 says 5+ is threshold AND 6504 (JLP DEV8?) says you can have UP TO ten! But then para 6505 says 'individual housing' (one house?) does NOT count and says it is 4+ !!!</p> <p>Q36 (In terms of individual developments sizes) please could you untangle all of these conflicting statements and confirm which figure is actually the <u>correct</u> one we COULD be allowed to use for the MACK Plan area and especially in Milton Abbot?</p> | <p>Q33 No. The AECOM Site Assessment report is aimed at identifying the sites that are most suitable for development so that residents can either support or suggest alternative sites to those recommended in the Regulation 14 version of the MACK Plan from a position of informed understanding of all the facts.</p> <p>Q34: It means there is little that we can do to influence the lack of medical and dental practices accessible by our residents.</p> <p>Q35: The provision of affordable homes for local people has emerged as the most pressing need for our community. Affordable homes are subsidised by open market homes and the ability to do this requires a minimum development size of 10 houses to deliver the requisite economies of scale. Therefore, it is not possible to meet both the strong evidenced need for affordable houses and have only smaller developments. 6.4.0.4 actually suggests "It seems only reasonable that where Class Q developments deliver 3 or more homes they should therefore be considered part of the new housing stock and be counted against the new building target for 2014-2034. It is a request.</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Q37 As all these policies MAY appear to allow potential smaller (groups of) developments to count towards JLP targets what is the policy that says we HAVE to build ALL 20 as one large development? (contrary to what most residents favoured.)</p> <p>Q38 And doesn't the MACK Plan Policy 6-2 (bullet points 4/5, page 49) actually agree with this point, i.e. confirms we do NOT need one large development of 20 mostly on one site?</p> <p>Q39 Does the reference (7102) to "...potential development in Chillaton may be seen in conjunction with JLP policy TTV2..." mean some houses CAN be built in Chillaton?</p> <p>Q40 Where does (7103, last sentence) "within and around Milton Abbot" mean distance wise?</p> <p>3) Affordable Homes (incl Community Input)</p> <p>Q41 Can you confirm (see para 6221) that it was the MACK Plan team that drafted the questions for AECOM to use in their independent HNA survey?</p> <p>Q42 Is it correct that (see para 6306) JLP DEV8 says 11+ houses = you must have 30% affordable housing and therefore you do not have to commitment to 20 to get this allocation?</p> <p>Q43 When the draft plan (para 6232) confirms the HNA identified a need for FOUR affordable homes why was this increased to six?</p> | <p>Paragraphs 6503, 6504 and 6505 are simply providing facts. The use of the term "individual housing" will be considered for Reg 15 submission.</p> <p>Q36: The Councils, in preparing the JLP housing supply figures, included an allowance for "windfall developments". These are, generally, small scale proposals of less than 10 dwellings that gain approval but have not been predicted or formally allocated. However, having queried the scale of development relevant to the MACK Plan area we were advised. Neighbourhood Plans can, however, formally allocate larger development sites (sites of 5 dwellings or more) that have come forward through development-led proposals and have not commenced building work on site. Other proposals, such as minor infill developments and one off conversions, would be classed as "windfall" and, hence, not count towards the indicative figure.</p> <p>Q37: See answer to Q35.</p> <p>Q38: No</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>Q44 Who took this decision and when, and what evidence/resident support basis was used? (If my maths is still any good then 30% of 11 = approx. 4 and 30% of 20 = approx. 6)</p> <p>Q45 Therefore I am correct that we could have four new affordable homes in Milton Abbot WITHOUT needing to take all 20 in the village and especially in ONE place?</p> <p>Q46 Can we have smaller plots (as residents wanted) including affordable houses by using Community Land Trusts (Policy 6.1 third bullet, page 46 says these are supported) or Rural Exception Sites to meet our needs/‘quotas’ for all houses/affordable houses/sizes, or even for disabled/elderly residents? (please see Cannomede Cottages in South Tawton which were built on a rural exception site by Hastoe Housing Association) https://www.hastoe.com/news/new-homes/devon-celebrates-six-new-affordable-homes-in-south-tawton/</p> <p>Q47 Could we have something like this scheme or have I misunderstood it?</p> <p>Q48 Could you confirm (para 6243 second bullet) how many respondents said this and where did they live?</p> <p>Q49 What were the reasons given (6243 third bullet) why (the 20% of) respondents said everyone in their house would have to move together etc and where did/do they live?</p> | <p>Q39: Because Chillaton is not identified as a sustainable village it counts, in planning terms, as open countryside. Development in Chillaton could only take place if there is overwhelming support for it in Chillaton. This has not emerged.</p> <p>Q40: Within or adjacent to the village boundary</p> <p>Q41: AECOM completed the HNS, the aims of which were agreed with the Team. The questions for the separate HNA were agreed with the Team.</p> <p>Q42:No. The local need for affordable homes is 6 and a case could be made for more but with an allocation of 20 homes in the JLP, 6 affordable homes is the most that can be delivered to meet the local need.</p> <p>Q43: The paragraph that you refer to is in a section about the Housing Needs Survey (HNS). The figure of 6 is a compromise of a much higher</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>Q50 And the 4% figure for family members wanting their own home – again where did/do they live?</p> <p>4) Village Boundaries 6502 states that both Milton Abbot and Chillaton residents did NOT want to expand the size of their villages or increase the ‘built up landscape’ beyond current boundaries. However right at the end of the draft MACK Plan (para 7401) it proposes to extend the one for Milton Abbot (but not Chillaton). The aerial plan photo for Milton Abbot shows the new area has been expanded to encompass Site E and now appears to effectively be ‘inside’ the other potential sites included in the DRAFT plan for consideration. I appreciate this is ONLY a proposal at the moment but in respect of including it in the draft plan:</p> <p>Q51 Who chose the proposed (new) Milton Abbot boundary (7401)?</p> <p>Q52 Could you confirm who took the decision to change the boundary in this way and when?</p> <p>Q53 On what basis was this decision made including the evidence base/resident support used?</p> <p>Q54 If there wasn’t any do you not agree such a fundamental change to Milton Abbot village should be part of a separate consultation for its residents ONLY rather than be presented in a</p> | <p>figure from the Housing Needs Analysis (HNA) report and analysis of many months of data supplied by Devon Home Choice.</p> <p>Q44: see above</p> <p>Q45: see above</p> <p>Q46: No. We have the sites that we have available, the sites that were presented through a Formal Call for Sites process. From Council Guidance notes “Rural exception sites are sites for affordable housing development in rural locations where market housing would not normally be acceptable because of planning policy constraints”. Clearly this is not the case here We believe that South Tawton comes under the Dartmoor National Park Authority.</p> <p>Q47: see above</p> <p>Q48: No. As is clear from this paragraph , it is drawn from analysis of the 2017 Resident’s Survey which was a snapshot of the community at that time. However, the more recent Housing Needs</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>document that (although draft feels like a finished document) is for the WHOLE Mack Plan area to comment/vote on?</p> <p>Q55 Do we have a 'current' village boundary? (7401, third sentence, infers we have already have a draft one?)</p> <p>Q56 If we do have one , where can I find the 'current' village boundary photo/plan?</p> <p>Q57 Or is it the black lined boundary in Map 4.2, Page 23?</p> <p>Q58 And if we do have a 'current draft' how/when was this decided and who did so?</p> <p>Q59 Does this reference to it being a 'draft' one mean it has NEVER been established?</p> <p>Q60 If this is the case does that mean Milton Abbot can also be technically still classified as 'Countryside' in terms of development?</p> <p>5) MACK Plan area and sustainability designations/Referendum process</p> <p>Para 1108 states the JLP (and by inference the MACK Plan) is the appropriate way for 'sustainable villages' to identify/meet local needs for development and WDBC agrees with this. And 1106 confirms the MAGPC understandably wanted the MACK Plan to give "...those who live in its Parishes more say...".</p> <p>And as I understand it, after further statutory stages, the final 'approved' document must be validated by a public Referendum for ALL residents in the MACK plan area. There is an odd contradiction here because, even though the MACK Plan area encompasses 2000+ people (para 1401), as Milton Abbot is the ONLY sustainable village in this area, it is effectively the ONLY one to be directly affected by the whatever (vote) decision is eventually made.</p> <p>Some may argue that as all the other villages/hamlets are not currently regarded as sustainable why should they be in the plan? And more importantly how can they be part of any decision</p> | <p>Survey did indicate a similar situation.</p> <p>Q49: As is clear from this paragraph , it is drawn from analysis of the 2017 Resident's Survey which was a snapshot of the community at that time.</p> <p>Q50: As is clear from this paragraph , it is drawn from analysis of the 2017 Resident's Survey which was a snapshot of the community at that time.</p> <p>When Chillaton was not assessed as a sustainable village it ceased to have a village boundary as it is now classed, in planning terms as open countryside.</p> <p>When the JLP came into force all existing village boundaries went into abeyance. Therefore, until the MACK Plan is approved, Milton Abbot has no formal village boundary either.</p> <p>Q51: As recommended by WDBC, the suggested village boundary for Milton Abbot is drawn round the periphery of the existing village but has been extended to include the</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>making process as none of results/consequences of their choice will have any direct effect on them or their communities? Some may even argue this raises questions about the integrity/fairness of the Referendum itself?</p> <p>Surely the alternative, if all other communities ARE part of the plan, is to ensure the (totally laudable) aims of the plan – to identify and meet LOCAL future development needs/provide support etc - are achieved in a much fairer (and evenly spread) way across the whole MACK plan area.</p> <p>Q61 Do you agree with this summary or am I misunderstanding the whole process?</p> <p>Q62 Do you agree there is a contradiction in having a neighbourhood plan area with only ONE sustainable village in it whilst allowing the whole area to vote on what happens (primarily) to that village?</p> <p>Q63 Was the Mack Plan area confirmed as the NP boundary in June 2013 (para 11010, page 6) or did you mean June 2014? (I only ask because Appendix 2-1 Designation Statement asks for comments by a deadline of 29 September 2014 so I was unsure which was the correct year.)</p> <p>Q64 Do you have a summary of the residents response to this (2014?) request for comments?</p> <p>When the MACK plan area was formally approved in 2013/2014 (?) I think Milton Abbot had already lost its shop., full time post office and regular bus route, making it much similar to Chillaton in respect of sustainability assessment for development. In fact at its July 2014 meeting, MAGPC, in its overview of possible site developments for Milton Abbot (see minutes Appendix A),actually stated that, "...any assumptions regarding the sustainability of development in Milton Abbot that erroneously had regard to the existence of a village shop, should be reviewed".</p> | <p>sites that are recommended for development.</p> <p>Q52: When the JLP came into force all existing village boundaries went into abeyance. Therefore, until the MACK Plan is 'Made', Milton Abbot has no formal village boundary either.</p> <p>Q53: see above</p> <p>Q54: see above</p> <p>Q55: see above</p> <p>Q56: see above</p> <p>Q57: see above</p> <p>Q58: see above</p> <p>Q59: see above</p> <p>Q60: No</p> <p>The definition of the MACK Plan designated area was publicised and agreed in 2014. All correspondence, events, the 2017 survey etc have adopted it without adverse comment from the community.</p> <p>National, Regional and Neighbourhood Planning rules are what governs this and it is within them that the MACK</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>Q65 How long ago (date?) was Milton Abbot defined as a 'sustainable community'?</p> <p>Q66 If Chillaton (see para 4109) is effectively not defined through the JLP as "...sustainable community.." because it does not have "...good access to a local convenience store within reasonable walking distance of residents", why isn't Milton Abbot the same?</p> <p>Q66 Do you agree that when the whole MACK area was defined in 2013/2014 (when BOTH villagers had already lost their shops/full time post offices/buses) there was little difference between the two villages in respect of any sustainability for development assessment?</p> <p>Q67 How do you regard this has changed, given this situation remains the same in 2021?</p> <p>Q68 And if it is the same, doesn't that have a major influence on where potential developments should be ACROSS the whole MACK Plan area?</p> <p>Q69 As the MACK Plan area cannot now change, do you agree the fairest thing to do is the alternative, to ensure the draft plan applies more fairly/equally across its whole area?</p> <p>Q70 Sorry if I missed it but does the draft plan refer anywhere to it being put to (public) vote at a Referendum for all parish residents – as your covering letter does?</p> | <p>Plan has been produced. The policies within the draft MACK Plan go well beyond just where new houses may be built. As made clear within the plan, new development includes change of use and conversion within the plan area, not just Milton Abbot. Different policies will have different levels of importance to different people in different locations - broadband and mobile coverage for instance is far more of an issue to those living in hamlets than to those in Milton Abbot or Chillaton. Similarly, the protection of our heritage is just as important wherever you live.</p> <p>Q61: see above</p> <p>Q62: see above</p> <p>Q63: The MACK Plan area was formally designated by WDBC on 6 Nov 2014. Thank you for spotting this. We have amended paragraph 1.1.1.0 to reflect the correct date.</p> <p>Q64: No</p> <p>Q65: You would have to address this question to WDBC</p> <p>Q66: You would have to address this question to WDBC</p> <p>Q66: No. Even today Milton Abbot has a village hall, village church,</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | <p>Q71 I appreciate you have no control over the designation/sustainability (JLP) definitions but could you please explain how this will be addressed in the plan or the voting process?</p> <p>6) General</p> <p>Q72 Is the statement at Policy 5-1 last bullet point (page 34) based on national or local (JLP) policy or was it drafted by the MACK Team?</p> <p>Q73 Where is the class Q development at para 6402 last sentence (page 47) and does this count towards our local targets?</p> <p>Q74 And if not, why not?</p> <p>Q75 Is the phrase (in bold) at para 6404 a MACK team aspiration or is it actual policy?</p> <p>Q76 Which resident engagement response informed/led to the statement at Policy 6-3 first bullet? (the para 6605 only mentions people having preference for large rear gardens in new houses etc).</p> | <p>visiting post office and primary school. Chillaton has none of these.</p> <p>Q67: see above</p> <p>Q68: No, see above</p> <p>Q69: By its very construct, the plan applies fairly across the whole of our community. The policies within the draft MACK Plan go well beyond just where new houses may be built. Different policies will have different levels of importance to different people in different locations - broadband and mobile coverage for instance is far more of an issue to those living in hamlets than to those in Milton Abbot or Chillaton. Similarly, the protection of our heritage is just as important wherever you live.</p> <p>Q70: No but as it has only been issued with the covering letter (by post and online) which states “This is your opportunity to comment on the plan before it is formally submitted to West Devon Borough Council where it is subject to further consultation and formal examination before being put to a vote at a Referendum for all residents of our parishes”.</p> | |
|--|--|---|---|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>Q77 (If we are trying to meet the future needs of ALL potential new residents some of these could be elderly.) Do you agree that they may NOT want a large back garden and was this considered when drafting the policy statement at 6-3 (second bullet).</p> <p>Q78 (It is unclear exactly how many houses are proposed for Site B and how many for Site E?) If there are five homes proposed for Site B (see para 7305) does this mean there will be 15 houses built on Site E? (draft plan does not say.)</p> <p>Q79 If it is 15 houses to be built on Site E will they ALL be built on the current 'hard standing' area'? (see also Q5)</p> <p>7)REG 14 PROCESS ITSELF</p> <p>The original accompanying letter for the draft plan invites ALL comments (either positive OR negative) to be sent in; the original newsletter online was more neutral ("all views") but essentially the same. I would suggest they both met the often promoted (and good practice) values/aims of ensuring ALL consultation (during the whole NP process) is always done in the most open, fairest and balanced way as possible.</p> <p>However I am not sure your 27 January 2021 newsletter does the same. It states (in bold) <i>"If residents support these site proposals then we would like to hear from you."</i></p> <p>These last three weeks of the REG 14 consultation are an even more crucial time to promote/guarantee as fair and impartial a process as possible. Most replies will come in now because, as with any consultation, many people always leave it to the last minute. Therefore it seem wrong to now change the tone/influence of any</p> | <p>The website also has a plan progress section with a graphic culminating in a Referendum, this has always been publicised. It is a key element of neighbourhood planning which underpins the democratic credentials of all Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>Q71: You will need to address questions on voting process to WDBC who run the Referendum.</p> <p>Q72 JLP recycling/refuse & cycles (Dev12.11) / waste management (Dev31) refers.</p> <p>Q73: We originally named this site but were advised to remove the name. It was built before the 2017 cut off date to contribute to JLP housing targets so did not count</p> <p>Q74: see above</p> <p>Q75: Aspiration</p> <p>Q76: Not at all, para 6.6.0.4 states "New residential development proposals should demonstrate, through a design and an access statement, that adequate and well located private amenity space is provided of an appropriate size and type as part of good quality design.</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>message that is meant to encourage responses. I appreciate you may feel the message has not changed but, more importantly, it is how it MAY be interpreted by some residents who read it that matters most.</p> <p>Of the people who leave it late to comment (or don't bother at all) many are arguably the ones who are nervous/hesitant/cynical about consultations/older; it is these who could put off by the feeling that the MACK Team ONLY want to hear from them if they, "... support these site proposals...". I know that the MACK team would never want people to feel it is not worth sending ANY reply because they have read the draft plan and think the whole thing is the dreaded 'done deal'.</p> <p>Q80 Could you please explain why your consultation 'message' has changed at the halfway point?</p> <p>Q81 Do you feel this message is still as impartial as it could be? Q82 Do you intend to (urgently) put out another message that is more in keeping with the earlier two?</p> | <p>This space should nominally be provided as both communal areas and (rear) gardens".</p> <p>Q77: 60m2 is actually a fairly small space when measured out. We do not consider this a large back garden but more of a minimum to ensure that residents can enjoy some privacy in their own gardens.</p> <p>This was the figure presented to all who attended the Drop In events with an actually area identified that was representative. All those who commented agreed it as a minimum.</p> <p>Q78: It is up to the developers to propose development plans as guided by the policies in the MACK Plan. We are not at that stage.</p> <p>Q79: see above</p> <p>Q80: There has been no conscious change of message. We have, as you point out, sought resident input throughout. Following your comment we contacted WDBC and were assured that this newsletter to which you refer was fine</p> <p>Q81: see above Q82: see above</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|---------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | |
| 52 | J.C. | <p>Many thanks to all the people behind bringing this plan together. I believe it provides a fair evaluation of the planning sites available and is in the best interests of the community as whole. I do have sympathy for the owners of the allotments but perhaps a reasonable solution to this could be reintroducing the allotments that are currently overgrown and unused along Edgcumbe Lane?</p> <p>Hopefully, the recommendations will be embraced by all and the plan will provide the value that it is designed to do in terms of the power of locality.</p> | <p>Thank you for your suggestion concerning allotments. We will include this in our review of all comments once the Regulation 14 consultation ends on 20 Feb.</p> | <p>Comments on the allotments noted</p> |
| 53 | John Lewis | <p>I think an excellent job has been done on the Mack plan, especially relating to future housing development. I hope the plan is adopted in full</p> | | |
| 54 | Dorothy Lewis | <p>Well done to all the folk who put together the Mack Plan. I would wholeheartedly support the plan. The housing is a hot topic of course but is spot on and hopefully will be taken up as per the plan.</p> | | |
| 55 | Derwent Dawes | <p>I would like to say well done to the team who have taken the time to produce the Mac plan. I appreciate the impartial methodology used to try to select a site for building houses in the Milton Abbot area.</p> <p>I would like to see the community come together to put pressure on developers to provide amenities along with some affordable housing.</p> <p>Would it be possible to reinstate the village shop. Or perhaps extra land could be purchased for a village woodland/wildlife area. I believe that if we are thinking of building extra houses the impact to the environment should be offset by making extra space for nature.</p> <p>Living in Milton Abbot I am acutely aware of the amount of</p> | <p>Thank you for your suggestions. In order to manage expectations it is important to note that the subsidising of 6 affordable homes has to be the priority for funding with remaining, but still important, initiatives like those you suggest needing to be carefully prioritised.</p> | <p>Noted</p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|-----------|-------------|---|--|--|
| | | monoculture and improved pasture in the fields around the village and the lack of wild land with footpaths. | | |
| 56 | Jack | <p>It is pleasing to find that the plan has reinforced what the community has been communicating in the numerous representations that have been made across several recent planning applications. Hopefully, the plan has more success and carries more weight than seemingly these representations have – as many recent planning decisions have been made against the wishes of the community.</p> <p>The plan gives a clear way forward for where development should take place within Milton Abbot and it also clearly shows where the building of houses should not be allowed. I hope the plan therefore can protect our community against current and future unwanted planning developments.</p> <p>The residents of Milton Abbot understand that additional houses are needed – but they need to be in the right location and of the right type. The plan suggestions provide this, and they need to be implemented into planning policy.</p> <p>Affordable and smaller houses are vital to allow younger people to reside in the village and is pleasing to see the plan acknowledges this with the recommendations. It is time localism to become more important in planning policy and it is time for the plans recommendations to be adopted.</p> | | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | Thanks to all who have dedicated their time to producing the MACKPLAN. | | |
| 57 | Lesley-Jayne Edgar | I support the MACK plan in general. In regards to sections 5.5,7.1and 7.3 for a community centre and cafe. We have a lovely village hall that is under-used. Couldn't this facility be re-thought to form a cafe, at least on some days? The previous cafe in the village was popular with passing traffic. Parking and stopping off places would need to be considered to support a venture like this. A community shop and cafe would be fantastic, but parking and community support would be fundamental. It doesn't make sense to look at new facilities when existing ones are under-utilised. Traffic calming measures on each side of the village would reduce speeding. The effect of the signs and models during the Speed Awareness campaign shows the positive impact of even reminders. Thank-you to everyone who has put in so much effort for the plan. | Thank you for your sensible observations. The question of utilising our existing village hall, with its long history, or pursuing an alternative has been raised before and we will certainly look again at it once this consultation period is over and we can look across all comments. We have discussed the Milton Abbot and Chillaton, Parking and Road Safety problems with Devon County Council. Their recommendations on what actions could be taken are now included in the revised MACKPlan. | |
