

**RESPONSE TO WDBC'S COMMENTS ON THE REGULATION 15 MACK PLAN**

**Comment:** Para 1.1.0.2: Attribute quote: see Reg 14 comment on Page 5, para 1.1.0.2.

**Response.** Quote already attributed as requested at Reg 14 and made clearer at Reg 15, footnote 1 refers.

**Comment: Para 1.1.0.3:** Remove reference to West Devon Core Strategy. This has been replaced by the JLP

**Response:** Reference will be removed.

**Comment:** Para 4.4.2 Reword: "The MACK Group voluntarily undertook Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitat Regulations Assessment (Appropriate Assessment). These were carried out by AECOM and are included as Appendices."

**Response:** This paragraph has already been reworded at the request of the BC. Wording will be further updated.

**Paras 5.1.13.** As per comments on Reg 14 comment at 5.1.0.11 the whole list of Grade II assets should be included. I am content these are contained in an Appendix to the Plan

**Response:** As per discussion at Reg 14 and Reg 15, there is a contradiction here. On the one hand saying that the list should be included and on the other saying that an appendix is acceptable. As stated at our response to Reg 14 and 15, these are already included as an appendix.

**Comment:** Para 5.1.19: The Development Management process will determine where it is necessary to consult Historic England. This will not necessarily apply to all development proposals.

**Response:** We have not mandated that consultation with HE is required. Rather, following lengthy discussions with HE we have expressed a preference that HE are consulted "...any development plan is encouraged to include formal consultation with Historic England".

**Comment: 7.5:** The Council made the following comments at Regulation 14:-  
*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.*

Although the wording does not appear in Policy, I would suggest its inclusion as currently worded could be misleading.

**Response:** The NP does not cover the single development included therein, rather it is a standing document representing the future aims and aspirations of our community. Para 7.5.1 and 7.5.2 are paraphrased from current guidance whilst 7.5.3 and 7.5.4 contain community feedback on the types of projects that they feel would make future development acceptable.

In relation to the proposed development, as the BC is aware, we have had a number of discussion on the subject with the developer and these have been “agreed” and included within Policy 9.6

Policy/Text	Comments	Response
<b>Policy 4-2. Environmental Considerations</b>	<b>Suggest rewording the first sentence....</b> "The MACK Plan supports and encourages all new development to be" ..... <b>constructed....etc.</b>	Accepted
<b>Policy 6 -1. Promoting Employment</b> <b>6.1a Loss of existing employment facilities</b>	<b>Policy 6-a: Bullet Point 1: It would be unreasonable to insist that replacement facilities be provided elsewhere in the MACK area.</b>  <b>Policy 6.b: Suggest a set of criteria against which development will be gauged would add clarity to this Policy.</b>	At the outset we were advised to consider other Neighbourhood Plans that had already been adopted and use these to gain inspiration, guidance and to benchmark our own developing Plan. This we did and this particular Policy already exists in "Made" Plans within the WDBC (Bigbury Policy 'BP8 - Existing and Proposed Employment' for instance).  Noted. The team will await further input from the Examiner before opting to define any further criteria.
<b>Policy 7-1. Sustaining Local Infrastructure</b>	<b>Bullet Point 1: The Development Management Checklist determines what must be submitted with specific planning applications. This bullet point should be removed.</b>	Accepted

<p><b>Policy 7-2. Community Facilities</b></p>	<p><b>It is assumed that the list of community facilities listed under 7.3 are those which Policy 7.2 seeks to protect if so then the list should be included in the Policy itself.</b></p>	<p>The list will be transferred to within the policy.</p>
<p><b>Policy 9-2 Q Class Development for Residential Purposes</b></p>	<p><b>Class Q development is permitted development. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot include policy requirements beyond those set by Central Government. As such this Policy should be removed from the NP.</b></p>	<p>Our Plan and Policies introduce a local dimension to existing regulations where Q Class developments have had a significant impact on our rural communities with landowners regularly perceived as “exploring the boundaries” of the regulation. These are often seen to progress simply for use as second homes or holiday lets and do little to address the local housing need.</p> <p>We consider that the 2 instances introduced in Policy 9-2 are not specifically covered in the regulation but are supportive of its intent.</p> <p>In addition, at the outset we were advised to consider other Neighbourhood Plans that had already been adopted and use these to gain inspiration, guidance and to benchmark our own developing Plan. This we did and this particular Policy already exists in “Made” Plans (Bigbury Policy BP10 – Conversion of Farm and Rural Buildings for Residential Purposes, for instance).</p>

<p><b>Policy 9-3. Housing Density and Design</b></p>	<p><b>Bullet Point 4: See comments on Para 7.5 above. It was suggested that particularly with reference to contributions towards community facilities that justification is provided. This is not apparent from the accompanying text.</b></p> <p><b>Bullet Point 5: Lacks clarity in terms of what is being sought. See Regulation 14 comments</b></p>	<p>As a rural community we are woefully short of amenities and resources and this was highlighted throughout our community engagement. As such it was imperative that we addressed this within our plan to make any development acceptable. Additional community benefits are therefore explored in some detail at paragraph 7-5. Additional Community Funding.</p> <p>Clearly we cannot list within a Policy what such requests might actually be as each instance would be wholly dependent on the details of any specific application whilst remaining within the guidance of current regulation.</p>
<p><b>Policy 9-5. Settlement Boundary</b></p>	<p><b>I would suggest this portion of the Policy marked in red removed from this location and relocated in Bullet Point 2 of Policy 9.1.</b></p> <p><b>Suggest the penultimate sentence begins..."Inappropriate development...etc"</b></p>	<p>Accepted</p>