| 58 | Alan Clarkson | I apologise for the number of questions that ask for specific figures/numbers for anecdotal or statistical evidence to support certain statements in the draft plan (here and earlier). In previous answers I think you referred to having gathered "individual" comments (as and when, so to speak) during the whole process. But when I ask for specific things like exact numbers (of people) and where they live I am just trying to understand what the true level of support is for something ACROSS the whole MACK Plan area. So I would appreciate if you could provide these (more detailed) figures. | | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>(numbering continues from second set of questions)</p> <p>Green Spaces</p> <p>Paras 4431/4 re the 2017 survey clearly refers to just keeping or protecting the green spaces we <u>already</u> have in the village and making sure they are 'protected'.</p> <p>Q83 Is the proposal statement at 4-1 (second bullet) based on <i>just</i> the need to comply with the requirements of the "... recent Local Green Space legislation...."? (Para 4431)</p> <p>Q84 Could you please provide any documented evidence from any community engagement events (or elsewhere) that residents wanted <u>new</u> green spaces/'high quality green infrastructure' <u>on</u> new developments?</p> <p>Q85 Didn't residents ONLY just want our existing green spaces/sites protected?</p> <p>Q86 Could you also please explain what "...high quality green infrastructure provision...." is? (AECOM phrase?) or is this what is being referred to at Paras 6.1.22 – 6.1.22 of the MACK Design Statement at Appendix 2-4?</p> <p>Q87 Is the 'requirement' to provide and hand over these (green) amenities a legally binding one?</p> <p>Q88 Was the (HNA para 145) conclusion (at 5402) that there is "...a general absence of playing fields, play parks and public green spaces...." (in Milton Abbot) based on residents responses OR just their (AECOMs?) opinion?</p> <p>Q89 If it was residents responses could you provide clear data on the actual numbers/location of these people?</p> <p>Q90 Could you confirm if the allotments "...adjacent to Higher Edgcumbe Lane, Area D." (para 4424) are the old allotments</p> | <p>Q83: No</p> <p>Q84: As this proposed community action is specifically to determine the community's aspiration to establish Local Green Spaces, a forensic examination to determine exactly how many and which residents suggested this at drop in events and on doorsteps would be pointless. It is also why we have introduced Community Action 4-1. Local Green Spaces</p> <p>Q85: We do not have any designated Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>Q86: Reference 10 provided clearly defines what Green Infrastructure is and how Local Green Spaces are defined</p> <p>Q87: It is dependent on individual case circumstances. LGS may be Local Authority or privately owned land used for allotments or recreation and need no handover. It may be common land or it could be land where ownership is</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | <p>associated with Site B? (I only ask because there are also overgrown old allotments across the road in the triangle of land bordered by the main road, Lutyens Fold and Tamar View properties; and this land is much more "...adjacent to Higher Edgcombe Lane".)</p> <p>S106 Funding – follow up With regard to the "...tangible return to the community...", para 7.1.0.6 infers this <i>may</i> (my italics) be achieved through exploiting S106 funding for formal green space, playgrounds, allotments or a community building.</p> <p>Q91 Could you please confirm if this (S106) funding is <u>legally</u> guaranteed in respect of the proposed developments at Site B and Site E? (I did ask this in my first set of questions (Q9) but unfortunately in your answer you just explained the 'test' required to receive the funding and did not give any confirmation about the actual legal requirement.)</p> <p>Q92 Can any S106 funding be spent in any other villages/hamlets in the MACK Plan area? In the draft plan section 7-3 (Site Assessment Outcomes) most of the wording for the paragraphs about Site E (7.3.0.6 to 7.3.0.9) are taken <u>directly</u> from the AECOM summary in Appendix 2-5 MACK Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment. 7.3.0.8 makes clear "...there is a desire in the community to deliver <u>new</u> community facilities <u>alongside new</u> development area" (my underline). Even though later endorsed by the MACK team, this comment ORIGINALLY came from AECOM and to reach such a conclusive statement they (AECOM) MUST have seen the relevant resident feedback material?</p> | <p>transferred to a Parish Council which would be legally binding.</p> <p>Q88: It will have been based on AECOM's research Q89: see above Q90: Yes. This incorrect description has already been corrected.</p> <p>Q91: No, Section 106 agreements are negotiated between a developer and council to help make new home schemes more attractive to communities. It can be used to help fund affordable housing as well as roads, parks and youth services Q92: Specific guidance can be found at https://www.local.gov.uk/pas/pas-topics/infrastructure/s106-obligations-overview</p> <p>AECOM had access to the evidence base on the MACK Plan website just as anyone else has.</p> | |
|--|--|---|---|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>Q93 Could you please therefore confirm exactly WHAT resident response material supporting this ‘desire’ was passed to AECOM? (I appreciate that in earlier answers (Q7) you have said it was random individual comments gathered etc but you did not give any specific details of how many people said this (1?, 5? 10?), where they lived or how many individuals this collectively totalled to support this idea).</p> <p>You said the information was recorded (see answer to Q10) so should be relatively easy to provide please? And it would help to avoid any concerns you may have about “...misrepresenting any individual or community opinion”?</p> <p>Q94 And again, where did people say they wanted any new community facilities (like a community centre?) specifically <u>on</u> (or alongside) new developments? (7308)</p> <p>Q95 If not a new community centre, what exactly are the ‘new community facilities’ and will they be on Site B or Site E, or both?</p> <p>Traffic Issues</p> <p>There have been many understandable concerns recently about speeding in the village, especially on the straighter section from/to the school, where too many drivers see this as the opportunity to ‘put their foot down’. As you know, many people feel intimidated by (too fast) cars and lorries passing them, especially if they have young children with them. (I assume this was all reflected in the 2017 survey and 2020 drop in events?) The problem of insufficient (maybe inconsiderate is more accurate?) parking in the centre of the village is also mentioned in the draft plan. (paras 5602/7402)</p> <p>The Milton Abbot Speed and Road Safety Group is doing a wonderful job highlighting the speeding problems. They are obviously hoping to persuade the relevant bodies that we need traffic calming measures introduced to make things much safer for villagers.</p> | <p>Q93: See above. You have access to all the evidence. The whole point of providing a copy of the plan to every household was to ensure that we were not doing just that. We are confident that the response will inform us if this is not the case, to date, it has not.</p> <p>Q94: 7.3.0.8 doesn’t mention Community center. it is introduced once within the plan, that being under potential section 106 projects. The remainder of the question is a repeat of Q10.</p> <p>Q95: See Appendix 2-4 paragraph 6.1.22 for guidance</p> <p>We have discussed the Milton Abbot and Chillaton, Parking and Road Safety problems with Devon County Council. Their recommendations on what actions could be taken are now included in the revised MACKPlan.</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>I understood that most feedback (over years but especially in recent months) has ONLY related to excessive speeding at the ‘top’ of the village on the stretch of straighter road to/from the school? I have not, however, read any anecdotal or statistical evidence about speeding problems at the west end of the village. But (as a solution?) the draft plan introduces a new mini roundabout (fifth bullet point, para 7402) at the new entrance to the Site E, to slow traffic entering the village from the west.</p> <p>Even IF you accept a mini roundabout here could stop traffic speeding on the straight section (see below) there is a lot of anecdotal evidence that mini roundabouts do NOT always slow drivers down; conversely they ignore them, speed over them, arguably making them MORE dangerous? Similar roundabouts (to the one proposed) in Tavistock and Launceston have little affect in changing (bad) driving habits in respect of slowing traffic (can everyone honestly say they have NEVER just driven over one?). Worse, they often cause ‘near misses’ and sadly actual accidents.</p> <p>Q96 Could you provide any documented anecdotal or statistical evidence that confirms residents concerns about speeding at <u>this</u> (west) end of the village?</p> <p>Q97 And what is the supporting evidence to conclude that a mini roundabout <i>here</i> can actually resolve the speeding issues on the road to/from the school?</p> <p>Q98 Do you agree that the <i>current</i> parking problems will NOT be resolved by new allocated spaces on the new development, they just won’t get any worse.</p> <p>Q99 With safety in mind are you confident that any new mini roundabout BY the new development would have “...no material adverse impact on the safe and efficient operation of the local road network...”? (Policy 5-1, first bullet, page 34).</p> | <p>The mini -roundabout proposal has now been taken out of the revised plan.</p> <p>Q96: No</p> <p>Q97: We have discussed the Milton Abbot and Chillaton, Parking and Road Safety problems with Devon County Council. Their recommendations on what actions could be taken are now included in the revised MACKPlan.</p> <p>Q98: see above</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)</p> <p>I apologise these questions are a bit ‘rushed’ but, as you know, this draft document was only added to your evidence base/references page on 2 February 2021. I have therefore only had a few days to read and understand the contents.</p> <p>Q100 Can you confirm why the SEA draft report was indicated (page 57 footnote 23) as part of the evidence base for the draft plan when it was first issued ? (The Locality organisation states that the this document should be made available at the same time as the draft plan but it was only finished on the 19 January 2021 and first added to the evidence base on 2 February.)</p> <p>Q101 Doesn’t this mean residents only have two weeks to consider this document instead of six?</p> <p>Q102 Can you confirm this report is just the initial scoping study (for consultation – page 61 paras 11.5 to 11.8) and not the ‘final assessment’ document? (7204)</p> <p>Q103 When were the three statutory consultation bodies (Historic Eng, EA and N.England) sent this report?</p> <p>Q104 Is the consultation with them still on-going? (the report has xx – xx as the consultation dates and there is no deadline for these bodies to respond).</p> <p>Q105 Is there any reason the reference to this document on page 57 does not make clear it was also drafted by AECOM? (7204, first sentence).</p> <p>Q106 Why does the draft plan indicate that each site was ‘subsequently evaluated’ though the (AECOM?) SEA when this document does not mention any of the sites in the draft plan?</p> <p>Q107 What grade of agricultural land is the farm land at Site E (1-3a or 3b-5?) and where can I find confirmation of this?</p> <p>Q108 Do you agree that the first SEA objective (page 52) should be for the <u>whole</u> MACK Plan area?</p> | <p>Q99: see above</p> <p>Q100: The SEA is not however a prerequisite for Reg 14. Government Regulations states “Before submitting a plan proposal to the local planning authority, a qualifying body must publicise, in a manner that is likely to bring it to the attention of people who live, work or carry on business in the neighbourhood area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • details of the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan; • details of where and when the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan may be inspected; • details of how to make representations; and • the date by which those representations must be received, being not less than 6 weeks from the date on which the draft proposal is first publicised; | |
|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Q109 How can this be achieved if ALL the facilities are just in Milton Abbot? (plus if you put them all in Milton Abbot then all the other residents in the MACK Plan area who want to use them will have to DRIVE here. Doesn't this then defeat some aspects of the environmental objectives in the SEA?).</p> <p>MACK Housing Needs Survey Report (Feb 2020)</p> <p>There seems to be a lot of data/evidence used to produce this document (and the conclusions/recommendations put forward by Devon Communities Together) that is not included in the final draft. I am hoping you will be able to provide this please?</p> <p>There is a reference (findings section) to 73% of people in favour of a small development of affordable houses:</p> <p>Q110 Could you confirm that you effectively mean this represents 73% of the 25% who responded and let me have the actual number of people this equates to?</p> <p>The document (8.1) confirms that (after subtracting one person buying an open market property) only 4 out of 91 (4%) stated they wanted to move within five years (BUT stay in the MACK Plan area) and identified a need for affordable housing to be able to do so.</p> <p>Q111 Do you agree that this assessment of the need for an affordable home is just based on household income rather than an expressed desire <u>from</u> any of the respondents for an affordable home?</p> <p>Q112 Could you please tell me where to find the 'separate document' mentioned in the findings (page 3) which was '...passed to the MACK Plan Committee...' ?</p> <p>This was supposed to include a breakdown of the main results by parish (inside the MACK area) which is the information I need. At 5.3 there is only a breakdown to show the TOTAL number of actual <u>replies</u> received per parish; NOT how the statistical figures given elsewhere relate to EACH parish in table five).</p> | <p>Indeed, Locality guidance suggest only that the SEA process will help the plan independent examination and any potential subsequent challenge.</p> <p>Q101: see above Q102: yes Q103: January 2021 Q104: These bodies had to respond by the 20th February 2021 Q105: No Q106: As you point out, the SEA had not been completed when you asked this question so it is not clear how you have drawn this conclusion.</p> <p>Q107: The AECOM site assessment report contains this data Q108: yes Q109: We understand that the SEA is not just about housebuilding and has a relevance across the MACK Plan area. Q110: You have access to the HNS report. You will know, if you completed a response to the HNS survey, that the responses were confidential and not accessible outside Devon Communities Together.</p> <p>Q111: No</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | <p>Q113 And is this the same document (+ A4 Note) referred to at Paras 5.4/5-5 which was also passed to the MACK Team (but incorrectly referred to as the 'Parish Council').</p> <p>This is a document that appears to be very important as it contains suggestions from 41 respondents on possible (development) sites within the parish AND their general comments on affordable housing in the area.</p> <p>Q114 Do you agree therefore that this document should be part of the evidence base on the MACK Plan website so that residents have the opportunity to fully consider its contents? (This allows residents to take them into account (as with all other evidence) <u>before</u> making any judgement on the draft plan).</p> <p>Q115 Sorry if I missed it but I am correct that the ONLY main reference to the MACK HN Survey is at 6-2.3 on page 44 of the draft plan and that Devon Communities Together is not in fact mentioned anywhere?</p> <p>Q116 If correct, why did you not publish (in the draft) all the main findings of this survey?</p> <p>Q117 Why does the draft plan advocate five affordable homes to meet local needs in the MACK Plan area when both the HNA and the conclusion and recommendation in the HN Survey say four is sufficient?</p> <p>GENERAL</p> <p>Q118 Do you know (roughly) how many years it will take (see para 4208) for the TVAONB extension to 'cover' Milton Abbot?</p> <p>Q119 Do you know of any national formula or study that proves/concludes that building <i>additional</i> houses in a small village (with little or no facilities like shop, post office, regular bus) can 'bring them back' or guarantee the establishment of new ones?</p> <p>Q120 Or is this generation/establishment of new services primarily based on S106 funding etc?</p> | <p>Q112: It is not clear to which document do you refer?</p> <p>Q113: see above</p> <p>Q114: as above</p> <p>Q115: No to both</p> <p>Q116: see above</p> <p>Q117: The MACK Plan recommends 6 not 5 affordable homes. This figure is drawn from the 3 principal sources - the HNA, the HNS and the Devon Home Choice data. The figure of 4</p> | |
|--|--|---|---|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Q121 And does para 5501 essentially infer this? Q122 If 73011 confirms that only small scale development in Chillaton is possible because of the "...limited range of local facilities...." how is Milton Abbot able to take a larger (?) development when we <u>also</u> have limited facilities and are therefore essentially in the SAME situation?</p> <p>Q123 Whose is the 'submission' mentioned in para 73012? Q124 And do you mean this submission does not support affordable homes, green space, additional resources etc because the proposal is for less than ten houses? Q125 If EACH site detailed in the draft plan was assessed using <u>exactly</u> the <u>same</u> criteria/information/matrix etc to ensure consistence of approach and a fairness/independence in the final selections doesn't the statement at 73014 introduce an <i>additional</i> selection criteria that was ONLY used in respect of C Site B?</p> <p>I appreciate that in your earlier response you have justified 73014 by paras 73012/13 but it would appear the MACK Plan Team (AECOM did not) has effectively just said "cannot select SITE X because there is space at site Y" !</p> <p>Q126 Could you please comment why (if my interpretation is correct) you have deviated from the assessment criteria that was agreed with AECOM which was designed to ensure a fair, consistent and equitable process for ALL possible sites? Q127 Is the phrase (para 7307) "... support the efficient use of land" a reference to national/local plan terminology, or wording that AECOM 'created'?</p> | <p>that you quote just happens to be the lowest of the 3. Q118: No Q119: No</p> <p>Q120: Our aim is to achieve the best results for the village whether through developer contributions or intelligent design. The extent of what can be achieved will not be known until any development is much further advanced but it must be recognised that affordable housing will be the principal beneficiary.</p> <p>Q121: Para 5.5 covers the potential for exploiting Section 106 funding. Q122: Decisions as to which villages are classed sustainable is beyond the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan. You would need to take this up with WDBC. Milton Abbot has a village hall, a pub, a school, a church and a visiting post office. Chillaton has none of these so the situation is not the same. Q123: The landowner/his agent Q124: This submission was quite detailed but despite access to the relevant documents failed to deliver those elements listed.</p> <p>Q125: No. It recognises that Chillaton Site B is in 'open countryside' in</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Q128 And what does it mean in respect of a new development of houses to replace what is essentially a rural farm building and pasture land?</p> <p>Q129 If it is an 'expression' from AECOM do you know how they formulated this phrase and what evidence/method they used to do so?</p> <p>Q130 I appreciate that you have said before this was an AECOM statement/conclusion but the MACK Team has fully endorsed their report so, as you agree with it, could you please say what you <u>personally</u> take this to mean?</p> <p>Q131 And do you agree with AECOM that replacing a rural farm land (and related buildings) with 15/20 houses will 'improve' the 'outlook' of the village?</p> <p>Q132 Just double checking but are the jobs totals mentioned at 5232 for jobs 'done' actually IN the MACK plan area or do these figures relate to the occupations/jobs that people who LIVE in the area do (for a living)?</p> <p>Q133 When para 7.4.0.2 (last bullet point) states "... land should be identified and set aside to deliver an asset for the community" which of the two preferred sites will this land be on and what will the actual asset be?</p> <p>Q134 Has the MACK Team or MAGPC already 'chosen' this asset?</p> <p>Q135 I appreciate you may reply that "...it is for all residents to decide..." but on a personal level (also as residents) do you/the team feel that the village hall should be refurbished or replaced?</p> <p>Q136 Was the (final?) "...overall assessment..." (para 7205) carried out in addition to all the others just conducted by the members of the MACK Team?</p> <p>Q137 Did the HNA cover Chillaton as it is not regarded as a sustainable village?</p> | <p>planning terms and the recommended Milton Abbot sites are in a sustainable village. Strong resident support from Chillaton residents would have to be evident for planning permission to be achievable for the Chillaton site. This is not the case.</p> <p>The other sites in Chillaton would have been assessed likewise if they had been positively assessed by AECOM</p> <p>See above</p> <p>Q126: We have not, see above</p> <p>Q127: It means the use of a brownfield site for at least part of the proposed development</p> <p>Q128: see above</p> <p>Q129: see above</p> <p>Q130: See above. The personal views of the MACK Plan team have no relevance and we have gone to great lengths to ensure that the MACK Plan is based on evidence rather than our opinion.</p> <p>Q131: If sympathetically designed and of good quality, yes.</p> <p>Q132: Those who live in the area.</p> <p>Q133: It is too soon to be able to answer either of these questions until much further on in the planning process</p> <p>Q134: No</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Q138 Do you accept that AECOM could have reached a different conclusion about the suitability of any of the five new sites IF they had been required to analyse a significant number of objections received about them?</p> <p>In your earlier answer (Q1) you mentioned people getting ‘deeply upset’ about possible development at Site E. (So, irrespective of whether the decision was taken NOT to consult during the summer of 2020):</p> <p>Q139 Do you therefore agree that any resident consultation (at this time) COULD potentially have generated sufficient negative responses that AECOM could NOT have ignored these in their (independent) assessment of all possible development sites?</p> <p>Q140 And conversely (and leaving aside all the other obvious tangible issues – water supplies, traffic/access, privacy etc) do you agree that AECOM were unavoidably (and quite understandably) persuaded NOT to recommend site D <i>because of the number</i> of objections received about this site? (I think Nov 2020 AECOM report 2.6 Task pro-forma says each site recorded ‘background’ detail and the ‘Next Steps’ section at 5.6 mentions consultation responses.)</p> <p>Q141 Bearing in mind that Chillaton children ‘feed’ Milton Abbot School, how can ‘limited school capacity’ (AECOM I think?) effectively prevent ten houses being built in Chillaton but allow 20 in Milton Abbot?</p> <p>Q142 Which reviews is the draft plan referring to at 73015?</p> | <p>Q135: Refurbishment of the existing village hall has certainly been suggested and has merit. As it is listed it cannot be replaced. It also has a considerable history to it which would be sad to discard.</p> <p>Q136: The overall assessment simply collated the various inputs listed at the reference and outlined (what appeared to be) the outcomes they collectively delivered</p> <p>Q137: yes</p> <p>Q138: No. AECOM assessed the suitability of each site against identical criteria. Their judgement is based on which sites are suitable for development (i.e have a reasonable prospect of getting planning approval). That they were able to only recommend 1 fully and 1 partially in Milton Abbot is a reflection of the planning challenges associated with the village.</p> <p>Milton Abbot Site E was not mentioned in the response to Q1.</p> <p>Q139: No. See the response to Q 138.</p> <p>Q140: No. Milton Abbot site D was not recommended for the reasons that AECOM state in their report and you state in your question.</p> <p>Q141: You will need to identify which part of the MACK Plan report this</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|---------|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>question relates to for us to be able to answer it.</p> <p>Q142: The JLP SHLAA and the AECOM site assessment report</p> | |
| 59 | JBE | <p>Many thanks to all members of the MackPlan team who have obviously worked so hard to produce the MackPlan, which I strongly support. It is gratifying to learn that the decision relating to the most suitable site for future development has echoed the thoughts of the many inhabitants of Milton Abbot who have felt that Site D is not suitable for development. Independent experts have identified the exact reasons why residents feel that the site should be rejected. Sites MA Site B and MA Site E are well placed to safely provide the future needs of all ages of future residents of Milton Abbot without compromising the landscape of the village. The independent decisions relating to the suitability or unsuitability of all the sites which were proposed for development were clear and concise.</p> <p>The plan has highlighted other issues, such as the lack of a village shop and the lack of an adequate bus service. The deterioration of the Village Hall is also a problem as it uninviting as a meeting place, although it does provide a venue for the Post Office, but that only operates one morning a week.</p> | <p>The question of utilising our existing village hall, with its long history, or pursuing an alternative has been raised before and we will certainly look again at it once this consultation period is over and we can look across all comments</p> | <p>Comments on the Higher Edgcombe Lane Site have been collated and included within relevant assessments in Appendix 2-5 Section 2</p> |
| 60 | S.L.Cox | <p>It is great to see such a well-reasoned and thought through plan which hopefully becomes of significant important in terms of shaping the future of the rural communities that they cover. Unfortunately, the plan is too late to provide</p> | <p>The website www.mackplan.org.uk has a section named Plan Progress that has a graphic showing the significant steps that lie ahead</p> | <p>Comments on the Higher Edgcombe Lane Site have been</p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|--------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>protection against MA Site F (with planning for a house already being granted in this location) but hopefully it plays a vital part in deciding on the merits of MA Site D.</p> <p>Starter homes and affordable housing are very much needed in the area, and it is great to see that this has been recognised by the proposals set out for MA Site B and especially MA Site E.</p> <p>Is there any information on what happens next in terms of timescales after this consultation period end</p> | and their approximate time scales. This is very much our best estimate. | collated and included within relevant assessments in Appendix 2-5 Section 2 |
| 61 | Steve Wilson | I support the MACK plan as a well thought out and much needed guide to the future development of our village. I would very much hope that any future developments would also include enhancing our village with a community shop or some kind of village 'hub', more help for wildlife and an effective way to tackle speeding traffic. | | |
| 62 | Matt and Chloe Worsfold | We applaud the effort, thought out and thorough report that has been made by the MACKplan team. We fully agree and completely support that the recommended sites have been independently looked into and are the right options for the village and it's residents. Hopefully now with the MACKplan providing a much better option for future housing it will stop the proposed site behind Edgcombe Lane from gaining planning permission. | | Comments on the Higher Edgcombe Lane site have been collated and included within relevant assessments in Appendix 2-5 Section 2 |
| 63 | PG | A thorough piece of work, well done. I agree with all that was said but it is important that any new development big | | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| | | or small must be designed to be sympathetic to its surroundings. | | |
| 64 | Mr and Mrs JPA | <p>We fully support the idea to improve our villages by way of the Mac Plan.</p> <p>Well done to all who have dedicated their time and efforts to put a futuristic plan into being.</p> <p>It is very important that we all look ahead, time will wait for nobody so once again thank you to all of those concerned, with the plan in question.</p> <p>Affordable homes in this day and age are a most for our young families who have not had an easy time to get onto the property ladder, The sites that are being considered in our area are not to large and should have the right mix of affordability and be in keeping with the flavour of our surroundings.</p> <p>We trust that this could be achieved with good thinking by our councils, planners ,and contractors, with good design in mind.</p> <p>Austerity has not been good for our rural areas.</p> <p>Councils have not been able to maintain our villages and roads, everybody has had to pay a price for the lack of investments and maintenance in our lanes, kerb clearance and the visibility of road signs because hedgerows are overgrown, and drainage is very poor.</p> <p>Chillaton has a major problem with flooding in its centre, drains are blocked owing to the amount of slurry to be cleared by residents after heavy rain.</p> <p>Traffic is another problem for the villages Milton Abbot and Chillaton in question.</p> | <p>The provision of affordable homes is our highest housing priority for any new development.</p> <p>We agree on the importance of sympathetic and good design and have included that in our design statement.</p> <p>We have discussed the Milton Abbot and Chillaton, Parking and Road Safety problems with Devon County Council. Their recommendations on what actions could be taken are now included in the revised MACKPlan.</p> | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|-----------|-------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>Our roads are outdated and in great need for investment and upgrading and the need for traffic calming.</p> <p>These villages are dangerous for residents to take walks owing to the volume of speeding traffic, HGV's in particular.</p> <p>The centre of Chillaton is not a pretty sight, we would like to see more involvement by parish councils with these problems in mind.</p> <p>As for Mac Plan brilliant but we think a lot of work has to be done before the introduction of new homes and family's and extra traffic.</p> <p>It would be an asset to Milton Abbot and Chillaton if we could attract more commercial investments.</p> | | |
| 65 | Guy Talbot | <p>A well thought and very detailed plan.</p> <p>I am happy with the conclusions.</p> <p>It would be very helpful if an executive summary could be added. This would make future review of the plan much easier as the salient points in the plan would all be in one place, whilst the detail would be there for detailed reference.</p> | <p>We debated at length whether to include an Executive Summary or not and decided not to in the end because we needed residents to read the detail as it is in the detail that we have tried to lay out what the evidence indicates that we (the residents) want for the future of our community which is much broader than simply where any future development should go. In reality we are now past the point of needing one as, from a planning policy perspective, it is the detail that counts.</p> | |
| 66 | Richard Marshall | <p>I have read the plan and would like to make some observations.</p> <p>I understand the importance of a Local Plan and I am</p> | <p>We recognise that in a perfect world, small developments would be the preferred</p> | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| | | <p>grateful to the authors for the considerable time and effort they have spent, drawing together into one document a lot of relevant information for us to consider. I was however surprised at the conclusions because they seem to be different to what I had heard discussed before.</p> <p>Building 20 houses. If there is a need for 20 houses then I do not agree that they should all be built on one site. I believe there are landowners willing to make smaller sites available. The preference of residents is for smaller sites and this is acknowledged in the report at 7.1.0.5 I understand that land in Chillaton has already been identified as suitable for building houses and there are numerous sites in MA for smaller developments.</p> <p>Proposal to build on MA Site B. The plan says (at 4.4.2.4) that the Allotments at Area D are “currently unused”. This is completely incorrect. This land has been continuously used since it was first designated as allotments by the Duke of Bedford. It is still rented and used by local residents as can be seen by the level of maintenance of this area. This green space allows an important “first view” of the village and the G2 listed Lutyens designed estate houses when approached from the West. The land is an important part of the history of Milton Abbot and should be retained as green space for use by future generations. The need to retain green space had “overwhelming support” according to the 2017 Residents Survey. (4.4.3.1)</p> | <p>approach. Our evidence gathering over the last 2 years has however revealed that the most pressing local need is for affordable homes for local people. Affordable homes are made affordable through being subsidised by open market homes. A development has to be 11 homes or more for the rules to require the developer to include 30% affordable housing in the development. Therefore, the only way to deliver the affordable homes that our community so needs is to have either a single development of 20 or 2 sites of 11 and to increase the number of houses to 22. As we do not have 2 sites that are independently assessed as being both suitable for development and capable of delivering 11 new houses, the only way of generating the housing that local people need is by having a single development. The 1 site in Chillaton that was identified as being partially suitable for development has been</p> | <p style="color: red;">Comments on the allotments noted</p> |
|--|--|---|--|---|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>Proposal to build on on MA Site E. (7.3.0.6) If it really is necessary to build all the houses on one site then site E has sufficient land to more than accommodate 20 houses with a low building density. There would be no need to intrude onto the allotments which could be retained as green space separating the new houses from the older village houses. Building on site E would be visually less intrusive, with proper landscaping.</p> <p>MA Site C Vicarage Gdns. (7.3.0.17) This area was considered suitable for building in the previous draft report and I am not sure what has changed. This site is on the edge of the village, adjacent to newer houses and more than large enough to accommodate 20 houses. I do not understand how this can be considered to have “significant landscape and visual sensitivities”. It would extend an existing development and most villagers wouldn’t be aware that it was there. Certainly the visual impact would be much less than Sites B & E. There is also reference to “possible odour issues from the sewage treatment works”. WDBC has given PP for a new agricultural dwelling even closer than Vicarage Gardens so I’m not sure this is a good reason.</p> <p>Like many villagers I accept the need for towns and villages to expand in order to accommodate our growing population and to provide a range of homes suitable for young and old alike. I question the need for “estates” to be built, preferring smaller organic growth but, if a larger development is needed I believe it should be sighted as unobtrusively as possible.</p> | <p>discounted for the reasons explained in the Regulation 14 draft of the MACK Plan.</p> <p>The rented status of the allotments has been corrected in the draft MACK Plan. The plan recognises the need to protect our heritage. We have gone considerable lengths and public expense to identify the most suitable sites for development, of which the allotments are one of the 2 sites in Milton Abbot deemed suitable. To be absolutely accurate, it is in fact Site E that is the first view of the village when approaching from the west.</p> <p>The argument against the development of Milton Abbot Site C (Vicarage Gardens) is made in full in the AECOM Site Assessment report which is available to read on the MACK Plan website. The JLP assessment, reproduced in Appendix 2-5 of the Reg 14 version of the MACK Plan, to which you refer concluded that</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | I would like these comments to be taken into consideration. | 5 dwellings could be built in the northern part of this site. It would therefore not be able to deliver the affordable housing that the local community needs for the reasons explained above. | |
| 67 | Rob Gardiner and Sharon Miller | <p>Brilliant to see such a well written, well-reasoned and community focused plan. Well done to all involved. Site E for Milton Abbot looks particularly favourable in our eyes and hopefully will provide the opportunity for starter homes so younger people can afford to buy property in our lovely village. We have a brilliant primary school here in Milton Abbot and attracting young families to the village is vital to for the future of it (along with supporting the other few services that remain in the village).</p> <p>West Devon Borough Council goes out of its way to promotes a community engagement philosophy yet often we find this is simply paying lip service to that portrayal and our views are largely ignored when it comes to making key decisions. Let us hope that this time this is not the case and the recommendations of the plan are fully utilised in order to help stop developments in the wrong areas and provide development in the ones that actually work for the community rather than the developer!</p> | | |
| 68 | Jeremy Gallow | <p>Clearly a great deal of effort and thought has gone into preparing this plan on our behalf, for which everyone involved should be thanked.</p> <p>The scope of the plan, as defined in the document, varied between “Milton Abbot, Chillaton and Kelly” (frontispiece), “the villages of Milton Abbot and Chillaton” (para. 4.1.0.1),</p> | | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| | | <p>and the Bradstone, Chillaton, Dunterton, Kelly, Meadwell, Milton Abbot and Quither villages and hamlets.</p> <p>1.) For clarity, to ensure that the planning authorities are in no doubt as to the authority of the plan, it might be useful to harmonise the description of the scope of the plan – for example making it clear that the plan refers to the whole of the civil parishes of Milton Abbot, Kelly, Bradstone and Dunterton.</p> <p>2.) I note that, during the assembling of the MACK plan, the Government has introduced the “Class Q developments” provision, which appears to take no cognisance of local plans. Most of the Class Q developments will be of the “non-affordable” category, thereby making it even more difficult and expensive for local people to get on, or remain on the “housing ladder”. I note, too, that the Covid-19 epidemic has encouraged the movement of people from Covid-19 “hotspots” to Devon, further putting pressure on the local housing stock, and may or will also encourage the purchase of “second homes” in the MACK plan area.</p> <p>I therefore not only agree with the principal of 6.4.0.4 (“counting Class Q developments against the new building target”), but would suggest extending that provision to require a pro-rata increase in the proportion of affordable housing allowed for in the new building target, reflecting any Class Q (or other) exception to the local plan.</p> | | <p>1). Noted and actioned</p> <p>Comments on Q Class developments also noted.</p> |
|--|--|---|--|---|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|------------------|-------------------|---|--|---------------------|
| <p>69</p> | <p>JAT</p> | <p>Thank you to the MACK Plan Team for the long hours which have been invested in this draft plan. As the regulations now allow residents to make any comments I have some to put forward. I have also read the supporting evidence.</p> <p>7.4 The village boundary. "...it is proposed that the current draft village boundary for Milton Abbot (MA) is extended and adopted...". Please can you supply the established boundary map or is MA like Chillaton and it does not possess an established boundary?</p> <p>4.1.0.9. "The JLP establishes that a sustainable village community should have good access to a local convenience store within reasonable walking distance of residents." This is used to justify why Chillaton is not sustainable – yet MA is also without a local shop and is sustainable! I appreciate MA has a school but children from Chillaton attend MA school. Also, it is stated only small scale development in Chillaton, ten houses, is due to limited school places and yet ok for MA to have 20 houses! It's the same school!!</p> <p>4.5 The photos of public rights of way footpaths. What is shown as "good" is over developed. This isn't a walk in the beautiful unspoilt countryside. The bad and the ugly are what the countryside is. Please don't adopt the "good" option locally.</p> <p>MA is so close to the AONB and should be kept at least looking like a historic rural village. The preferred site, MA</p> | <p>Milton Abbot does not have a current agreed boundary. A map of the proposed boundary will be included in the revised plan.</p> <p>The defining of what is a 'sustainable' village is a matter for WDBC and beyond the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The Good - Over the past few years the footpath from Uppaton to Narracott had become impassable for all but 2 months of the year due to a bog that had become established behind Hogs Tor where the path crosses the stream. To protect this new natural habitat whilst reopening the</p> | <p>Noted</p> |
|------------------|-------------------|---|--|---------------------|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | <p>Site E is a greenfield site, a farm. What better setting for a rural village? If 20 houses are developed here the western approach to the village will be changed out of all recognition. Everyone only seems to disagree to development from the east.</p> <p>I am sure many in our community would have objected to this development if it had not been put forward in the MACK Plan but in a usual application. I don't see why it is any different now. I also object to the possible development on the old allotments, these have a historic value to the village and are not unused.</p> <p>When residents were surveyed independently the majority or respondents said they prefer small sites. So why not? The independent survey suggesting we need four affordable house is only a "snapshot in time". Since the survey this may not now be the case. According to WDBC we have over 300 affordable houses coming online in Tavistock! So is there the need for more? Moreover, there</p> | <p>footpath a bridge was constructed sympathetic to its surroundings. This has been much appreciated by residents and walkers locally. The Bad - Over about a year obstacles were placed at the kissing gate behind Chillaton House on the footpath to Beckwell. For the last year a pallet has been securely fastened across the gate preventing access (as shown in the picture).</p> <p>The Ugly - The footpath from Uppaton Wood to Willesley is often rendered impassable due to overgrown hedges and banks, as shown in the picture, probably being cut back just once in the past 2 years.</p> <p>Maintaining access to the countryside is our aim and is preferred over obstruction and a lack of suitable management.</p> <p>The need for affordable homes to keep young families in the area was highlighted in our surveys and public engagement meetings.</p> | |
|--|--|---|---|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|----|--|--|--|
| | | <p>is I believe, no definite legal obligation for Section 106 funding from any developer.</p> <p>Sorry but I cannot support this draft plan in this current form.</p> | | |
| 70 | Jo | <p>I live next door to the garage. My drive is used constantly for parking and a turn around point for vehicles, increased recently due to the road closure. On one occasion a van hit my steps. My drive is a pull up area for couriers to rearrange the back of their vans as well as transporters off loading broken down vehicles.</p> <p>My car was also damaged by a customer of the garage, which I then had to resort to having heavy stones places on my drive to prevent any further damage.</p> <p>I have been refused double yellow lines, even though when cars are parked outside my house it makes the road even more unsafe with near misses and head on collisons being almost a daily occurance, however i was refused the double yellow lines without any reason why. I was told to call the police by devon highways if there was an obstruction! What a total waste of police resource. No explanation from devon highways as to why they have refused. I have appealed their decision and await a response.</p> <p>The speed of traffic through the village is frightening, I would say most vehicles drive through here in excess of 50 mile an hour. The lorries, well, its criminal as to the speed</p> | <p>We have discussed the Milton Abbot and Chillaton, Parking and Road Safety problems with Devon County Council. Their recommendations on what</p> | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>they drive through here, especially Burcombe haulage company. I am surprised we have not had any fatalities.</p> <p>There are no pathways making it safe to walk your dog. The village is not safe for children to be outside by the road.</p> | <p>actions could be taken are now included in the revised MACKPlan.</p> | |
| 71 | Alan Clarkson | <p>(Part 1 of 8)</p> <p>Thank you to the MACK Plan team for all their hard work, especially over the last few difficult months.</p> <p>I fully support the principle of local neighbourhood plans. They are still the BEST way for local people to all agree the type of developments we should have and the best place to build them, if it is done in an open, fair, impartial and balanced way based on <u>all</u> the evidence.</p> <p>Sustainable Development/Affordable Homes</p> <p>Although the draft plan explains about the JLP targets, why do we need to accept all 20 houses in Milton Abbot (AND practically in one place!) just to get some Section 106 funding? This money is not even guaranteed (anyone remember the promised shops, primary school and station at the Callington Road development?)</p> <p>Most people, and the Parish Council, have always said they want smaller developments spread more evenly. The draft plan is also a bit unclear about what is precisely the <u>exact</u> number of houses we have to build in one place to still secure any S106 funding. If it can be less than 20</p> | <p>The provision of affordable homes for local people has emerged as the most pressing need for our community. Affordable homes are subsidised by open market homes and the ability to do this requires a minimum development size of 10 houses to deliver the requisite economies of scale. Therefore, it is not possible to meet both the strong evidenced need</p> | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>(see 6-2, page 49) can we use other ways of providing suitable low cost homes, maybe even bungalows for the elderly or disabled, through Community Land Trusts or Rural Exception Sites? (6-1, page 46); one scheme I think has been built in South Tawton and one is planned for Brentor.</p> <p>The draft plan did not give any precise information that the <u>majority</u> of residents want six affordable homes in Milton Abbot, although I understand this evidence was recorded; there was also no figures to support the reasons <i>why</i> people need affordable homes in the area. I am not even sure of the ‘correct’ number of affordable houses we actually require because both housing surveys said we need four but the plan says six. If we <i>can</i> have smaller developments could we just have four? Or alternatively, if there is no definitive proof people desperately want affordable homes IN the MACK Plan area, shouldn’t the plan address the fact that over 300 affordable homes are being built in Tavistock?</p> <p>As for all new houses all being built in Milton Abbot, the village is not as ‘sustainable’ as it was without the shop, full time post office and regular bus; it is now a bit more like other local communities. Even the JLP establishes that, “... a sustainable village community should have good access to a local convenience store within reasonable walking distance of residents.” (para 4109.) It is therefore strange this is used to justify why Chillaton is not sustainable yet Milton Abbot is!</p> | <p>for affordable houses and have only smaller developments.</p> <p>The local need for affordable homes is drawn from the output of the HNA, the HNS and data form WDBC. 6 is an average of theses figures and a case could be made for more. 6 is the highest figure that can be delivered from 20 in terms of enforcement and ability to be subsidised by open market houses.</p> <p>Decisions as to which villages are classed sustainable is beyond the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan. You would need to take this up with WDBC. Milton Abbot has a village</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>This classification is very out of date and even the Parish Council said this should be looked at in 2014! And is there any way we can avoid 'rushing' to accept so many new houses (and all in one place), especially now the Government is changing the whole planning system?</p> | <p>hall, a pub, a school, a church and a visiting post office. Chillaton has none of these so the situation is not the same.</p> | |
| | | <p>(2 of 8)</p> <p>Local Infrastructure</p> <p>We are all worried about the future of Milton Abbot and want it to thrive; some (but not all) think this can be done by building new houses, but everyone wants to create better facilities. But is there any way we can do all this in a more balanced way? It is vital we protect what we already have – a small, peaceful, beautiful country village.</p> <p>We all know there is nothing left in Milton Abbot shop wise but it's the same for most small villages now and it won't really change. If you want better or bigger amenities you go to the local towns. Although it would be lovely to have the old shop and post office back, commercial (and online!) habits have changed forever. I do not see that building lots more houses is a potential way of bringing them back but the lack of houses and facilities certainly hasn't stopped</p> | <p>The allocation of 20 new homes in the JLP to be built in Milton Abbot is not optional A neighbourhood plan gives us the ability to shape the development to provide the best outcome for the village, it does not allow us to reject the allocation which is a very small part of the allocation</p> | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | <p>people – young couples, families, first time buyers – from moving here.</p> <p>Tavistock is swamped by new houses, services are very strained (with little prospect of getting new ones very soon) and many say the town they love is being ‘lost’. Whilst such growth is inevitable in large towns, if we are not careful, something similar could happen to Milton Abbot.</p> <p>Why do we need a new community centre in Milton Abbot when we have a perfectly good village hall in the heart of the village. With some appropriate funding grants or donations, and loads of community spirit, it could be transformed. Look at the amazing success of Brentor village hall and all the things it is now used for. As so many people have said there is no end to what Milton Abbot village hall could be used for – a café (is there room at the back for outdoor seating?), meetings, party hire, keep fit/yoga, activity clubs, library and of course a theatre and.....a community shop!</p> <p>It would be sad to see the village hall neglected or even demolished (for more houses like Lamerton!) which is what will happen if it is replaced by a ‘new’ one. (Policy 5.1 third bullet seems to agree.) And it is not dependent on any S106 money.</p> | <p>of the 26,700 homes being built in our region (Plymouth, South Hams and West Devon from JLP paragraph 3.2 page 18).</p> <p>The question of utilising our existing village hall, with its long history, or pursuing an alternative has been raised before and we will certainly look again at it once this consultation period is over and we can look across all comments. As you recognise, finding a solution to the current village hall’s lack of parking would make it much more accessible</p> | |
| | | <p>(3 of 8)</p> <p>Green Issues</p> | | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | <p>It seems very odd to give up some of our beautiful green spaces for houses only to have ‘new green infrastructure’ in the new housing developments. Please let’s just protect and improve the ones we have – the old allotments, the village park; I thought there was “overwhelming support” for this in the 2017 residents survey? (para4431).</p> <p>The Milton Abbot Park Group are doing a wonderful job trying to improve the park and playground; I know everyone is fully behind this and the brilliant wildflower garden and fruit tree idea. As part of this initiative the park group have asked WDBC if they will give us the chance to establish new allotments in the long forgotten public green space behind Tamar View. The implications of ongoing costs sadly prevented the Parish Council from taking over this land from WDBC years ago but hopefully this may now be possible. If we get this land I know everyone will pitch it to clear it and the community will come together to agree how to use it.</p> <p>Everyone in Milton Abbot wants to do so much more, especially with our green spaces. We don’t need to get too carried away with providing ‘new’ green spaces though, after all, we <u>are</u> surrounded by beautiful countryside.</p> <p>As for, “...new or enhanced outdoor sport and children and young people facilities” is there any way the Parish Council and the governors/PTA at the school could look into letting villagers use its playing field and/or MUGA out of hours? Lots of schools, including Kelly and Tavy College, already do this sort of thing and benefit from the additional</p> | <p>We have discussed the Milton Abbot and Chillaton, Parking and Road Safety problems with Devon County Council. Their recommendations on what actions could be taken are now included in the revised MACKPlan.</p> | <p style="color: red;">Comments on the allotments noted</p> |
|--|--|--|---|---|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | <p>income.</p> <p>Road Safety</p> <p>I do not think the answer to all the speeding problems near the school is a mini roundabout at the <u>other</u> end of the village. Sometimes these can make roads <i>more</i> dangerous – a lot of bad drivers don't stop for the one near Westmoor Vets in Tavistock causing near misses and accidents.</p> <p>The Milton Abbot Speed and Road Safety Group are already doing a wonderful job highlighting all our road safety issues and are trying to convince the relevant bodies we need permanent traffic calming measures on the fast straight section of road. The Department of Transport take a lot of convincing but surely the ideal solution here would be a <i>real</i> speed camera – like the one in Horrabridge – or maybe 'build outs?</p> <p>To alleviate the village parking problem, more considerate parking aside, could we make more use of the pub car park 'out of hours'? Maybe the road safety group could look into how we could set up some sort of resident permit parking bay system? Any money raised could go towards the upkeep of the car park area or even the pub itself.</p> | | <p>All references to mini roundabouts have been removed</p> |
| | | <p>(4 of 8)</p> <p>Consultation on Sites</p> | | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>The two preferred sites have not been chosen in a totally fair and impartial way; they may not, consequently, be the best (or only) ones suitable for development in the MACK Plan area.</p> <p>Until now, we have not technically been properly consulted on ALL five <u>new</u> potential development sites. Doesn't this mean the 'independent' decision made by AECOM – to select Sites B and E as the preferred ones – was not completely fair? They did not have ALL the available facts about EVERY site because five (including these two) had no resident consultation on them beforehand.</p> <p>Para 7205. The draft plan should therefore not say the overall (MACK Plan Team?) assessment was able to consider community feedback about EACH site.</p> <p>It is not 'fair or balanced' if this is the FIRST chance we get to effectively approve or reject the two 'preferred' sites. This should have been done when they were still <u>equal</u> possibilities rather than now when they are the chosen favourites ('done deal'?). It feels like the decision has already been made – didn't we all get very angry when WDBC appeared to do something like this?</p> <p>I think one of the Locality leaflets says, "...if the outcomes have already been determined, then community engagement is tokenistic (marketing)" and "Common mistakes include things like consulting too</p> | <p>AECOM, conducted an entirely independent assessment of all sites against identical criteria in order to identify which site or sites were most suitable for recommendation for development in the MACK Plan. A realistic prospect of achieving planning permission was vital rather than identification of popularity for a site or sites with no realistic prospect of being approved for development. AECOM had nothing to gain in terms of which sites were recommended and therefore had no motivation other than to generate an honest and unbiased report which we believe they have done. The 86% Regulation 14 resident endorsement of the MACK Plan is strong evidence that AECOM have done their job to the satisfaction of the local community. We have therefore presented, in the Regulation 14 consultation version of the MACK Plan and the evidence base available online and advertised as such, a factual</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | <p><i>late....” (and) “ Asking consultants to produce options before consulting the community is also poor practice.”</i></p> <p>We had a few weeks last summer (long before AECOM were involved) when we could have given our views on all these sites; wasn't this a critical point in the process. (Locality say, “... residents should be involved at EVERY stage...”).</p> <p>It also does not seem fair (or impartial?) when I was told by the MACK Plan Team that we weren't immediately consulted about these two/five sites as we might get unnecessarily upset (or angry?) for no reason as they may never be picked. Sorry, but if the purpose of the draft plan is to give us ALL possible options equally so we can all decide the best one(s), the MACK Plan Team should have consulted us at this time.</p> <p>Their argument sent to me is puzzling. They decided it was better for residents to have a “... proper unbiased assessment of each site...” that was essentially based on all gathered information because this meant we would see “...all the facts...” to help us make a final judgement.</p> <p>The MACK Plan team told me <i>they</i> all discussed the pro and cons of ALL ten sites before they gave AECOM what were apparently ‘detailed instructions’ on how to conduct their site assessments; I have no idea what this was but they did have, “...access to all publically available data on all sites”; I don't know if AECOM were even told we had</p> | <p>presentation of the realistically available sites and those that have the potential to satisfy the most important local needs with the minimal impact. This is the first of two periods of consultation where residents can base their opinions on the full facts.</p> | |
|--|--|---|---|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>not been consulted about the five new sites or whether they were told about any relevant objections to other sites.</p> <p>Consequently we do not know if the AECOM report would have reached a different conclusion about the suitability of any of the two preferred sites IF their analysis included objections received about them.</p> | | |
| | | <p>(5 of 8)</p> <p>Site Assessments</p> <p>MA Site B – Old Allotments (five houses).</p> <p>I am not sure this site has enough off road parking for five new houses (Policy 5-2); the hardstanding area can only, "...accommodate between 3-4 vehicles."(AECOM). It does not make any sense to build on the 'old allotments' just so (if I have understood para 7308) there is enough room on Site E to provide new "...high quality green infrastructure..."</p> <p>AECOM said keep them and we should. They are historically a wonderful community asset for Milton Abbot and are still definitely used and have been for years.</p> <p>MA Site E – West of Village (15/20 houses?)</p> <p>I do not agree this site is suitable for 15-20 houses (could the MACK Plan Team confirm how many please?)</p> | | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>It isn't just "... hardstanding farmyard/buildings..." there is pasture land too and it is obviously a greenfield site; the draft plan should also consider the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) points about avoiding building on the best agricultural land. There is not even any guarantee all the new houses would be built on the hardstanding area because the layout is left to the developer.</p> <p>Despite all the dramatic AECOM jargon at para 7307 replacing some old <u>farm</u> buildings with 15 or 20 new houses is not going to make the site or Milton Abbot look much better! I am sorry but what could be much more rural than..... A FARM?!</p> <p>And I definitely don't agree with AECOMs bizarre comment that the new houses will improve the view from above the village because its better than an old farm! Para 7308 does not seem justified as I have not seen any proof that <u>everybody</u> in Milton Abbot suddenly wants a new community centre or new green spaces next to lots of new houses. AECOM did put this in their final recommendation but it wasn't mentioned anywhere else in their report. If this was influenced by information the MACK Plan Team had, I haven't seen it.</p> <p>Could the following AECOM comments that weren't put into the draft plan also be taken in account:</p> <p>There are direct views into a medieval field system to the west of the site;</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>There are “ short views into the site...” from the old Methodist Chapel. (I love that one, it is literally right next to the site and will be surrounded by houses if site B is developed too;</p> <p>Several properties in Lutyens Fold and Higher Edgcombe Lane will also be affected (by the development);</p> <p>There are, “potentially direct views into the site from the Tamar Valley Discovery Trail.”;</p> <p>They also said the risks of flooding from surface water run off must be prevented by inclusion of sustainable drainage measures in the new development.</p> <p>I wanted to mention all these <i>other</i> AECOM comments because other sites were discarded or downgraded for what AECOM/the MACK Plan Team considered totally valid reasons – visual impact, landscape issues, heritage impact concerns, effect on the AONB or privacy etc (paras 73015 – 73022) so to leave out these ones about Site E seems inconsistent.</p> | | |
| | | <p>(6 of 8)</p> <p>Site Assessments (cont)</p> <p>C SITE B – Between Marlow Crescent and Sunway (10 houses)</p> | | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>AECOM says that services and facilities within Chillaton village centre are relatively limited and development could increase car journeys; this would be the same in Milton Abbot. It is also strange only small scale development in Chillaton is thought possible because of this 'limited' range of local facilities when its accepted Milton Abbot can accommodate a large one when it is essentially the same.</p> <p>Please bear in mind that as Chillaton children 'feed' into Milton Abbot School it is wrong to say that 'limited school capacity' effectively prevents ten houses being built there but allows 20 in Milton Abbot.</p> <p>AECOM says there is suitable vehicle access into the western section of the site and development here would not harm any designated or non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Para 73013 – the recent application used to explain why Chillaton should not accept development was in a totally different place on what is arguably much more isolated open countryside.</p> <p>AECOM say development (of the whole site) would result in a significant extension of Chillaton village, harming 'landscape character'; this does not seem to be an issue for them in their assessment of Site E in Milton Abbot. They also say that this site is 'adjacent to and connected to' the Chillaton boundary. (I notice when this same classification was given to Site E in Milton Abbot a decision was taken to extend the village boundary.)</p> <p>There is also some inconsistency between AECOMs</p> | <p>As stated in the Regulation 14 version of MACK Plan: <i>'Chillaton is considered as countryside and developments should be avoided and only permitted in exceptional circumstances'</i>. The JLP requirement of 20 new homes is nominated to the sustainable village of Milton Abbot. As suitable sites exist in Milton Abbot that have the capacity to deliver the full JLP housing allocation, it is difficult to determine what exceptional circumstances could underpin the development of Chillaton Site B. Notably 86% of the Regulation 14 resident comments have been supportive of the recommendations of the MACK Plan.</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>assessments of this site and Site E in Milton Abbot. One of the AECOM pro forma questions is “<i>Is the size of the site large enough to significantly change the size and character of the existing settlement?</i>” Their conclusion for development of the whole of this site is “yes” but surprisingly it is “no” for Site E.</p> <p>They do not think that development on the western section of the site has any significant flood risks.</p> <p>AECOM say the site is potentially suitable and available and 10 houses could be built on the western section of this site.</p> <p>For some reason the MACK Plan Team (para 73014) introduces an <i>additional</i> selection criteria that was ONLY used in respect of C Site B which I think essentially says ‘this site is also eliminated because we have a better one in Milton Abbot’. We were told EACH site had the <u>same</u> assessment criteria and information to ensure a fair and consistence approach.</p> <p>It is important to remember that people in Chillaton wanted SMALLER developments too, which may lead to all the same benefits that Milton Abbot is hoping for, including the opportunity to “...maintain the vitality of rural communities...” (JLP Policy TTV2, para 7102). Unfortunately the draft plan very quickly rejects this possibility (para 7103).</p> | | |
| | | (7 of 8) | | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>Site Assessments (cont)</p> <p>MA SITE C – Vicarage Gardens (five houses)</p> <p>AECOM say the site is close to services and facilities in the village centre, has vehicle access from the present Vicarage Gardens and is available with 12 months notice. They say the site would be seen from the Tamar Valley Discovery Trail and from approximately seven properties, including three at Vicarage Gardens. (References to the Discovery Trail and eight properties in Lutyens Fold and Higher Edgumbe Lane were not mentioned in the draft plan in regard to Site E).</p> <p>AECOM rated these effects as ‘Medium Sensitivity’ for this site but ‘High Sensitivity’ for Site E. This is not consistent.</p> <p>If you build new houses ANYWHERE in a small rural, historical village, surrounded by beautiful countryside, this will ALWAYS, “... lead to significant landscape and visual sensitivities and the potential for adverse impacts to the setting of heritage assets.”</p> <p>AECOM rate the ‘harm’ caused by Site C as, “Some impact, and/or mitigation possible”. (It is unusual AECOM thinks Site E doesn’t affect <u>any</u> heritage assets).</p> <p>There is also a reference to an ‘odour’ from the sewage works. This does not seem to have been a major issue for people who live in Vicarage Gardens. (This is also not</p> | <p>See responses on AECOM report above</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | <p>mentioned in the draft plan in relation to Site E, even though this site is also close by).</p> <p>Oddly, AECOM conclude the site is available but, “....not currently suitable”.</p> <p>This site has always had local support for some development so I am not sure why the AECOM report and draft plan does not reflect this anywhere or why it is now just totally dismissed as ‘unsuitable’.</p> <p>Village Boundaries</p> <p>Such a fundamental change to Milton Abbot should be not in the draft Plan; this should be a separate consultation and just for Milton Abbot residents to decide.</p> <p>The MACK Plan Team did not tell me how the ‘new’ boundary was chosen, or who chose it, but we should not be expanding the size of the village or increasing the ‘built up landscape’ beyond its current boundaries just to encompass Site E.</p> | <p>There is no official boundary for Milton Abbot currently. We were advised by WDBC that the new boundary area for Milton Abbot should include the area proposed for development. This has now been recognized in the Regulation 15 of the Plan.</p> | <p>The JLP left it to Neighbourhood Plans to define settlement boundaries. Our Proposed Policy is included with as Policy 9-6 of the revised Plan</p> |
| | | <p>(8 of 8)</p> <p>Community Engagement/Supporting Evidence/MACK Plan area</p> <p>The MACK Plan team has said there is majority support for all the statements and proposals in the draft plan about building a lot of new houses in Milton Abbot, six affordable</p> | <p>From the comments received in the Regulation 14 Consultation there is 86%</p> | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | <p>homes, new community buildings and green spaces. But they could not give me the appropriate supporting evidence even though they collected and recorded all individual residents feedback at community events and meeting people when distributing MACK plan material.</p> <p>I also had to make a lot of assumptions about the draft plan because I could not get my concerns about it clarified by the MACK Plan Team. It might be helpful to everyone if they can make my questions (and their answers) available on their website very soon.</p> <p>It is unusual to have ALL the local communities responding to the consultation when Milton Abbot is the ONLY place affected by it; especially as everyone MUST be influenced by where they live. Should this be addressed in any way later in the process or at the Referendum stage?</p> <p>Or, wouldn't it be better – if the draft plan still has to cover the whole area – to make sure its outcomes positively affect all the <u>other</u> communities as well? Maybe proposing some houses for Chillaton can give people there impetus to do what we want to do in Milton Abbot? The draft plan should therefore definitely include potential development sites outside Milton Abbot; new housing, potential funding and community benefits can then go to other places in the MACK Plan area.</p> <p>This is imperative because the draft plan is supposed to be for <u>everyone</u> in the MACK Plan area. Other communities are just as worried about the future and want their village</p> | <p>support from residents for the proposals in the MACK Plan</p> <p>We have responded above on why Chillaton has not been chosen for development. There are other aspects of the Plan and its proposals apart from housing which impact on all areas.</p> | |
|--|--|---|---|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | <p>or hamlet to thrive. If you accept they must have the same concerns and aspirations as everyone in Milton Abbot – and want them addressed – the draft plan has to offer them something too.</p> <p>Regulation 14 Consultation/Conclusion</p> <p>The six week consultation should have been a bit more impartial. Its overall ‘message’ about how to respond seemed to change halfway at a critical point, both in the newsletter and other public statements; this was just when a lot of people would be starting to respond. No one should be ‘put off’ getting involved in the neighbourhood plan process because they think it is not worth it or a ‘done deal’. In a small village it could be fairly intimidating for someone to offer an opinion against the ‘majority’ views being announced everywhere, especially when these come from those who are running it.</p> <p>Could the MACK Plan Team (and WDBC) please make sure any further consultations, and the Referendum publicity, encourage ALL residents to respond, whatever their point of view.</p> <p>Without further definitive evidence of any formal directives or precise details of actual majority community support the current draft plan has not yet made the case for putting all 20 houses in one village in one place, the need for six affordable homes or demonstrated that the best development sites have been chosen. I cannot, therefore, support this draft plan in its current form.</p> | <p>Summary: This series of observations and comments needs to be read in conjunction with Mr Clarkson’s earlier and similar comments made at sections 44,51 and 58 of this document and the detailed responses to these earlier questions. Mr Clarkson was also offered a Zoom meeting with the MACK Plan Team during the Regulation 14</p> | |
|--|--|---|---|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | Could all these comments be taken into consideration. | consultation period in order to address his concerns but chose not to do so. | |
| 72 | John and Mary Cox | <p>Having lived in Milton Abbot of all our lives we are very protective over potential changes to the village which could bring negative consequences. We understand that additional housing is going to happen, but we are fearful that the focus is solely on adding houses rather than the impacts the housing has on others living in the area.</p> <p>Having reviewed the MACKPLAN we are very positive about the sites it has identified for future development and feel they bring the least negative impacts for established residents of the village. Well done to all who have worked so hard on the plan and hopefully their hard work rewards us all in the future shaping of our communities.</p> | | |
| 73 | Stephen Gill | <p>Regulation 14 Comments.</p> <p>In addition to achieving a sustainable development solution the two most identified key objectives are to secure affordable housing to meet local needs and also securing community facilities.</p> <p>There is only one submitted site which provides both of these requirements , that is C Site A: Land East of Marlow Crescent. This proposal includes a huge 66% affordable housing ratio { 9 dwellings of which 6 would be affordable } together with a large piece of land to be given over to the Parish Council to provide community facilities such as play areas etc.</p> | <p>In a transparent and independent assessment by AECOM of the suitability for development of all 10 proposed sites against identical criteria, Chillaton Site A was assessed as <i>'not suitable to take forward for the purposes of the MACK Plan'</i>. Whilst AECOM had access to all presented information concerning the proposed nature of the development, the issues that they identified are predominantly with the site itself rather than the nature of the development. Public</p> | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>These benefits would be delivered by a unilateral undertaking by a philanthropic landowner. Strangely the report fails to even discuss the merits of these material planning considerations.</p> <p>A further key aspiration of the residents is to have smaller sites . You explain that this is not possible as , quite rightly , in order to demand affordable housing and community infrastructure from developers then the trigger point for this is 10 dwellings . However , given the above mentioned site is providing these benefits it would allow the remaining 11 dwellings required to be accommodated on 3/4 sites of 2/3 dwellings – thus meeting the aspirations of residents.</p> <p>Furthermore , unlike the proposed site east of Marlow Crescent, it is by no means an absolute given that the proposed sites for development in Milton Abbott will result in the affordable housing and community infrastructure.</p> <p>Such can be legitimately requested but , in my many years of trying to negotiate such benefits on sites of 10 or more dwellings , key issues of viability are raised and quite often the development fails to proceed .</p> <p>In the reports discussion on this matter no mention is made of this possible alternative strategy of securing the benefits on one site by unilateral undertaking .</p> <p>As you will know , the above proposal was submitted in 2015 and it was later admitted { in an email exchange with Mr . Howard Ashbridge } that the benefits of the affordable housing and community facilities had not been made known to the residents. Subsequently the Mackplan team have informed me that all of details of the scheme would be made known to the residents and to AECOM.</p> | <p>presentations to the local community championing the proposed development would not make the site itself any less unsuitable for development.</p> <p>However, contrary to your assertion, the 3 page MACK Plan site assessment for this site which includes the provided map, does highlight the potential for community facilities:</p> <p><i>“While the original proposal offered 16 homes of which 12 (70%) would be affordable with a parcel of land made available for a community led project, the updated proposition that was submitted for the neighbourhood plan reduces the scope to 9 homes which includes 6 affordable housing units and 3 market houses. This would still provide an affordable housing rate of 66%.”</i></p> <p>Your assertion of there being 'no physical constraints to development on the site including and affect on the amenity of neighbouring residents' conflicts with the WDBC SHELLA Assessment 'The site is set back</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>I'm afraid this is difficult to believe given there is no discussion within the document on these matters . Even within the brief Site Assessment there is no mention of the land to be given over for community facilities. Given it is a key objective of the NP to achieve such it is difficult to understand why there is no mention of this key material consideration.</p> <p>It is also puzzling that as this site is 1.4ha in size , it is not considered under the 'larger sites' summary.</p> <p>It is noted that Milton Abbott has slightly more facilities than Chillaton . However the NPPF points out that small settlements can provide 'clusters' where development in one village can support facilities in another . Chillaton is therefore a suitable candidate for some development and would not be regarded as unsustainable. Indeed the report seems to acknowledge this general point by expressing some possible support for the site between Sunwaye and Marlow Crescent .</p> <p>However , given the principle of development in Chillaton is not completely dismissed , it is highly questionable as to why any planning professional would advocate and perpetrate the extension of 'ribbon development ' – a form of development which has been vilified by the planning profession for several decades.</p> <p>The site east of Marlow Crescent has been previously considered by a government Planning Inspector and found to be ' well located to the existing development' and that ' the flood plain can be safeguarded ' . Indeed as I have pointed out in my previous detailed submissions the</p> | <p><i>from the road and any development would therefore have to sit behind the row of houses in Marlow Crescent. This could impact on the amenity of properties and would result in a pattern on development which is uncharacteristic of the village.'</i></p> <p>The JLP has allocated an indicative target of 20 new houses to Milton Abbot, not to Chillaton. Chillaton, in planning terms is now classed as open countryside. As a consequence significant development in Chillaton requires overwhelming local support which has not been forthcoming during the Regulation 14 Consultation. In fact, in the 2017 Resident's Survey this site was objected to by 75% of respondents.</p> <p>The 2017 Resident's Survey did indeed identify a preference for multiple smaller developments, however the overwhelming majority of responses to this Regulation 14 consultation recognise the need for affordable housing and the rationale underpinning the proposal for a</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Planning Inspector found no physical constraints to development on the site including and affect on the amenity of neighbouring residents. Clearly you disagree with the findings of a government appointed Planning Inspector – yet there is no evidence , or even discussion , as to why this is so. The Inspectors comments cannot simply be ignored. The dwellings are located well away from the flood plain and have no adverse affect on ecology , heritage , archaeology or landscape [all of which having been previously discussed – and documented – as part of a previous Public Inquiry]. Furthermore , the distance from dwellings in Marlow Crescent is almost twice that of recommended development standards and with windows to habitable rooms facing away from the existing dwellings.</p> <p>Overall , it is considered not merely disappointing but also highly suspicious as to how key material planning factors have not been mentioned or discussed within the report . Even if you considered other factors to outweigh the proposed benefits they should at least have been discussed within the report – particularly given these key benefits of affordable housing and community benefits are your two key objectives. Add to this the spurious constraints mentioned which are at complete odds with the findings of a government Planning Inspector { again not discussed } and no evidence to back up the claims . Whereas there is documented evidence to show the total lack of constraints to the development of the site. It can only be assumed that there is one reason for this .</p> | <p>single development on the one site identified as being wholly suitable to allocate within the whole MACK Plan area.</p> <p>Whilst it is understood that it is your role to champion your client’s proposals, your use of phrases like ‘highly suspicious’ do you no credit. If you have evidence to support this claim then please submit it, otherwise we would be grateful if you would publicly withdraw it.</p> <p>In summary, after fair and transparent comparison of all sites, suitable sites for the full JLP development target have been identified within the sustainable village for which it is designated. A review of Regulation 14 responses reveals 86% of resident respondents agree with this recommendation.</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>This is displayed in the final point of Policy 6-2 Housing Density and Design. This is aimed at protecting residents views of the countryside. As you will { or certainly should} know the protection of a view is not a material planning consideration. Whilst the planning system will not protect the view from your window , loss of outlook where development would have an adverse and overbearing effect that would result in an unduly oppressive living environment for residents would be avoided. As mentioned above the distance between the dwellings , together with window orientation , ensures no overbearing effects.</p> <p>However , the suggested policy goes much further than that ,and as such is contrary to planning law and cannot be justified or defended under scrutiny. Finally , I would like to raise issues regarding Engagement – which might also link with some of the points mentioned above . On several occasions since the proposal was initially submitted I have volunteered to give a presentation to the Mackplan group/residents. This was considered important due to the amount of detail and material benefits associated with the scheme . The submission was not merely a red line around a site . A detailed Planning Policy Document , Design and Access Statement and Detailed Plans were submitted . Crucially it was considered necessary to explain the huge affordable housing quota and the land for community infrastructure issues .</p> <p>I have not been invited on any occasion to brief the team or residents. Nor have I been notified of any of the 'Drop In ' events . As a key stakeholder one would expect to be</p> | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|---|
| | | <p>notified of such events rather than have to rely on constantly checking the website. This cannot be blamed on the current Covid restrictions as the requests for a presentation go back to 2015.</p> <p>Added to this is the previous email confirmation from Mr Ashbridge which explained residents had only been informed of every sites location – without mention of the details of the scheme. The current report amplifies this approach by its failure to even discuss the affordable housing quota and the complete lack of any mention whatsoever of the land for community infrastructure. Are all the residents aware of the material planning benefits involved with this scheme ?</p> <p>These later matters will of course be more appropriate for the Regulation 16 consultation to follow and will be expanded on at that time .</p> | | |
| 74 | <p>Stephanie Parker-Stephenson Natural England</p> | <p>Regulation 14 Draft MACK Plan</p> <p>Natural England welcomes the draft Milton Abbot, Chillaton and Kelly (MACK) Neighbourhood Plan, and recognises the considerable work that has gone into the preparation of the evidence base, including the environment study and the site assessments.</p> <p>Natural England do, however, advise that further evidence is prepared to explain the purpose of the proposed village boundary, to describe the methodology used in deciding where to position it, and to justify the inclusion of any undeveloped land within the boundary.</p> <p>Additionally, it appears that paragraph 7.4.0.2 is describing two site allocations for housing. It would be advisable to present these allocations in a policy format. The allocations should also be clearly</p> | | <p style="color: red;">New Policy as Policy 9-6, Settlement Boundary.</p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>identified on a policy map, alongside the proposed village boundary and any land safeguarded by other policies in the Plan. We also refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan. Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) In due course, it is expected that West Devon Borough Council, as the competent authority, will consult Natural England on their screening opinions as to whether SEA and HRA are needed. Natural England are likely to advise that, as the Plan proposes two site allocations within the zone of influence for the recreational disturbance of the Plymouth Sound and Estuaries SAC & Tamar Estuaries Complex SPA, the Plan is likely to require Appropriate Assessment. The approach set out in the Plymouth Sound and Estuaries EMS Recreation Mitigation and Management Scheme, and the adopted Plymouth and South West Devon SPD need to be reflected in the Appropriate Assessment.</p> <p>For any queries relating to the specific advice in this letter only please contact Stephanie ParkerStephenson. on 07799438517. For any new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.</p> | | |
| | | <p>Annex 1 – Neighbourhood planning and the natural environment: information, issues and opportunities Natural environment information sources The Magic1 website will provide you with much of the nationally held natural environment data for your plan area. The most relevant layers for you to consider are: Agricultural Land Classification, Ancient Woodland, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Local Nature Reserves, National Parks (England), National Trails, Priority Habitat Inventory, public rights of way (on</p> | | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>the Ordnance Survey base map) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (including their impact risk zones). Local environmental record centres may hold a range of additional information on the natural environment. A list of local record centres is available here² . Priority habitats are those habitats of particular importance for nature conservation, and the list of them can be found here³ . Most of these will be mapped either as Sites of Special Scientific Interest, on the Magic website or as Local Wildlife Sites. Your local planning authority should be able to supply you with the locations of Local Wildlife Sites.</p> <p>National Character Areas (NCAs) divide England into 159 distinct natural areas. Each character area is defined by a unique combination of landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity and cultural and economic activity. NCA profiles contain descriptions of the area and statements of environmental opportunity, which may be useful to inform proposals in your plan. NCA information can be found here⁴ .</p> <p>There may also be a local landscape character assessment covering your area. This is a tool to help understand the character and local distinctiveness of the landscape and identify the features that give it a sense of place. It can help to inform, plan and manage change in the area. Your local planning authority should be able to help you access these if you can't find them online.</p> <p>If your neighbourhood planning area is within or adjacent to a National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), the relevant National Park/AONB Management Plan for the area will set out useful information about the protected landscape. You can access the plans on from the relevant National Park Authority or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty website. General mapped information on soil types and Agricultural Land Classification is available (under 'landscape') on the Magic⁵ website and also from</p> | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>the LandIS website⁶ , which contains more information about obtaining soil data. Natural environment issues to consider The National Planning Policy Framework⁷ sets out national planning policy on protecting and enhancing the natural environment. Planning Practice Guidance⁸ sets out supporting guidance. Your local planning authority should be able to provide you with further advice on the potential impacts of your plan on the natural environment and the need for any environmental assessments.</p> <p>1 http://magic.defra.gov.uk/ 2 http://www.nbn-nfbr.org.uk/nfbr.php 3 http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140711133551/http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/protectandmanage/habsandspeciesimportance.aspx 4 https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-character-area-profiles-data-for-local-decision-making 5 http://magic.defra.gov.uk/ 6 http://www.landis.org.uk/index.cfm 7 https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/807247/NPPF_Feb_2019_revised.pdf 8 http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/natural-environment/</p> <p>Landscape</p> <p>Your plans or orders may present opportunities to protect and enhance locally valued landscapes. You may want to consider identifying distinctive local landscape features or characteristics such as ponds, woodland or dry stone walls and think about how any new development proposals can respect and enhance local landscape character and distinctiveness. If you are proposing development within or close to a protected landscape (National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) or other sensitive</p> | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>location, we recommend that you carry out a landscape assessment of the proposal.</p> <p>Landscape assessments can help you to choose the most appropriate sites for development and help to avoid or minimise impacts of development on the landscape through careful siting, design and landscaping.</p> <p>Wildlife habitats</p> <p>Some proposals can have adverse impacts on designated wildlife sites or other priority habitats (listed here⁹), such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest or Ancient woodland¹⁰. If there are likely to be any adverse impacts you'll need to think about how such impacts can be avoided, mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for. Priority and protected species You'll also want to consider whether any proposals might affect priority species (listed here¹¹) or protected species. To help you do this, Natural England has produced advice here ¹² to help understand the impact of particular developments on protected species.</p> <p>Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land Soil is a finite resource that fulfils many important functions and services for society. It is a growing medium for food, timber and other crops, a store for carbon and water, a reservoir of biodiversity and a buffer against pollution. If you are proposing development, you should seek to use areas of poorer quality agricultural land in preference to that of a higher quality in line with National Planning Policy Framework para 171.</p> <p>For more information, see our publication Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land¹³ . Improving your natural environment Your plan can offer exciting opportunities to enhance your local environment.</p> <p>If you are setting out policies on new development or proposing sites for development, you may wish to consider identifying what</p> | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>environmental features you want to be retained or enhanced or new features you would like to see created as part of any new development. Examples might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing a new footpath through the new development to link into existing rights of way. • Restoring a neglected hedgerow. • Creating a new pond as an attractive feature on the site. • Planting trees characteristic to the local area to make a positive contribution to the local landscape. <p>9 http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140711133551/http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/protectandmanage/habsandspeciesimportance.aspx 10 https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-and-veteran-trees-protection-surveys-licences 11 http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140711133551/http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/protectandmanage/habsandspeciesimportance.aspx 12 https://www.gov.uk/protected-species-and-sites-how-to-review-planning-proposals 13 http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/35012</p> | | |
| 75 | <p>Bridget Passmore</p> <p>Chillaton Public Hall Trust</p> | <p>Chillaton is considered to be non-sustainable. As such the Chillaton Public Hall Trust support the need for any development across our joint parishes, this must be seen to deliver improvements to the sustainability of the whole local community.</p> | | |
| 76 | <p>Lorna Garrod</p> | <p>I would like to comment on MA Site B 'Old Allotments' I am a single female pensioner, I purchased my property in 2000. I chose a 400yr old cottage in a Conservation Area as I am passionate about original architecture and the history, I have been renovating since I moved in. I would not like to see New Builds changing the character of the village.</p> | <p>Thank you for your comments. We will look at the wording on the Allotments area (site B) we did not mean to imply the area is unused.</p> | <p>Comments on the allotments noted.</p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>The title of 'Old Allotments' give the impression of it being waste land, neglected, unloved, far from it ! The care, attention and expenditure given by the tenant over the past 20 years, make it the 'Private Enchanted Garden' it truly is ! A place loved by the family and grandchildren, for family gatherings over the years.</p> <p>It has been a 'Healing Garden' for me, I have been blessed in being invited to use for the past 10 years due to ill health. I have no outside area to sit being on the junction of the main roads in centre of the village. I have also spent many hours watering the pots, beds and greenhouses whenever they are away, being offered any produce I require, which is not much being alone!</p> <p>The benefit of blackberries and apples from the ancient trees are a bonus, not only the exercise of gathering, but the fresh air with no pollution from traffic!</p> <p>The Windfall apples are offered as 'Free Apples' in centre of village, last seasons supplied hundreds to a charity in Horrabridge who made produce for the Aged and Needy ! I helped to collect them, they are looking forward to this years crop!</p> <p>Other parts of the 'Old Allotments' are also leased as valuable space for neighbours, The Chapel now having a garden for their families,</p> <p>As far as Pedestrian access to services and facilities in the village, we do not have any ! Not even a bus, we had at least 5 routes a day 21yrs ago, a Pub, Butchers and General Store, Post office / shop etc.</p> <p>My only issue regarding the other homes being planned is to ensure no extra traffic using Higher Edgcumbe Lane as it is only a single lane and not suitable</p> <p>it is dangerous for pedestrians and children. The tarmac and parking bays</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|--|
| | | <p>damaged when used for overtaking, holdups with vans and cars reversing both in and out due to width of road, they have to back out on to main road. Even the Council Refuse truck has been unable to access at times !</p> <p>20 new homes in the village could be 40 plus extra vehicles !</p> <p>I often get disturbed by being asked to move the vehicle outside my home(mine is parked in my bay up the lane) - or do I know whose vehicle it is !</p> <p>The roiundabout on Fore St is a better plan with no vehicle access into Higher Edgecumbe Lane. It could also slow traffic through the village, I have walked village children to school in the past and it is a very dangerous single path, as they are young and skip to school, If they fell they would be on the road, an accident waiting to happen. {I have cared for 20 children in the years I have been here}</p> <p>Finally I have no plans on leaving my Cottage but worry about how isolated it has become since losing facilities and becoming more dependent as I age.</p> | | |
| 77 | <p>Donna Collier Savills On behalf of Hardicott Estate.</p> | <p>Draft MACK Plan Consultation – Land West of Milton Abbot & Land South of Fore Street (Hardicott Estate).</p> <p>I write in response to the Milton Abbot, Chillaton and Kelly (MACK) Regulation 14 Draft Version of the Neighbourhood Plan to 2034 ('MACK Plan') (December 2020), with specific reference to the Site Assessment Report conducted by AECOM and their recommendations that have informed the MACK Plan. The purpose of writing is to request the Parish Council's take into account the information contained within this letter before committing the strategy outlined in the MACK Plan. This response is prepared by Savills and made on behalf of the Hardicott Estate; the sole owner of two sites put forward under the call for sites in March 2020; in</p> | <p>Your representation and its conclusion places considerable emphasis on the results of the 2017 Residents Survey. A great deal has changed since the 2017. Independent, factual evidence of local housing need has been gathered, publication of the Joint Local Plan has occurred and most notably the sites submitted in response to the MACK Plan Call for Sites in March 2020 are not the same as they were in the 2017</p> | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>particular MA Site A (West of Lutyens Fold), also known as Land West of Milton Abbot, and MA Site B (Old Allotments), also known as Land South of Fore Street, Allotment.</p> <p>Consultation on Preferred Sites</p> <p>Members will recall that on 24th January 2018 the MACK team reviewed local residents' questionnaire responses to an earlier Neighbourhood Plan Consultation in 2017. The results showed that of the five sites considered for Milton Abbot, MA Sites A and B were most favoured; more residents favoured these sites than opposed. This differed from Sites C, D and E where more residents disagreed with the prospective development of the latter sites. The graph below (labelled Figure 1) is representative of the responses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Put in FIG 1 <p>The MACK Plan confirms the suitability of MA Site B for development. However, in respect of MA Site A, and following recommendations in AECOM's Assessment, the MACK Plan has rejected MA Site A, instead recommending that MA Site E 'West of Village' (land and farm buildings) should be allocated for development. The following sets out the reasons as to why we feel further consideration is required in regards to the strategy. 19th February 2021 The Parish Clerk Milton Abbot Group Parish Council Briardale Woodlands Dousland Yelverton PL20 6NB By email to: Mackplan2019@gmail.com Our Ref: BB/ PG/ TRP 2163 Your Ref: a Page 2 MA Site A - Land West of Milton Abbot (West of Lutyens Fold) The MACK Plan acknowledges that MA Site A is sustainably located in the context of the village the subject of proposed growth. Whereas AECOM's assessment concludes that MA Site A is not suitable for taking forward as an allocation (Section 5, page 29) we feel that this judgement is not accurate as many of the issues raised could be appropriately addressed or mitigated. We have carefully considered the issues raised in the MACK Plan, specifically</p> | <p>Resident's Survey. Resident preferences to a different set of choices in 2017 cannot be used in isolation to strengthen the case for Milton Abbot Site A in 2021. The views of the residents today, as expressed in their responses to the Regulation 14 Consultation, are the resident views that are pertinent.</p> <p>The task of the Neighbourhood Plan is to gain and collate evidence to identify and recommend the most suitable method of delivering the JLP allocated figure of 20 new houses. AECOM conducted an independent assessment of all 10 sites using identical criteria for each site. Milton Abbot Site E and partial development of both Milton Abbot Site B and Chillaton Site B were identified through this wholly independent process as being the most suitable sites for development. Further analysis revealed that Milton Abbot Sites E and B could potentially deliver the requisite affordable housing. In short, regardless of what mitigation or compromises you</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>access, landscape and visual sensitivity, streams and agricultural strip field systems (including curved field boundaries and earth banks). These issues are discussed below and we respectfully request review of the matters below and reconsideration of this finding upon the following basis: Access The existing access to Site A is off the site's northern boundary and onto Higher Edgcumbe Lane, noted to be single track and relatively narrow. However, Higher Edgcumbe Lane joins the B3362 at two points, one to the east and one to the to the west. For the greatest part, Higher Edgcumbe Lane serves only a handful of properties to the west and hence is very lightly trafficked so that movements associated with the proposed residential development on MA Site A would not be such to present a constraint to its development. This is particularly so when the northern aspect of the site is capable of delivering passing bays potentially in association with relocated access points into the site, so delivering a highways benefit. We consider that potential exists to substitute the site's existing northern access, for one off the southern boundary with the B3362 in close proximity to 30mph zone. This would deliver a highways benefit, taking traffic off Higher Edgcumbe Lane, with potential for additional signage on the B3362, by agreement with County Engineer. Landscape and Visual Sensitivities Site A adjoins existing development to the east at Lutyens Fold and slopes gently north to south. The site is understood to have visible in views from the Tamar Valley AONB and Discovery Trail, yet the proposed housing will be small in scale and seen in the context of the existing village, as well as being capable of accommodating appropriate landscape mitigation. The visual impacts from long-views would therefore be slight when viewed within the wider context. a Page 3 Design solutions within the site would be sympathetic, development being read against the sloping topography and not materially breaching</p> | <p>might consider feasible for the sites that you represent, more suitable sites are available and are therefore recommended for development in the MACK Plan.</p> <p>In terms of access to Milton Abbot Site A, an inspection in person of Higher Edgcumbe Lane to the west of Milton Abbot Site A would reveal a lane so narrow that undergrowth from the hedge banks brushes both sides of a car at the same time and that there are no passing places. It is wholly unsuitable for consideration in any access arrangement. The AECOM Site Assessment Report cites the dangers of speeding traffic, the adverse impact to the distinctive hedge bank and the disparity in ground levels as reasons not to utilise direct access onto the B3362. We agree with their conclusions.</p> <p>One of the most important findings of the evidence gathering process that has occurred over the last 2 years has been the proven local need for affordable housing. A development needs to be over</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>the skyline. The scheme's density would be appropriate to the existing pattern of development, sympathetic to the site's characteristics and oriented to preserve the privacy and amenity of the proposed occupants and neighbours. Stream As the site is entirely within Flood Zone 1 and therefore not subject to flood risk, we understand this issue to therefore be primarily in relation to ecological concerns. Resolution of the design and construction management issues relevant to the stream subdividing the site would be informed by professional ecological advice to address and mitigate any potential impacts. There is adequate space on site to allow for buffers and potential enhancements to that habitat. There is no reason at this stage to assume that this feature of the site will be prohibitive to development. Field Systems Where at all possible, the development would retain the existing hedge banks (save for the section removed for access) and the integrity of the respective boundaries of the fields would be embraced within the design strategy. An archaeological appraisal would be needed to confirm the likely presence of underground archaeology, however, the crop marks which have been recorded as potential field systems are indicated on the HER as not affecting this site area in particular. There is no reason to believe therefore that this would be a significant constraint to development. Hedge Bank An ecological assessment would establish the quality of the existing hedge bank and opportunities for enhancement to provide onsite biodiversity net gains. The methods will differ from site to site but will usually be advised by a trained ecologist. Agricultural Land Classification The land is currently identified as Grade 3 agricultural land. Further investigation is required to ascertain whether it falls within sub category 3a (Good Quality Agricultural Land) or 3b (Moderate Quality Agricultural Land). The concern in this case is uncertainty rather than a specific objection and the matter could</p> | <p>11 houses in order to be required to deliver 30% affordable housing. A development of 20 homes will therefore result in 6 affordable homes. To be viable in terms of delivering affordable homes, Milton Abbot Site B would need to be part of a larger development with Site E. The assertion that Milton Abbot Site E relies on Milton Abbot Site B is in fact the reverse. Indeed, Site E has the capacity to deliver all 20 houses, including the 6 affordable homes, green space and community facilities sought by our residents.</p> <p>In conclusion, each of the 10 sites has been assessed independently against the same criteria and the best and most suitable sites recommended for development. We absolutely recognise your obligation to argue in support of the sites that you represent but with 86% of resident responses to the Regulation 14 MACK Plan being supportive of the policies and recommendations of the plan,</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>easily be rectified. It is not possible therefore to rule to site out based on an assumption in the negative. MA Site E – ‘West of Village’ At odds with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to support, strengthen and grow rural business, the proposed Allocation of MA Site E will unnecessarily consume built infrastructure crucial to such a business. The farm at the centre of MA Site E has developed over a number of years and as recently as 2018 its growth was demonstrated by the Council’s approval of planning permission (App Ref 4170/18/OPA) for a significant permanent rural worker’s dwelling to be located on land to the south of MA Site B, (e.g. south of Old Allotments). The Agricultural Appraisal supporting the application for the dwelling explains that the farmed land extends to circa 131 acres together with the range of modern agricultural buildings. Stock reported at the time of the application ran to 700 ewes and 130 head of cattle, including 65 dairy bred cattle, the progeny reared under the Dairy Sired Beef Scheme exported to Ireland. The Appraisal observes the historically limited availability of agricultural buildings, observing that those existing at Milton Abbot would also be utilised during times of extreme adverse weather to reduce ewe losses and lamb mortality. a Page 4 The loss of such rural buildings which could support a viable and successful rural business does not therefore present an ideal choice for development. Nor is this support by local residents who would rather see MA Site A come forward for development.(please see above). MA Site B – Old Allotments The MACK Plan indicates that Site E is considered suitable for up to 5 dwellings. This number is derived from the desire to retain some of the allotments. It however goes on to say that the site isn’t suitable to be brought forward in isolation and is therefore reliant on MA Site E (an adjoining site to the west) also coming forward. MA Site E has been selected for 20 dwellings but in order to deliver</p> | <p>we feel that the community has made its opinion clear.</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>this quantum of development, it is suggested that additional greenspace is required from MA Site B. It seems therefore that MA Site E is therefore in fact reliant on MA Site B and not the other way round as stated in the MACK Plan. Whilst it is not usual to allocate sites of 5 dwellings, it is identified that the site could make a suitable and valuable contribution to local housing growth. However, it is impractical to allocate sites of a small scale which cannot be delivered independently, simply due to them adjoining each other geographically. Importantly, the linking of the sites adds potential risks which could result in the sites not being able to come forward or potentially delayed in doing so. This would not be in the interests of the Plan to delay or hinder the planned housing delivery. If MA Site E is required to deliver additional green infrastructure, then its allocation numbers should be reduced in order for it to be able to do so independently. Conclusions In line with preference previously expressed by respondents to the Neighbourhood Plan Consultation, the MACK Plan concludes that MA Site B is potentially suitable for taking forward as an allocation for five homes. The suggested dependency on MA Site E for its delivery does not seem appropriate in this case for the reasons given above. If both sites are taken forward, it is possible for both sites to be delivered independently with some adjustment to the wording within the Plan and reduction of potential delivery numbers on MA Site E. Respondents to the same Consultation similarly expressed a preference for MA Site A. In line with those views it remains our submission that MA Site A is entirely suitable for development to meet the needs of Milton Abbot, the concerns identified in the AECOM Assessment being ones that can be managed and mitigated. We therefore ask the Parish Council to reconsider the decision to exclude MA Site A from the MACK Plan. If you require any further information In respect of the above sites</p> | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>then please do not hesitate to contact me. In the meantime thank you for your kind consideration. The MACK Plan confirms the suitability of MA Site B for development. However, in respect of MA Site A, and following recommendations in AECOM's Assessment, the MACK Plan has rejected MA Site A, instead recommending that MA Site E 'West of Village' (land and farm buildings) should be allocated for development. The following sets out the reasons as to why we feel further consideration is required in regards to the strategy.</p> <p>19th February 2021 The Parish Clerk Milton Abbot Group Parish Council Briardale Woodlands Dousland Yelverton PL20 6NB By email to: Mackplan2019@gmail.com Our Ref: BB/ PG/ TRP 2163 Your Ref: a Page 2 MA Site A - Land West of Milton Abbot (West of Lutyens Fold)</p> <p>The MACK Plan acknowledges that MA Site A is sustainably located in the context of the village the subject of proposed growth. Whereas AECOM's assessment concludes that MA Site A is not suitable for taking forward as an allocation (Section 5, page 29) we feel that this judgement is not accurate as many of the issues raised could be appropriately addressed or mitigated. We have carefully considered the issues raised in the MACK Plan, specifically access, landscape and visual sensitivity, streams and agricultural strip field systems (including curved field boundaries and earth banks). These issues are discussed below and we respectfully request review of the matters below and reconsideration of this finding upon the following basis:</p> <p>Access The existing access to Site A is off the site's northern boundary and onto Higher Edgecumbe Lane, noted to be single track and relatively narrow. However, Higher Edgecumbe Lane joins the B3362 at two points, one to the east and one to the west. For the greatest part, Higher Edgecumbe Lane serves</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>only a handful of properties to the west and hence is very lightly trafficked so that movements associated with the proposed residential development on MA Site A would not be such to present a constraint to its development. This is particularly so when the northern aspect of the site is capable of delivering passing bays potentially in association with relocated access points into the site, so delivering a highways benefit. We consider that potential exists to substitute the site's existing northern access, for one off the southern boundary with the B3362 in close proximity to 30mph zone. This would deliver a highways benefit, taking traffic off Higher Edgecumbe Lane, with potential for additional signage on the B3362, by agreement with County Engineer.</p> <p>Landscape and Visual Sensitivities</p> <p>Site A adjoins existing development to the east at Lutyens Fold and slopes gently north to south. The site is understood to have visible in views from the Tamar Valley AONB and Discovery Trail, yet the proposed housing will be small in scale and seen in the context of the existing village, as well as being capable of accommodating appropriate landscape mitigation. The visual impacts from long-views would therefore be slight when viewed within the wider context. a Page 3 Design solutions within the site would be sympathetic, development being read against the sloping topography and not materially breaching the skyline. The scheme's density would be appropriate to the existing pattern of development, sympathetic to the site's characteristics and oriented to preserve the privacy and amenity of the proposed occupants and neighbours. Stream As the site is entirely within Flood Zone 1 and therefore not subject to flood risk, we understand this issue to therefore be primarily in relation to ecological concerns. Resolution of the design and construction management issues relevant to the stream subdividing the site</p> | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>would be informed by professional ecological advice to address and mitigate any potential impacts. There is adequate space on site to allow for buffers and potential enhancements to that habitat. There is no reason at this stage to assume that this feature of the site will be prohibitive to development. Field Systems Where at all possible, the development would retain the existing hedge banks (save for the section removed for access) and the integrity of the respective boundaries of the fields would be embraced within the design strategy. An archaeological appraisal would be needed to confirm the likely presence of underground archaeology, however, the crop marks which have been recorded as potential field systems are indicated on the HER as not affecting this site area in particular. There is no reason to believe therefore that this would be a significant constraint to development. Hedge Bank</p> <p>An ecological assessment would establish the quality of the existing hedge bank and opportunities for enhancement to provide onsite biodiversity net gains. The methods will differ from site to site but will usually be advised by a trained ecologist. Agricultural Land Classification The land is currently identified as Grade 3 agricultural land. Further investigation is required to ascertain whether it falls within sub category 3a (Good Quality Agricultural Land) or 3b (Moderate Quality Agricultural Land). The concern in this case is uncertainty rather than a specific objection and the matter could easily be rectified. It is not possible therefore to rule to site out based on an assumption in the negative.</p> <p>MA Site E – ‘West of Village’</p> <p>At odds with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to support, strengthen and grow rural business, the proposed Allocation of MA Site E will unnecessarily consume built infrastructure crucial to such a business. The farm at the centre of MA Site E has developed over a number of years and as recently as</p> | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>2018 its growth was demonstrated by the Council’s approval of planning permission (App Ref 4170/18/OPA) for a significant permanent rural worker’s dwelling to be located on land to the south of MA Site B, (e.g. south of Old Allotments). The Agricultural Appraisal supporting the application for the dwelling explains that the farmed land extends to circa 131 acres together with the range of modern agricultural buildings. Stock reported at the time of the application ran to 700 ewes and 130 head of cattle, including 65 dairy bred cattle, the progeny reared under the Dairy Sired Beef Scheme exported to Ireland. The Appraisal observes the historically limited availability of agricultural buildings, observing that those existing at Milton Abbot would also be utilised during times of extreme adverse weather to reduce ewe losses and lamb mortality. a Page 4 The loss of such rural buildings which could support a viable and successful rural business does not therefore present an ideal choice for development. Nor is this support by local residents who would rather see MA Site A come forward for development.(please see above).</p> <p>MA Site B – Old Allotments</p> <p>The MACK Plan indicates that Site E is considered suitable for up to 5 dwellings. This number is derived from the desire to retain some of the allotments. It however goes on to say that the site isn’t suitable to be brought forward in isolation and is therefore reliant on MA Site E (an adjoining site to the west) also coming forward. MA Site E has been selected for 20 dwellings but in order to deliver this quantum of development, it is suggested that additional greenspace is required from MA Site B. It seems therefore that MA Site E is therefore in fact reliant on MA Site B and not the other way round as stated in the MACK Plan. Whilst it is not usual to allocate sites of 5 dwellings, it is identified that the site could make a suitable and valuable contribution to local housing growth.</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|---------------|--|--|--|
| | | <p>However, it is impractical to allocate sites of a small scale which cannot be delivered independently, simply due to them adjoining each other geographically. Importantly, the linking of the sites adds potential risks which could result in the sites not being able to come forward or potentially delayed in doing so. This would not be in the interests of the Plan to delay or hinder the planned housing delivery. If MA Site E is required to deliver additional green infrastructure, then its allocation numbers should be reduced in order for it to be able to do so independently.</p> <p>Conclusions In line with preference previously expressed by respondents to the Neighbourhood Plan Consultation, the MACK Plan concludes that MA Site B is potentially suitable for taking forward as an allocation for five homes. The suggested dependency on MA Site E for its delivery does not seem appropriate in this case for the reasons given above. If both sites are taken forward, it is possible for both sites to be delivered independently with some adjustment to the wording within the Plan and reduction of potential delivery numbers on MA Site E. Respondents to the same Consultation similarly expressed a preference for MA Site A. In line with those views it remains our submission that MA Site A is entirely suitable for development to meet the needs of Milton Abbot, the concerns identified in the AECOM Assessment being ones that can be managed and mitigated. We therefore ask the Parish Council to reconsider the decision to exclude MA Site A from the MACK Plan.</p> <p>If you require any further information In respect of the above sites then please do not hesitate to contact me. In the meantime thank you for your kind consideration.</p> | | |
| 78 | Mike Cunniffe | <p>Comments on Mackplan. The plan is a comprehensive document ,reflecting the needs of the area and taking into account the future housing and community needs of the local villages and</p> | | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|-----------|------------------------|---|----|--|
| | | hamlets whilst respecting the particular features of the landscape and environment. I am pleased that it has been thoroughly researched and subject to independent assessment. It provides a welcome framework for future planning and hopefully secures the voice of the community in influencing future developments. As local residents my wife and I support the plan. | | |
| 79 | Howard Asbridge | <p>It might be helpful if I put Mr Gill's concerns over residents' lack of awareness of his proposals for land to the east of Marlow Crescent, Chillaton into context, by quoting from the email I sent him when originally addressing this issue. This occurred after the publication of the residents' questionnaire in 2017 and I said:</p> <p><i>The survey was only the latest stage of NDP consultation and others will follow, including the opportunity for residents to consider whatever information the owners of potential development sites wish to put forward. With a questionnaire already running to 20 pages and eight potential sites to consider, to have included specific proposals for each one would have made the survey impracticable and I'm sure you will appreciate the need to have treated each site in the same way.</i></p> <p>The eight sites referred to were those identified by the Borough Council in an earlier 'Call for land' and included Mr Gill's. However, as I said in my email to Mr Gill:</p> <p><i>Although the Borough Council carried out the 'Call for land' exercise, it will not provide contact information regarding the landowners concerned, because of the Data Protection Act. I am therefore in the process of finding the owners of</i></p> | a. | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | <p><i>all the sites concerned and providing them with the information I have sent you, as I already had your details. Landowners will then have the opportunity to put forward proposals, should they so wish, having regard to the outcome of the survey.</i></p> <p><i>No specific details of the further consultation process have yet been considered by the MACKPLan team, but my expectation is that there will be public meetings to facilitate this in both Chillaton and Milton Abbot. Indeed, on page 4 of the survey review, it states that 'Further consultation will now take place with regard to specific sites'. I hope that this addresses your main concern.</i></p> <p>Having produced the questionnaire and reported on the analysis of its results, I was no longer involved with MACK plan. A new team was formed with a stronger representation from Milton Abbot, which made sense, given the initial focus on that village by the Borough Council as a source of new homes. Notwithstanding that, the team quite rightly decided to make a fresh 'Call for Land' and to include any sites in the whole of the Plan area in the independent assessment they commissioned, including Mr Gill's.</p> <p>In a MACK plan newsletter dated March 2020 it was said:</p> <p><i>All sites will be discussed with the Parish Council and WDBC and then reviewed at a meeting of local residents</i></p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|-----------|--------------------|--|--|--|
| | | <p><i>prior to an eventual referendum on the whole Neighbourhood Plan.</i></p> <p>Of course, Covid 19 has prevented such meetings from being held.</p> | | |
| 80 | Mr M Hooper | <p>C Site B – Between Marlowe Crescent and Sunway</p> <p>One of the primary purposes of the Mack plan, as set out in the forward to the plan, is to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support and enhance the local economy, infrastructure and community facilities • Identify additional actions to improve community facilities, services. <p>The confirmation that site B is not appropriate as a Local Green Space is supported.</p> <p>In terms of the comments made concerning infrastructure and services, it is considered an additional housing in Chillaton will help create a mass of the population that would support the reintroduction of the services which have been lost over time, including a village shop and pub. It is considered that the primary purpose of the plan is to create sustainable settlements, and it is considered that housing growth will assist in achieving that aim. Furthermore, it should be noted that the NPPF supports the growth of smaller villages <i>Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in</i></p> | <p>Thank you for your comments and observations. You requested that we look again at the distribution of housing development between the villages of Milton Abbot and Chillaton. The rationale for the recommendations made in the MACK Plan is stated within the plan but for clarity we offer the following:</p> <p>b. Our evidence gathering over the last 2 years has revealed that the most pressing local need is for affordable homes for local people. Affordable homes are made affordable through being subsidised by open market homes. A development has to be 11 homes or more for the rules to require the developer to include 30% affordable</p> | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p><i>one village may support services in a village nearby. The above advice would support the development of site B.</i></p> <p>The neighbourhood plan looks favourably on developing smaller clusters of housing (paragraph 6.5.0.3), and the development of site B falls within that aspiration.</p> <p>The comments in paragraph 7.1.0.2 are particularly pertinent to the consideration of the suitability of site B, stating that <i>However, potential development in the village may be seen in conjunction with JLP Policy TTV2, which seeks to enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities, including through, where appropriate, potentially supporting local services and facilities.</i> The development of sites E would help support local services and facilities to return to the village.</p> <p>The general thrust of the site assessment and the support for site B is welcome. The site can provide a mix of affordable and open market housing, and any additional community benefits are deemed necessary.</p> <p>It is suggested that the Mack plan reassess the distribution of housing to have a split between Milton Abbot and Chillaton in order to provide a more holistic pattern of growth across the plan area and support sustainable growth in Chillaton.</p> | <p>housing in the development. Chillaton Site B is proposed for 10 homes and had some local support for 7. Both fall below the threshold for the mandatory delivery of the affordable housing needed for local people.</p> <p>c. As stated in the Regulation 14 version of MACK Plan: <i>'Chillaton is considered as countryside and developments should be avoided and only permitted in exceptional circumstances'</i>. The JLP requirement of 20 new homes is nominated to the sustainable village of Milton Abbot. As suitable sites exist in Milton Abbot that have the capacity to deliver the full JLP housing allocation, it is difficult to determine what exceptional circumstances could underpin the development of Chillaton Site B. Notably 86% of the Regulation 14 resident comments have been supportive of the</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | recommendations of the MACK Plan. | |
|----|--|--|--|--|
| 81 | Mr E Perrse EJFP Planning | <p>This response relates to the assessment of sites MA Site D, MA Site E and MA Site F and the apparent anomalies in the assessments and conclusions reached concerning the sites. In addition, the lack of consultation with the landowner/agent about site D and a lack of recognition of the advanced state of the planning application for part of site D. The professional consultation responses for the application relating to landscape highways and heritage matters have not been considered. There is no assessment of this oven-ready part of site D in the site assessment. In addition, important information relating to the water supply has been ignored and appears to be misrepresented in the site assessment. The site assessment finds that site E is suitable for development despite the anomalies in the individual assessment of the sites listed above. Accordingly, it is considered that the AECOM site assessment is fundamentally unsound for the reasons set out below.</p> <p>All three sites will be visible to a certain degree from the Tamar Valley AONB that said site E is the closest. Sites D and F both have intervening buildings and structures between the AONB boundary and the site boundary. This is important because when it comes to the assessment of sensitivity in terms of visual amenity yet the site assessment lists site E as having a medium sensitivity and sites D and F as having high sensitivity, this is despite the fact that there are intervening buildings between the AONB</p> | <p>We are of course aware of the 152 letters of objection to Milton Abbot Site D on the WDBC Planning Portal and the body of evidence submitted by residents in justification of their objections. As you will be aware, these objections are far broader than flooding, threat to fresh water supplies and heritage damage. Given the relative timing of the planning application for 0016/20/OPA and the MACK Plan, a planning decision will have been made in connection with planning application 0016/20/OPA before the MACK Plan is voted on in a referendum. It is not therefore our intention to discuss the merits of the claims that you make in this representation. AECOM, conducted an entirely independent assessment of all sites against identical criteria in order to identify which site or</p> | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>and the sites at D and F. In terms of site D and the area which is subject to the current planning application, this part of the site is well related to existing development (with development on three sides), no assessment has been made of the lower section of this site in the AECOM site assessments despite the known existence of the planning application. In the application proposal, the Council's landscape officer has confirmed that five dwellings will not give rise to any landscape impact concerns. This is in direct conflict with the conclusions reached in the AECOM assessment.</p> <p>In terms of the sensitivity of the landscape, the AECOM assessment has stated that sites D and F have a medium sensitivity while site E has a low sensitivity. However, what is of concern is the conclusions that are reached in relation to hedgerows and trees – in relation to site E, it states 'there are trees and hedgerows located along the site boundaries that can be accommodated within the design of new development areas'. Yet, in relation to sites D and F, it states 'there are trees and hedgerows along the site boundaries which <i>are susceptible to development but could potentially be incorporated (my emphasis) into the design of new development areas</i>'. Why the difference between the assessment of trees and hedgerows in relation to the sites. It appears that the only reason for the difference is to move sites D and F into the medium sensitivity category. There appears to be no planning or landscape reason for arriving at the different conclusions for sites D and F compared to site E. Please see the point</p> | <p>sites were most suitable for recommendation for development in the MACK Plan. AECOM had nothing to gain in terms of which sites were recommended and therefore had no motivation other than to generate an honest and unbiased report which we believe they have done. The 86% Regulation 14 resident endorsement of the MACK Plan is strong evidence that AECOM have done their job to the satisfaction of the local community.</p> <p>AECOM were aware of all current and previous planning applications connected to the 10 sites that they were commissioned to assess.</p> <p>Your general observation in connection with the 'continuation of development through small cluster developments' is recognised. The 2017 Resident's Survey did indeed identify a preference for multiple smaller developments, however the</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>above in relation to the Council's landscape officer's comments for the planning application.</p> <p>There are similar concerns about the harm to designated heritage assets and setting, it is acknowledged that sites D and F share a boundary with the conservation area, and site E does not. However, to say that sites D and F will impact three nationally designated listed buildings, including the grade 1 listed church, and that site E will have limited or no impact is fundamentally incorrect. When viewed from the west, Site E will sit directly in front of the grade 1 listed church and, as such, will have an impact. Therefore the conclusion that has been reached in relation to site E must be in question. In addition, when considering the application site in site D, the associated historic impact assessment has concluded that the proposal for five dwellings will be acceptable.</p> <p>Specifically, concerning the assessment of site D, the concerns raised regarding the flooding matters are unfounded. It is not clear from the documents where the concerns regarding the flooding came from? However, this would have been clarified had AECOM spoken with the landowner or agent in order to establish the cause of the flooding. The reason for the flooding was a blocked covert. Once the blockage (a plastic bag) was removed, the flooding stopped, and there have been no further incidents. Thus, it is considered that the flooding concerns set out in the assessment are unfounded and should not have a bearing on the site assessment.</p> | <p>overwhelming majority of responses to this Regulation 14 consultation recognise the need for affordable housing and the rationale underpinning the proposal for a single development on the one site identified as being wholly suitable to allocate within the whole MACK Plan area and an adjacent site.</p> <p>Your submission states that flooding concerns about Site D are unfounded. The AECOM analysis using publicly available information disagrees with that view.</p> <p>In conclusion, we can confirm that site assessments were indeed carried out objectively and independently and the assessors were aware of the publicly available information to which you refer. A Neighbourhood Plan is generated by a community for a community and in the case of Milton Abbot Sites D, E and F, the conclusion is that the local community objects to the</p> | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | <p>In terms of the freshwater springs, these provide water to the properties in Edgecumbe Terrace, at least two of which are on mains water. A report dealing with the spring has been included with the application for part of the site. It is noted that there has been no reference to this report in the AECOM site assessment. This is considered to be a limitation of the site assessment for site D.</p> <p>In terms of access into the site, the assessment conclusions are again challenged on the basis that the local highways authority in considering the planning application for five dwellings, has concluded that the proposed access is acceptable. Again had the assessors referred to the application, they may well have arrived at a different conclusion, certainly for part of the site.</p> <p>In terms of the general comments the plan states at paragraph 6.5.0.3 that <i>The continuation of development through small cluster developments (4 or 5 houses)... are considered favourably</i>. The development of sites D and F would meet with the aspiration set out in paragraph 6.5.0.3. Whereas the development of site E does not.</p> <p>It is considered, therefore, that the proposed allocation of land in Milton Abbot is based upon site assessments that have not been objectively carried out, in that they have failed to take into account publicly available information which counters the conclusions particularly in relation to site D. Some of the conclusions that have been reached in the site assessment are illogical and do not appear to follow the same criteria from site to site. Thus resulting in</p> | <p>development of Site D, has indicated no support at all for Site F and has supported the proposal to develop Site E by 86%.</p> | |
|--|--|---|---|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|-----------|----------------------|---|---|--|
| | | hard to follow conclusions. The result of which it is considered that the basis for the site allocations is unsound. | | |
| 82 | Richard Inman | <p>Reply to Mr E Persse</p> <p>For clarity these comments are provided by the agent of a live planning application on MA Site D. The agent (EJFP Planning Ltd) resides in Tavistock and the applicants in Bere Alston. MACK Plan = Milton Abbot, Chillaton and Kelly Neighbourhood Plan.</p> | <p>During the Regulation 14 Consultation we are legally obliged to request comments from a number of other organisations and individuals as well as residents.</p> <p>These include statutory bodies such as WDBC, Historic England etc; landowners/agents and local organisations. Mr Persse was on that list.</p> | |
| 83 | MsP | <p>Reply to Mr E Persse</p> <p>Precisely when did you move into the area? Bannawell street isn't part of the plan, it's clear you are replying to bolster your clients application!</p> | <p>During the Regulation 14 Consultation we are legally obliged to request comments from a number of other organisations and individuals as well as residents.</p> <p>These include statutory bodies such as WDBC, Historic England etc; landowners/agents and local organisations. Mr Persse was on that list.</p> | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| 84 | Helen Foster | <p>Mr E Persse During the Regulation 14 Consultation we are legally obliged to request comments from a number of other organisations and individuals as well as residents.</p> <p>These include statutory bodies such as WDBC, Historic England etc; landowners/agents and local organisations. Mr Persse was on that list.</p> <p>This comment has been posted by the agent who has been paid to submit the live planning application at Milton Abbot Site D – the agents company being EJFP Planning Ltd, based in Tavistock. I believe that he lives in Tavistock and the applicant lives in Bere Alston, neither being residents to the MACK area of Milton Abbot, Chillaton or Kelly. This needs noting having been posted so close to the end date for comments.</p> | <p>During the Regulation 14 Consultation we are legally obliged to request comments from a number of other organisations and individuals as well as residents.</p> <p>These include statutory bodies such as WDBC, Historic England etc; landowners/agents and local organisations. Mr Persse was on that list.</p> | |
| 85 | Angus McKenzie | <p>Mr E Persse</p> <p>I can't give this comment any credence as you were not invited to participate in the MACK plan by virtue of you being a non-resident of the MACK plan areas. Nor have you made a declaration of interest in that you are financially involved with a current pending planning application that DOES sit within the MACK plan. Therefore your comment has limited if any validity or value. It certainly lacks integrity. This is not the forum to air your grievance.</p> <p>MACK Plan = Milton Abbot, Chillaton and Kelly Neighbourhood Plan. (NOT Tavistock or Bere Alston)</p> | <p>During the Regulation 14 Consultation we are legally obliged to request comments from a number of other organisations and individuals as well as residents.</p> <p>These include statutory bodies such as WDBC, Historic England etc; landowners/agents and local organisations. Mr Persse was on that list.</p> | |
| 86 | E.C. | <p>Mr E Persse</p> <p>MACK Plan:</p> | <p>During the Regulation 14 Consultation we are legally obliged to request comments from</p> | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|----------------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>“In 2014, Milton Abbot Grouped Parish Council and Kelly Parish Meeting agreed to create a neighbourhood plan covering their combined areas. <i>Its purpose is to give local people greater control over what kind of development takes place in their area, where it is and what it looks like</i>”</p> <p>It is shame that these comments have been provided purely in the interests of personal gain from those outside of this community.</p> | <p>a number of other organisations and individuals as well as residents.</p> <p>These include statutory bodies such as WDBC, Historic England etc; landowners/agents and local organisations. Mr Persse was on that list.</p> | |
| 87 | Diane Jardine | <p>Mr Persses’s comments regarding the AECOM site assessments being ‘<i>fundamentally unsound</i>’ are insulting after all the hard work undertaken to complete these UNBIASED assessments. If a paid agent’s comments regarding a live planning application on part of site D are to be taken seriously then so too should all the 170 plus cogent objections from the people of Milton Abbot, who should have a say as to where and what type of housing is acceptable in Milton Abbot.</p> | <p>During the Regulation 14 Consultation we are legally obliged to request comments from a number of other organisations and individuals as well as residents.</p> <p>These include statutory bodies such as WDBC, Historic England etc; landowners/agents and local organisations. Mr Persse was on that list.</p> | |
| 88 | JAC K | <p>Mr E Persse</p> <p>I’m quite shocked how ‘low some will go’ Mr Persse is a former WDBC planning officer now paid to assist applicants to circumvent/navigate planning law. Although not living, nor ever lived in the Mack area, he now decides he has a right to comment on a neighbourhood plan where monetary gain is his ONLY interest. Along with a sudden qualification in</p> | <p>During the Regulation 14 Consultation we are legally obliged to request comments from a number of other organisations and individuals as well as residents.</p> | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|-----------|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>flooding and heritage, the lack of concern for protecting and enhancing the village and its residents speak volumes. Please amend his post to show he's most certainly a party with a vested financial interest and a desperate attempt to at least win an occasional application on behalf of a poorly advised client</p> | <p>These include statutory bodies such as WDBC, Historic England etc; landowners/agents and local organisations. Mr Persse was on that list.</p> | |
| 89 | JoP | <p>Mr E Persse</p> <p>This guy is the agent for two planning applications? How is that right? He doesn't live in the area either His comments show clear bias and an attempt to skew a fair and open process. Funny that!!</p> | <p>During the Regulation 14 Consultation we are legally obliged to request comments from a number of other organisations and individuals as well as residents.</p> <p>These include statutory bodies such as WDBC, Historic England etc; landowners/agents and local organisations. Mr Persse was on that list.</p> | |
| 90 | Sonia Callaway | <p>It was my understanding that "Our Neighborhood Plan" was for us, the Communities of Milton Abbot, Chillaton and Kelly to have the chance to be involved in the decisions which affect us, the members of our communities where we live and have lived for many years.</p> <p>It seems greatly inappropriate, immoral and surly somewhat unprofessional for Mr E Persse of EJFP Limited to be commenting here on our communities MACK Plan. This implies that anyone and his dog, from any part of the country, can comment and try to impose their will on our village's future.</p> | <p>During the Regulation 14 Consultation we are legally obliged to request comments from a number of other organisations and individuals as well as residents.</p> <p>These include statutory bodies such as WDBC, Historic England etc; landowners/agents and local organisations. Mr Persse was on that list.</p> | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|-----------|-------------------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>I would like to say again that the Plan has been painstakingly put together from expert advice and even more importantly by using “credible, local knowledge”. Taking into consideration the views, thoughts and working knowledge of people who do have a vested interest in this community.</p> <p>I totally agree with the MACK Plan’s assessment of each site. The Plan and it’s conclusions successfully retains the character of Milton Abbot. The plan delivers by being sympathetic to the existing layout of the village without the need to build above the village on existing green field sites.</p> <p>There is so much support for this plan, I really appreciate all the hard work which has gone into putting it together for us, the community. I am grateful that we have had this opportunity to let our thoughts be known. Thank you.</p> | | |
| 91 | Kevin Boyd | <p>Please note, I strongly object to Mr E Persse of EJFP Planning Limited, using this facility to further his business interest in Milton Abbot. I was not aware that anyone other than the residents of Milton Abbot, Chillaton and Kelly had been invited to comment on our Neighborhood Plan!</p> | <p>During the Regulation 14 Consultation we are legally obliged to request comments from a number of other organisations and individuals as well as residents.</p> <p>These include statutory bodies such as WDBC, Historic England etc; landowners/agents and local organisations. Mr Persse was on that list.</p> | |
| 92 | Bridget Passmore | <p>The MACK plan is a comprehensive and detailed piece of work, well done to the team involved. I am broadly in</p> | <p>The defining of what is a ‘sustainable’ village is a matter</p> | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|-----------|------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | agreement with it, although feel it is a shame that Chillaton is deemed unsustainable in relation to new properties. We have over recent years lost our shop and pub and thus the heart of the village. It is disappointing that this could not be addressed by some new supportive development. | for WDBC and beyond the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. | |
| 93 | Helen Foster | Why is it appropriate that a comment is posted by the agent (Mr E Persse) who has been paid to submit the live planning application at Milton Abbot Site D – the agents company being EJFP Planning Ltd, based in Tavistock. I believe that he lives in Tavistock and the applicant lives in Bere Alston, neither being residents to the MACK area of Milton Abbot, Chillaton or Kelly. This needs noting having been posted so close to the end date for comments. | <p>During the Regulation 14 Consultation we are legally obliged to request comments from a number of other organisations and individuals as well as residents.</p> <p>These include statutory bodies such as WDBC, Historic England etc; landowners/agents and local organisations. Mr Persse was on that list.</p> | |
| 94 | Angus Mackenzie | I'd like to request from the moderators of this comment section that the comment of Mr E Persse is either removed or subject to annotation that includes a declaration/conflict of interest. The cause of this is well documented in the comments made since his submission. Thank you. | <p>During the Regulation 14 Consultation we are legally obliged to request comments from a number of other organisations and individuals as well as residents.</p> <p>These include statutory bodies such as WDBC, Historic England etc; landowners/agents and local</p> | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|-------|---|--|---|
| | | | organisations. Mr Persse was on that list. | |
| 95 | Amy H | <p>The MACK Plan document and associated work that has gone into it, is indeed a thorough document. Well done to all who were a part of it's creation and thank you for your time and efforts for doing so.</p> <p>I completely agree with all developments meeting environmentally friendly and sustainable standards, using local services wherever possible.</p> <p>Future builds should be built to the area needs not (just) for profits and I think there are various clauses within the document, that align with that.</p> <p>I do have a concern that future developments add a further drain to already oversubscribed local services e.g. Dr's and Dentists (as well as infrastructure). But believe that the MACK plan addresses this in several points, where any future development should also bring some tangible return to the local community.</p> <p>I am particularly in favour of clause 6.4.0.4 where Class Q developments are considered part of new housing stock and count towards the new building target for 2014-2034.</p> <p>Whilst its a shame that at present there seems no obvious way to have some community facility e.g. local shop for Chillaton specifically, if this MACK plan is voted into</p> | | <p style="color: red;">Comments on Q Class development noted.</p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|---------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>legislation, then it helps to ensure a higher chance of this becoming a reality and benefit to the local community, where presently this seems unlikely.</p> <p>One final point from myself regards the Neighbourhood Planning Policies. We have a great opportunity here to have at least some control over our local area developments and if voted through, would be a great and utter shame if we have no individuals (or individuals not willing) to proactively drive and ensure these policies are implemented and adhered to.</p> <p>With absolutely no reflection on the current team; but a concern and suggestion I wanted to put forwards (just from various experiences I've had working as part of large projects in my job), I think it's worth keeping on the table to discuss/review the team and everyone's eagerness to continue participation at regular intervals, to ensure we have a community team on board who progressively (& willingly) drive these actions forwards.</p> | <p>If the MACK Plan is adopted then the responsibility for action will pass to the Parish Council (MAGPC). We will pass on your views about ongoing community involvement.</p> | <p>A new Section on (future) monitoring/management of the plan has been included as Chapter 3</p> |
| 96 | Diane Jardine | <p>Mr Persses's comments regarding the AECOM site assessments being '<i>fundamentally unsound</i>' are insulting after all the hard work undertaken to complete these UNBIASED assessments. If a paid agent's comments regarding a live planning application on part of site D are to be taken seriously then so too should all the 170 plus cogent objections from the people of Milton Abbot, who should have a say as to where and what type of housing is acceptable in Milton Abbot.</p> | <p>During the Regulation 14 Consultation we are legally obliged to request comments from a number of other organisations and individuals as well as residents.</p> <p>These include statutory bodies such as WDBC, Historic England etc; landowners/agents and local</p> | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>organisations. Mr Persse was on that list.</p> | |
| <p>97</p> | <p>Mark and Cath Hutchins</p> | <p>We would like to thank all concerned for the careful, thoughtful, inclusive and rigorous process that has been followed in the formulation of the MACK Plan. We also appreciate the extensive public consultation that has taken place. We strongly support the idea of a Local Plan and hope that the future development of all of our communities is informed and directed by the Plan.</p> <p>It is also good to see the social, environmental and historical assets of our communities recorded in one document.</p> <p>We would like to make the following comments:</p> <p>Housing development (7.2) We strongly support the idea of building more affordable, sustainable housing in Milton Abbot (Policy 6.1; 6.5), in order to maintain it as a sustainable village. We would also like to see support for the existing, historic, village hall, a village shop and post office, children’s play facilities and designated green spaces alongside this development. However, we feel that Chillaton should also be considered</p> | <p>The question of utilising our existing village hall, with its long history, or pursuing an alternative has been raised before and we will certainly look again at it once this</p> | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | <p>as a potentially sustainable village, since, until recently, it also had a pub, Post Office and village shop. Milton Abbot's pub is now under threat, it only has a visiting (but nonetheless brilliant!) Post Office and has also lost its village shop. Could the two communities not continue to develop in tandem, with new housing developed sensitively in both, along with the associated improvements in community facilities and local transport connections that should accompany them?</p> <p>We were very pleased to see that an independent assessment has been made of all of the possible sites for housing development and acknowledge the difficulty of identifying areas that will suit everyone in the community.</p> <p>However, the identification of a single site for all 20 of the houses that the village is required to accommodate conflicts with the views expressed by most residents (7.1.0.5). We would prefer to see a number of smaller developments integrated into the village.</p> <p>We acknowledge the merits of Site E for development but would like to point out that Site B, identified as unused "old allotments" in the Plan, comprises allotments that have been in constant use, rented by local residents, for at least the last 25 and possibly, the last 100, years. They were originally associated with the now Grade II listed, Lutyens-designed estate houses in The Parade and include a group of original former pig sties. As such, they form part of the Duke of Bedford "model village" design, based around Venn Hill and The Parade. We would like to see them maintained in association with these listed buildings</p> | <p>consultation period is over and we can look across all comments.</p> <p>We recognise that in a perfect world, small developments would be the preferred approach. Our evidence gathering over the last 2 years has however revealed that the most pressing local need is for affordable homes for local people. Affordable homes are made affordable through being subsidised by open market homes. A development has to be 11 homes or more for the rules to require the developer to include 30% affordable housing in the development. Therefore, the only way to</p> | <p style="color: red;">Comments on the allotments noted</p> |
|--|--|---|---|---|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| | | <p>and the wider Conservation Area. They also have considerable wildlife value, including a number of Devon hedges and mature trees, which represent an important habitat for owls, bats and many other species. Rather than being built upon, in association with Site E, could site B be considered a designated Local Green Space for the village, which is argued for throughout the Plan and strongly supported by the community (4.4.2.)?</p> <p>We agree that Site D is clearly unsuitable for housing development and support the inclusion of statements of this unsuitability in the MACK Plan.</p> <p>Sites A and C are also considered unsuitable for housing development but either of these sites could also be considered ideal to be designated a Local Green Space. They both fit the criteria (4.4) of being in close proximity to the village, near to areas of family housing and both have local and historical significance, as set out in their descriptors in the plan. Both may also be important sites for wildlife.</p> <p>Rights of way We fully support the idea of promoting and improving rights of way in and around our communities (Community Action 4-2). As part of this assessment, could particular focus be given to the state of the path between Milton Abbot village and the cricket field?</p> <p>Employment (5.2.3) JLP strategic objective S09 calls for the development of new local <i>jobs</i> as well as homes. Could consideration of</p> | <p>deliver the affordable homes that our community so needs is to have either a single development of 20 or 2 sites of 11 and to increase the number of houses to 22. As we do not have 2 sites that are independently assessed as being both suitable for development and capable of delivering 11 new houses, the only way of generating the housing that local people need is by having a single development.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments. We will look at the wording on the Allotments area (site B) we did not mean to imply the area is unused.</p> | |
|--|--|---|---|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|----|--------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>the need for small scale, sustainable and flexible business premises be included in the Plan? Spaces for local micro-businesses to expand and new ones to start would be invaluable. This could include consideration of the need for offices, meeting rooms, workshops, storage etc., such as the new units on the Launceston/Callington road junction, for example.</p> <p>Community Facilities (5.4) Would it be worth considering the development of The Edgumbe Arms as a multi-purpose community facility (something like the White Hart, in Chilsworthy), incorporating a cafe, shop, meeting rooms, etc.? It also has some parking space.</p> <p>Residential parking (5.7) We definitely agree with the need to create additional parking spaces in Milton Abbot and could envisage something like the village car park in Lockett. Could Sites C or F be available for this?</p> | <p>As a privately owned facility, the operation of the village pub in Milton Abbot is well outside the scope of the neighbourhood plan.</p> | <p>A Policy has been introduced with reference to employment</p> |
| 98 | Paul B | <p>Congratulations to the MACK plan team for a thorough and well considered document.</p> <p>As a whole I agree with its findings and considerations. I do however find it disheartening when Chillaton is discribed as 'not sustainable' as although it may not be in the development sense it is sustainable to the many people of whom have made their home here. Going forward maybe some of the issues raised ie road safety, community facilities etc could be addressed within a focus group.</p> | <p>We have tried hard to ensure the MACK Plan represents the whole area. The potential benefits from new development (Section 106) are limited to the locality of the development by regulation. A number of community actions should</p> | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|-----|----------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| | | | bring equal benefit to Chillaton. | |
| 99 | MH | I have lived in Chillaton for many years and have witnessed the loss of all our local services. I understand therefore why we have been classed as non sustainable. I have read and agree with the MACK Plans findings however, I would like to point out that there is a NHS dentist at Kilworthy Park in Tavistock which is nearer than stated in the plan. | | The dental update has been incorporated into the plan. |
| 100 | Katherine King | <p>Firstly we would like to thank the writers of the MACK plan, it is very well thought out and considered.</p> <p>As with other commenter's we generally support and agree with the conclusions deduced from the plan. For us the important factors are: –</p> <p>Lack of Local Green Space 4.4.1 This year has really highlighted the lack of accessible green fields with public access in village centres. We have been encouraged to stay local and although we have wonderful access to footpaths and countryside it is sometimes important to just have a field to kick a ball around or to just run, especially for small children.</p> <p>Lack of Public Transport 5.2.4.3 We agree with the comments made about the lack of public transport running through the village of Chillaton. Without this it would be very hard to attract lots more residents to the village.</p> <p>Road Safety 5.6.0.3 We agree with the comments here about Chillaton's lack of</p> | | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|-----|----------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>roadside footpaths (especially needed for children walking into the centre for buses to school, this feels very unsafe). We would like to make the additional comment about the traffic coming in and out on the Lifton road. Due to the straight nature of the section of road by Marlow crescent, that has full view of the derestricted speed sign, cars are often speeding well in excess of 30mph out of the village. A lot of people use this section of road to walk dogs and walk children to into the village, making this extremely hazardous. We would suggest moving the 30mph sign to the other side of Sunway, with other traffic calming measures to firstly allow time for traffic to slow before getting to the village, but secondly, the derestricted sign would not be visible to motorists until they are truly out of the village.</p> <p>C Site B Between Marlow Crescent and Sunway We concur with the plan and would not support development of size in this location (or any other location in Chillaton). As stated above, without substantial investment in the village i.e. improved footpaths, road safety, transport links, return of a shop, post office and pub, then we don't feel additional houses would add anything too the village except to take away it's countryside feel. We obviously have objections to this precise location, as our current uninterrupted views of the countryside would be disturbed and would significantly devalue our home.</p> | <p>We have discussed the Milton Abbot and Chillaton, Parking and Road Safety problems with Devon County Council. Their recommendations on what actions could be taken are now included in the revised MACKPlan.</p> | |
| 101 | Andy Cox | <p>well done Richard Allen and team for the mack plan ..having served on the parish council I get what's gone on to get this done...</p> | | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|------------|-----------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| | | <p>sadly wdcb dragged their heels getting mack plan over the line .</p> <p>maybe they will redeem themselves by upholding what the village wants...</p> <p>Mr persse has a lot to say about our village needs...doesn't even live here..</p> <p>only in it for money...</p> | | |
| 102 | James Anderson | <p>Fantastic effort by all concerned in producing the MACK Plan, a lot of work, commitment, thought and research has been put to this document that gives a true reflection of the people that live in the villages and surrounding MACK Plan area and how they would like to see it developed in the future.</p> <p>I do hope that WDBC planning department do take time to refer to this document before considering ALL planning applications now and in the future or the public money that funded this will have been wasted along with everybody's time and efforts.</p> <p>This plan has been put together by people who genuinely are passionate and interested about the area they live in and not someone in it for their individual gains or their clients. Nor of someone working for WDBC planning dept. that has no interest in our local area who appears happy to pass any planning applications. Well done again to those involved, great effort and lets hope the plan is used as it was intended.</p> | | |
| 103 | David Stuart | <p>1. It is not clear whether this proposal is meant to be actual policy and therefore have formal and clear status</p> | David Stuart's response 13/5/21: | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| | <p>Historic England</p> <p>Page 63; para 7.4.0.2.</p> | <p>within the Plan. We recommend that this situation is clarified but for the purposes of this response have assumed it is intended as formal policy.</p> <p>2. In our previous response to an information consultation on the Plan in 2017 we drew attention to the desirability of using our guidance to ensure that site assessments took appropriate account of heritage considerations when determining their suitability for development in principle and specific proposals in particular. We can find no reference to this guidance having been used in Appendix 2-5 (Site Assessment, undated) or the Site Assessment Report dated November 2020 prepared by AECOM (referred to hereafter as the AECOM report) or in the Plan itself.</p> <p>3. Para 7.2.0.3 in the Plan states that “each site has been subject to formal, independent assessment through the application of a Site Options and Assessment conducted by AECOM. The purpose of the site assessment is to produce a clear assessment of the suitability of each of the sites available for potential residential development within the MACK Plan area.” While we do not necessarily dispute the findings of the assessment exercise the absence of clear methodology by which the outcomes and recommendations have been informed makes it difficult to confirm that that this as evidence is sufficient to demonstrate conformity with overarching policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Local Plan for the protection and enhancement of the historic environment.</p> | <p>Having read Graham’s response to Richard Allen below (Comment 104). I can confirm that we are happy to endorse his advice. It is extremely helpful that the Council has been able to undertake its own heritage assessment of the proposed site allocations, especially as this expertise has been able to usefully address the concerns associated with the Plan’s evidence base we had identified in our Regulation 14 response (see attached).</p> <p>On this basis we would support the recommendation that site B be removed from the Plan as a site allocation, and the provisions for any policy relating to site E that Graham has identified.</p> <p>We would also encourage the community to positively consider the other heritage suggestions for the Plan.</p> | |
|--|---|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>4. Section 1-1 of Appendix 2-5 refers to each site having been evaluated through a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). But we could not find a copy of an SEA on the Plan's website and are currently in receipt of an SEA Scoping consultation from AECOM which suggests that the SEA is still to be prepared.</p> <p>5. Sites B and E have been selected for development and we will comment on each individually:</p> <p>6. Site B. The AECOM report on p10 and in Appendix A identifies views into the site from the Grade II building '21 and 22, The Parade' which is adjacent to the site boundary, the building also lying within the designated Conservation Area which is directly to the east of the site. Reference to nearby undesignated heritage assets is also made. Appendix 2-5 also states that there are numerous Listed Buildings in the area, and highlights the proximity of the Grade I Church of St Constantine whose setting could be harmed by development of the site. No information on how these heritage assets and their significance have been assessed is provided, and the absence of a Conservation Area Appraisal means that there is no existing evidence on the setting of the Area. It is not clear how the AECOM report has been able to conclude that (part) of the site is suitable for development in principle and the accommodation of up to 5 dwellings in particular. Appendix 2-5 states that the site is very well screened but as our guidance on Setting emphasizes lack of intervisibility does not</p> | | <p style="color: red;">As recommended in your covering letter we engaged the help of WDBC Conservation and Archaeological officers. Their recommendation in summary advise against the development of Milton Abbot Site B on heritage grounds but accept the allocation of Milton Abbot E for development subject to a number of pre-conditions.</p> |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|-----|---|---|--|---|
| | | <p>automatically mean that the setting of a heritage asset won't be affected. Section 7-3 of Appendix 2-5 (p59) makes no reference to heritage issues in its summary of suitability.</p> <p>7. Site E. The AECOM report on p17 and in Appendix A states that development is not likely to cause harm to designated heritage assets or their settings due to the relative distance of the site from the designations within the village and visual screening. But, as indicated above, distance and screening are not in themselves automatically appropriate indicators of potential for harm and the means by which these conclusions have been arrived at is not clear. Reference is also made to various undesignated heritage assets on the basis that some impact and/or mitigation is possible but again this conclusion as an acceptable outcome is not substantiated. Appendix 2-5 in section 2-6 asserts that views into the site from adjacent heritage sites can only be enhanced by this development but this again is not substantiated with evidence.</p> | | |
| 104 | <p>Graham Lawrence WDBC Conservation Officer</p> | <p>Further to our positive meeting I was able to make a visit to MA whilst on site visits last Friday to look again at sites B and E, which was useful. I remain of the view that the allotment site does have a level of significance based on the social context of the location in relation to the estate housing and also in terms of setting to the listed buildings and Conservation Area (CA). Housing development would certainly change both settings and result in some level of harm so I would welcome the omission of this allocation site. An element of community use would be very good, but the gate has a sign saying it is private land – is that all of it or part?</p> | | <p>The MACK Plan has been amended to reflect your advice.</p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Site E can be an acceptable allocation in principle as it could achieve a sensitive enlargement of the village that is an enhancement. It is, however, in a prominent location in the foreground of the CA and Church of St Constantine (grade I) when approaching the village on the B3362 from the west. Development would need to follow a Design Brief or Masterplan informed by a Heritage Assessment – this can be referenced in your Plan and would be best evolved using our Pre-application Service and ideally with community involvement as encouraged by NPPF 128. I would place an emphasis on materials, quality of roofscape, means of enclosure of the site and between dwellings, planting etc. It should also be established if and how the existing agricultural buildings will be replaced and how in case there is a knock on effect in the vicinity – are they effectively redundant?</p> <p>I would encourage a commitment to work with WDBC to review the Conservation Area boundary as part of a CA Appraisal and Management Plan process. The existing boundary is tightly drawn based on the Government guidance at the time. This has long been superseded by Historic England guidance that encourages consideration of open spaces that contribute to the special character of the settlement. This could be an action identified in the Plan and would be beneficial as Milton Abbot is a village Conservation Area of particular quality.</p> <p>The MACK Plan could identify unlisted heritage assets which are valued by the community and build on the JLP policy and Supplementary Planning Document with regard to the protection of non-designated heritage assets (NDHA's). I referenced hedgebanks as an example of NDHA's that can be overlooked but</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|-----|---|--|--|--|
| | | there may be many other structures or features that are valued locally. | | |
| 105 | <p>Duncan Smith On behalf of West Devon Borough Council</p> <p>Overall Plan</p> | <p>Introduction</p> <p>The Draft Milton Abbot, Chillaton and Kelly Neighbourhood Plan MACK Plan was published for a formal 6 week public consultation between 23rd December 2020 and February 20th 2021. This represents the plan reaching Regulation 14 stage of the plan preparation process, and offers the first formal opportunity for all stakeholders to comment on the emerging plan.</p> <p>As the Local Planning Authority, West Devon Borough Council (WDBC) has a statutory duty to support the preparation of neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>As well as its statutory duty, WDBC has an obligation to ensure that any planning document that sits within the suite of Development Plan Documents (DPDs) is consistent with its corporate objectives, and will make a positive contribution to the long term health, wellbeing and resilience of the borough's communities. Advice and guidance provided to neighbourhood plan groups will reflect this wider remit, although it is acknowledged that this guidance may go beyond what is strictly required by regulation. Where we do exceed the levels of guidance required by regulation, we will clearly state as much in our comments.</p> <p>Advice and guidance at Regulation 14 stage is most usefully focused on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Draft Neighbourhood Plan Vision, Aims and Objectives 2) Comments on Supporting Text 3) The Draft Neighbourhood Plan Policies 4) The Draft Neighbourhood Plan Evidence Base 5) The Structure of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan and General | | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | <p>Comments 1) The Draft MACK Neighbourhood Plan: Vision, Aims and Objectives</p> <p>The MACK Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan) sets out policies and approaches which will add local detail to policies in the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan. The Plan sets out a vision for the MACK area as follows:</p> <p>“Our vision for the MACK Plan area is that by the end of the plan period in 2034 we will have safeguarded our rural environment and economy, through facilitating new homes that meet local needs, whilst having a minimal impact on their surroundings and support thriving sustainable local communities.”</p> <p>The vision effectively provides a good summary of what is seeking to be achieved.</p> <p>Underneath the Vision is a set of stated Objectives. These are clearly presented and link logically from the Vision to the Policies and are consistent with strategic planning policy. Only one issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 4.3 please refer to the Plymouth and South West Devon JLP: Supplementary Planning Document 2020. This document sets out the approved car parking standards. If the plan proposes to exceed or fall below these standards this must be justified. <p>2) Comments on Supporting Text</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 5, para 1.1.0.2 attribute quote. • Page 5, para 1.1.04 make clear highlighted points continue quote from NPPF? • Page 20 para 4.2.03 attribute quote. • Page 20 para 4.2.0.2 both Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Appropriate Assessment (AA) are required and have | | <p style="color: red;">Discussed with DCC Highways Dept</p> <p style="color: red;">Attributed</p> <p style="color: red;">Attributed</p> |
|--|--|--|--|---|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>been undertaken voluntarily although neither were complete when the Regulation 14 Consultation was undertaken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 20 para 4.2.0.3 2nd sentence as above. • Page 22 para 4.4.0.3 1st sentence this should read “...the former planning policies...” the JLP has replaced the plan you are referring to. • Section 5. Our Built Environment, Pages 27-29 Most NP Groups have identified a list of non-designated heritage assets for inclusion in their NP and set out a Policy to specifically protect such features. If you don't intend to do this then suggest you add a Community Action aimed at doing this and including that list and related Policy when the NP is reviewed. • Page 29 para 5.1.0.11 Is there a reason why all the Grade II Listed Buildings are not listed? • Section 5.5. Additional Funding Pages 35-36 The legislation and guidance relating Section 106 Funding is clear it can only be required to offset the unacceptable impacts of development. It cannot be seen as a funding mechanism to finance a wish list. There will be circumstances in the MACK area where it is appropriate to require 106 contributions. Given the low level of development envisaged, either through the allocation in the NP or by other means and the desire to maximise affordable housing opportunities, the list identified in Section 5.5 is, on face value, somewhat unrealistic. As such, I would suggest this Section is reviewed in the light of the legislation/guidance and an assessment of the potential developments that could be subject of realistic Section 106 requirements undertaken. • Section 5.6. Road Safety Page 36-39 I would suggest this Section is reviewed in the light of the meeting with Devon CC Highways Officers and improvements that could be sought which are not land use related are identified as Community Actions. | | <p style="color: red;">Amended</p> <p style="color: red;">non-designated heritage assets incorporated</p> <p style="color: red;">The length of the list</p> <p style="color: red;">List amended</p> <p style="color: red;">Section reviewed and amended.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 6-4 Class Q Developments, Page 47 I would suggest that the impact of Class Q developments is accurately catalogued in the Evidence Base. Two examples are mentioned in the text. I would also suggest that the highlighted text at the end of para 6.4.0.4 becomes a Community Action along the lines the Parish Council will lobby the Local Planning Authority to introduce the changes that are sought. • Page 48 para 6.5.0.4 See comments on Policy 6.1 relating to JLP Policy TTV27. I would suggest greater clarity around developments the plan would support on the edge of settlement. • Page 48 para 6.5.0.5 Sites of over 5 dwellings approved after March 2017 do count toward the JLP Indicative Figure. • GENERAL COMMENT ON HOUSING ISSUES I would suggest reference to JLP Policy TTV25 and Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plans: Supplementary Planning Document 2020 (pages 209-211) which respectively sets out the key housing policy in respect of Sustainable Villages and the methodology for interpreting the JLP Indicative Housing targets. • Page 50 para 6.6.0.5 See comments on Policy 6.3, criteria 2 and 3. • 6-8 Changing Environment pages 52-53 See comment made in regard of Policy 6-4. • Page 52 para 6.7.02 Information applicants must submit with planning applications is set out in the Local List. If the NP requires this to be exceeded then this must be fully justified. • 7 Consideration of Sites (Where to Build) Pages 55-63 There is no need to include all of the information contained in this Section in regard of Site Assessment and Outcomes. This information, however, is essential to the justification of the Plan's choice of a housing site(s). I would suggest therefore that this information is included in an Appendix to the Plan. I would suggest some brief | | <p style="color: red;">Policy on Q development and community action now included</p> <p style="color: red;">Noted</p> <p style="color: red;">TTV25 appears to be about Totnes?</p> <p style="color: red;">Noted Noted Noted</p> <p style="color: red;">Section reduced as recommended</p> |
|--|--|--|--|---|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| | | <p>paragraphs replace this text in the Plan itself with clear cross referencing to that Appendix.</p> <p>It will be necessary to include two Policies, in the Plan, that result from the content of this Section:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A Policy that identifies the selected site and any criteria that are considered necessary to ensure its appropriate development. 2) A Policy that identifies the Settlement Boundary and the policies that would apply to development proposed; a) within the Settlement Boundary and; 2) outside the Settlement Boundary. <p>Please see Section 5 of this document entitled The Structure of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan which sets out suggestions for the format and content of the Plan.</p> <p>● 7 Consideration of Sites (Where to Build) Pages 55-63 A Proposals Map which identifies the allocated site and illustrates the Settlement Boundary should be included. This should be to a recognised and acceptable scale on an OS base so as to allow easy identification.</p> <p>3) The Draft Neighbourhood Plan Policies</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans are advised not to try and repeat local or national planning policy. Some of the policies in the draft MACK Neighbourhood Plan are already the subject of adopted and emerging local planning policy and/or national planning policy or guidance. In such cases consideration needs to be given to what degree the NP policies add relevant and justifiable additional policy guidance for the locality.</p> <p>The Plan contains 6 policies as summarised in the table below. A commentary is provided for each Policy that looks at the level of conformity with locally adopted policy and national guidance, as</p> | | <p style="color: red;">Policy 9-6. Settlement Boundary</p> <p style="color: red;">OS based maps now included</p> <p style="color: red;">Noted</p> |
|--|--|---|--|---|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| | | well as considering how each policy will be implemented in order to achieve the aims and objectives of the plan. NB I have numbered the criteria applying to each Policy to ease the cross referencing of my comments | | |
| | Policy | WDBC comments | | |
| | <p>Policy 5-1. Sustaining Local Infrastructure Any new development (including change of use and conversion) within the plan area should:</p> <p>1. Demonstrate that there would be no material adverse impact on the safe and efficient operation of the local road network, including residential roads, rural lanes and parking.</p> <p>2. Proposals should demonstrate that</p> | <p>Criterion 1: Suggest rewording “...there would be no material unacceptable impact.....”</p> <p>Criterion 2: Suggest Plymouth and South West Devon JLP: Supplementary Planning Document 2020 is consulted to reword this criteria. (See comments on Objective 4.3 above). Is it required if the SDP already covers off the issues of concern?</p> | | <p style="color: red;">Amended</p> <p style="color: red;">DEV29.3 consulted and quoted</p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | <p>traffic implications including parking have been fully considered, assessed and resolved. Access arrangements and off-street parking should be provided without impinging on adjoining residential and non-residential uses.</p> <p>3. There will be a presumption against the loss of existing community and recreational facilities. 4. Developments must demonstrate that there will be no reduction in water supply and quality and that sewage and</p> | <p>Criterion 3: Suggest this is a Policy in its own right. It will be necessary to identify and list the facilities you are seeking to protect. See Section 5. The Structure of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan of this document for suggested Policies.</p> <p>Criterion 4: Suggest the Environment Agency are consulted on these matters.</p> <p>Criterion 5: This is not a Criteria of the Policy, it's a repeat of the content of JLP Policy DEV2. Is it required if DEV2 covers?</p> | | <p>Noted, however we only have very limited community and recreational facilities Environmental agency consulted</p> <p>Removed</p> |
|--|--|--|--|---|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| | <p>waste management implications have been assessed in order to ensure that existing networks have the capacity to manage increased demands.</p> <p>5. JLP Policy DEV2 requires that development should prevent deterioration of and where appropriate protect, enhance and restore water quality.</p> <p>6. Access roads will need to be designed with consideration of refuse collection vehicles (max 30 tons) and provide sufficient space for them to manoeuvre. They</p> | <p>Criterion 6: Suggest Plymouth and South West Devon JLP: Supplementary Planning Document 2020 is consulted to reword this criteria. (See comments on Objective 4.3 above). Is it required if the SDP already covers off the issues of concern</p> | | <p>DEV 13 consulted. Reference to refuse and emergency vehicles removed</p> |
|--|--|---|--|---|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|----------------|
| | <p>must also allow for the efficient delivery of goods, and access by service and emergency vehicles.</p> | | | |
| | <p>Policy 5-2. Parking The JLP SPD DEV 29 Parking provision, calls for sufficient provision and management of car parking in order to protect the amenity of surrounding residential areas and ensure safety of the highway network and for specific provisions to include parking for residents with disabilities, cycle parking, and motorcycle parking. Planning permission for</p> | <p>I believe this Policy is too wide ranging in terms of what is sought to control. I suggest Section 5. The Structure of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan of this document is referred to and the car parking issues are drawn together into a single policy which does not repeat policy already set out in the JLP itself and the SDP.</p> <p>Criterion 1: The Local List identifies the information that should be submitted with planning applications it is not necessary to repeat this or ask for more unless this is fully justified.</p> | | <p>Removed</p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>new development should only be granted where:</p> <p>1. it is demonstrated that access roads will be capable of accommodating the volume and size of additional traffic that will be generated. Applicants will be required to demonstrate beyond any reasonable doubt that this is the case through the use of independently validated evidence. Safe access and egress must be provided.</p> <p>2. adequate footpaths and cycle paths are provided to enable good and</p> | <p>Criterion 2: This is a big ask of all developments and should be qualified by the words “in appropriate circumstances.”</p> <p>Criterion 3: Suggest all Policy references to car parking are drawn together into a single policy which does not repeat policy already set out in the JLP itself and the SDP.</p> | | <p style="color: red;">Reference to the number of spaces removed</p> |
|--|--|---|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>safe access both within the development and from it to local facilities, particularly to school bus stops and Milton Abbot school.</p> <p>3. New developments do not rely on on-road parking but provide enough off-road parking spaces to ensure that pressure on existing parking is not increased.</p> <p>New housing needs to include a minimum of two off-road parking spaces for dwellings with 1 or 2 bedrooms and a minimum of three offroad parking spaces for dwellings with 3 bedrooms. Off-</p> | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | <p>road parking spaces are in addition to garages, if present, and should be constructed of permeable materials to reduce the risk of run off flooding. Development that will result in the loss of public car parking should not normally be permitted unless suitable alternative provision can be made.</p> | | | |
| | <p>Policy 6-1. Affordable Housing The MACK Plan area is bereft of suitable affordable homes; this must be addressed</p> | <p>I would suggest the opening statement is qualified by adding “...any future appropriate development...”.</p> | | <p>Amended</p> <p>Amended</p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>during any future development.</p> <p>1 All future development will need to provide affordable housing either onsite or through a financial contribution.</p> <p>2 Any development must provide at least 30% Affordable Housing.</p> <p>3 Affordable housing should be provided in perpetuity, where feasible, for example, through a Community Land Trust or other community housing scheme / mechanism which retains stock for the benefit of the local community at an accessible</p> | <p>Criterion 1 I would again suggest qualification “....All future appropriate development....”</p> <p>Criterion 2 JLP Policy DEV8 already contains this requirement it needn’t be repeated.</p> <p>Criterion 3 No need for “...where feasible...” since this Policy applies to affordable housing that is provided. The Plan omits to make reference to JLP Policy TTV27 which allows for the potential for “exception sites” to contribute towards fulfilling affordable housing need. I would suggest this Policy is considered in the light of prevailing circumstances in the MACK area and a Policy potentially included that takes account of any issues specific to the MACK area. Most NPs have done this or are doing this.</p> | | <p style="color: red;">Deleted</p> <p style="color: red;">Deleted</p> <p style="color: red;">We considered “exception sites” but did not consider them feasible as sufficient sites exist that would return affordable homes</p> |
|--|---|--|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| | <p>cost. Community housing schemes will be supported.</p> | | | |
| | <p>Policy 6-2. Housing Density and Design</p> <p>Residential development across the MACK Plan area should be supported provided:</p> <p>1.It is of a density that reflects the rural nature of the area, giving an impression of space and avoiding uniform house and plot layouts. In line with WDBC Strategic Policy 6 (Density of Housing Development) Milton Abbot and Chillaton have a strongly defined low density</p> | <p>Criterion 1: Inclusion of this criterion requires a level of local supporting evidence.</p> | | <p style="color: red;">Evidence provided through Reg 14 responses.</p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>meet or exceed the minimum space standards for new property sizes as set out by the Royal Institute of British Architects (ref RIBA 'Case for Space').</p> <p>4. That developments of 10 houses or more present a demonstrable return for the community in terms of delivering affordable homes, village green spaces and/or additional community amenities.</p> <p>5. That proposed developments of up to 10 houses are within, or</p> | <p>village green spaces/community amenities should be qualified by “where appropriate”.</p> <p>Criterion 5 I am unsure what this criterion is trying to achieve. Development outside the settlement boundary should be covered by a Policy which relates to JLP Policy TTV 27 (see comment on Policy 6.1). If you fulfil the JLP Indicative requirement, as you propose to do, why mention developments of greater than 10 within the settlement boundary?</p> <p>Criterion 6 I suggest in terms of both sentences add in “where appropriate”.</p> | | <p>Reference to affordable homes removed, where appropriate added.</p> <p>The requirement for 20 houses is only the current requirement. This document covers the next 2 decades throughout which the JLP (and therefore any future housing requirements) may change.</p> <p>Where appropriate added</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--------------------------|
| | <p>adjacent to, existing/proposed village boundaries seek to deliver on improving sustainability and help maintain or enhance the sense of community</p> <p>6. Building styles, design, materials and roofscape are in keeping with the individual character and reflect the local distinctiveness of the plan area, making a contribution to the rural nature of the area. Development should also preserve, enhance and promote the established building</p> | <p>Criterion 7 Unsure of what is meant by “front approach”.</p> | | <p>Explanation added</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--------------------------|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | <p>characteristics so as to avoid an excessive variety of building formats.</p> <p>7. New properties are designed to relate well to one another, as well as to existing adjacent buildings, being orientated to the front approach and avoiding extensive blank walls.</p> <p>8. Boundaries are treated sensitively and, where appropriate, hedgerows and Devon hedge walls should form an integral network of native and local species across any</p> | <p>Criterion 9 Suggest “adversely affect” replaces “devaluation”.</p> <p>Criterion 10 Suggest what you are trying to achieve here is more clearly defined. In planning there is no right to a view. I believe you need to separate this into two distinct types of amenity space public and private.</p> | | <p align="center">Amended</p> <p align="center">Amended to read “Any development does not adversely affect the visual amenity or outlook”</p> |
|--|--|--|--|---|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>development promoting natural wildlife corridors.</p> <p>9. The use of above ground cables (power, telephone or internet) is minimised to avoid devaluation of the appearance of a development.</p> <p>10. Any development does not interfere with the visual amenity of existing properties for which the countryside is a tangible extension of their gardens.</p> | | | |
| | <p>Policy 6-3. Amenity Spaces</p> | | | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| | <p>Amenity spaces should be well designed and fit for purpose and therefore;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Any development should include green (softscaped) communal areas designed to promote a sense of place. 2. New dwellings should have a minimum of 60m² of usable private gardens (amenity) space wherever feasible, and; 3. Be practically shaped (preferably rectangular); having a usable area; be accessible and well planned in relation to the | <p>I believe you need to separate this into two distinct types of amenity space public and private.</p> <p>Criterion 1 What exactly do you mean by “sense of place” can you give something more tangible that could be applied when determining a planning application?</p> <p>Criteria 2 and 3 Please look at the North Tawton NP which produced evidence to support their argument for a minimum amount of private amenity space that should accompany private dwellings. In particular ensure the evidence base you have to justify this is adequate. Also look at what the Plymouth and South West Devon JLP: Supplementary Planning Document 2020 says on this to bolster your evidence base.</p> | | <p style="color: red;">Amended to include “ ie local distinctiveness or unique character”</p> <p style="color: red;">Reference to team analysis added. Reference made to SPD Dev 10.5</p> |
|--|---|---|--|---|

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | <p>dwelling living spaces.</p> | | | |
| | <p>Policy 6-4. Our Future Environment</p> <p>All new properties in the MACK Plan area should be constructed in a manner that pre-empts impending changes in regulation i.e. are built for the future. This includes but is not limited to;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. being pre-wired from built for electric car charging 2. avoiding the use of gas or oil central heating, giving preference to electric heating ASHP, GSHP. 3. Using approved | <p>You can encourage development to surpass existing legislation but you cannot insist. Suggest the wording of this Policy reflects this.</p> | | <p align="center">Amended</p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>permeable Parking materials.</p> <p>4. Ensuring roof orientation and structure facilitates solar panel efficiency and solar panels should be installed to all new builds unless there is an insurmountable reason not to.</p> | | | |
| | | <p>4) The Draft Neighbourhood Plan Evidence Base</p> <p>The Evidence Base appears largely to cover all the issues that have been referred to in the Plan. Attention has been drawn to specific Policies identified in Section 2) that need to use appropriate evidence upon which to base the justifications of those Policies.</p> | | <p style="color: red;">Noted</p> |
| | | <p>6) The Structure of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>1) Structure</p> <p>As indicated in the Introduction to this Document your attention is drawn to advice that exceeds the levels of advice required by statute. This Section does that.</p> <p>As such it is simply suggested the NPG considers the structure, set out below, that has been used by Neighbourhood Planning Groups which have successfully progressed to Examination:-</p> | | <p style="color: red;">The Plan has been re formatted to achieve the suggested structure</p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------|
| | | <p>Introduction</p> <p>Vision, Aims and Objectives</p> <p>Policy Most Groups put their policies into separate sections. The commonest policy areas are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing • Environment • Heritage • Sport and Recreation • Community Facilities • Transport and Parking • Employment/Industry/Jobs <p>Plans.....There will be a range of Plans included in your Plan. It is essential, however, that you include a Proposals Map: This should illustrate all the proposals you are putting forward including the Settlement Boundary on an OS Based Plan at a recognised scale that easily legible.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Monitoring</p> | | |
| | | <p>Advice on Policy Content</p> <p>You may wish to order or group differently but generally each section comprises an Introduction then each policy identified is</p> | | <p>Noted</p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|------------------------------|
| | | <p>accompanied by a justification. The examiner will want to see the policies in their own section, clearly identified and justified based on your evidence base. I have used the Policy Section Headings (above) to set out the sorts of policies you should think about including in your Plan and where they should go. You have largely gathered all the information required and have, in the current Plan, a good basis to move forward. This advice, therefore, is intended to assist you in revising the Plan in a fashion that will assist you progressing to Examination. Some of the comments below repeat advice already provided in Section 2 of this document.</p> | | |
| | | <p>• Housing</p> <p>1) Housing Allocations: This policy should identify the sites you are allocating for housing. These sites should be included on the Proposals Map. See comments on 7 Consideration of Sites (Where to Build) Pages 55-63.</p> <p>2) Design of Development: Usually a criteria based policy setting out design standards and issues that should be taken into account by developers on new development sites.</p> <p>3) Exceptions Sites: I have made reference in the above text for the need to consider a Policy based on JLP Policy TTV27 that takes account of local circumstances relating to the MACK Plan Area.</p> <p>4) Car Parking: See comments elsewhere on the approach towards this Policy. If you seek variation from the standards identified in the JLP/SDP this should be evidenced and justified.</p> <p>5) Settlement Boundary: You should full justify the boundary you have identified in the text of the Plan and identify it on the Proposals Map. See comments on 7 Consideration of Sites (Where to Build) Pages 55-63.</p> | | <p>New Policy introduced</p> |
| | | <p>• Environment</p> | | |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>1) Allocated Local Green Space should be identified on the Proposals Map. This is here for completeness, I understand LGS will not be included in this Plan.</p> <p>2) Biodiversity: A Policy that protects and enhances biodiversity should be included.</p> <p>3) You include a policy regarding carbon friendly development in the current version of the Plan. Bear in mind there are existing national standards for construction etc. Your policy should therefore aimed at encouraging such standards being exceeded.</p> <p>4) Some NPGs have identified local views that should be protected. The evidence here should be photographic and concentrate on the significant/ important views. These should be illustrated on the Proposals Map.</p> | | <p>Noted</p> <p>A Biodiversity policy has been included Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> |
| | | <p>• Heritage</p> <p>1) Where there are Conservation Areas these should be identified in the Plan and a policy or policies that guide development in them (it) identified.</p> <p>2) You may want to include a policy that protects protected heritage features. Usually National and Local Policies are sufficient but you can bring local issues of importance into greater definition if this is necessary.</p> <p>3) You have not identified non designated heritage buildings/features nor a policy to protect and enhance. You may want to have a separate Policy for this if you decide to identify. See comments above on Section 5. Our Built Environment, Pages 27-29</p> | | <p>Noted</p> <p>Policy introduced</p> <p>Now included</p> |
| | | <p>• Community Facilities/Sports and Recreation</p> <p>1) Most groups identify community/sports and recreation facilities that are important and include policies to guard against their loss. Also suggest a marketing clause which would further</p> | | <p>We have very little by way of community facilities being limited to 2</p> |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | <p>protect against speculative loss. See comments on Policy 5-1, Criterion</p> <p>2) Some Groups have carried out studies of recreation to identify shortfalls in provision and put forward land use proposals to meet the shortfall. If you plan to do this the Council can assist in getting such a study off the ground.</p> | | village halls, an ad hoc play area and an allotment |
| | | <p>● Transport and Parking</p> <p>Most issues relating to matters such as road safety, speed and signage are not considered land use issues and, therefore, cannot be covered by NP Policies. See comments on Section 5.6. Road Safety Page 36-39 1) I have already mentioned car parking for housing under that policy head. If you wish to include parking policies that relate to land uses other than housing then this is where it could be located.</p> | | Noted |
| | | <p>● Employment/Industry/Jobs</p> <p>1) Some Groups have included policies guarding against the loss of employment land or changes of use of existing buildings that provide employment to uses other than employment.</p> | | Policy introduced |
| | | <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>The MACK Neighbourhood Plan seeks to manage development within a sensitive landscape, whilst enabling small-scale organic development that meets the priorities and needs of the local community. The broad aspirations of the plan are largely consistent with adopted and emerging local policy. Whilst it is suggested that that the contents and Policies of the NP are restructured, the Plan's strategy is clear and should form a good basis for preparation of the Regulation 15 Version of the NP.</p> <p>It is apparent that great deal of work has been undertaken to reach this stage of the Neighbourhood Planning process. There</p> | | Plan restructured |

Regulation 14 Consultation Statement: Appendix C Schedule of Comments, Responses and Regulation 14 Plan changes

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|------------------------------|
| | | <p>are, however, amendments necessary to ensure the text clearly evidences the Policies presented. Furthermore a composite Proposals Map should be included in the Plan.</p> <p>WDBC considers that the draft MACK Neighbourhood Plan can be brought into compliance with local policy and national guidance subject to the advice and guidance provided being followed and would welcome dialogue with the NP group to help achieve this.</p> | | <p>Proposal map included</p> |
|--|--|--|--|------------------------------|