

Hello Tim

I have now received comments on your draft NP back from Phil Baker who is one of our senior planning policy officers. He has added comments within the text of your PDF – attached. I have also added a few of my own. I hope you find this an easy way to view comments, but do let me know if not.

In general terms I would like to say that it is evident how much work has gone into the draft NP and I found it well written with some thorough supporting text. The use of maps, spatial diagrams and photos is particularly well done.

There are some areas of concern where further work would be beneficial. Key points are:

- 1) The plan is currently lacking any stated objectives. It is extremely helpful to identify a list of objectives that arise from your vision and set out in more detail what the plan seeks to achieve. Policies can then be judged according to how they will help to deliver these objectives, and this in turn will help the monitoring and review of your NP. See <http://mycommunity.org.uk/resources/how-to-develop-a-vision-and-objectives/> for more information on developing objectives.
- 2) The NPPF and national government guidance require that planning policy is written in positive terms, avoiding overly restrictive negative wording. Some of your policy could do with reviewing in the light of this. See [http://www.ourneighbourhoodplanning.org.uk/storage/resources/documents/How\\_to\\_write\\_planning\\_policies.pdf](http://www.ourneighbourhoodplanning.org.uk/storage/resources/documents/How_to_write_planning_policies.pdf) for guidance on writing policies.
- 3) You identify a preferred site but don't actually include an allocation policy for this site. This policy needs to state that the preferred site is allocated for housing development, and include the relevant criteria that you have identified, including a maximum total number of dwellings, the expected level of affordable housing (in line with JLP policy – 30% for developments over 10 dwellings), design and access criteria as appropriate and any related infrastructure that development of the site will make necessary and that it can be reasonably expected to deliver through a Section 106 agreement. These things are all identified in the plan but need pulling together into one allocation policy. (You should then find that putting them in other policies is not necessary)
- 4) You have carried out some site assessment work to evidence the choice of your preferred site. This is good, although you may need some further landscape assessment on the preferred site given its location in the AONB. I would suggest discussing this with AECOM in conjunction with the SEA work. I understand that you are carrying out some further consultation on the choice of preferred site – make sure that this is captured either within the site assessment notes or within the Consultation Statement (preferably both!).
- 5) You are producing your plan at a time when District policy is in the process of changing which makes life more complicated for you. It's understandable therefore that this version of your plan references Core Strategy policy and supporting evidence. However, I think you are aware that the draft Joint Local Plan is now out on consultation (<http://plymouth.objective.co.uk/portal/planning/jlp/>), and supporting evidence has been updated (<http://web.plymouth.gov.uk/homepage/environmentandplanning/planning/planningpolicy/plymouthplan/ppevidencebase.htm>). Your NP should be referencing this given the likely similar timeframes for adoption, although I don't believe it will cause any compliance issues.

I hope you find these comments helpful, and apologise once again that you did not receive them earlier in the process. (I imagine that you may already have some of the above issues in hand, given that you have been continuing work on your plan since this version was published.)

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like to discuss any of the issues raised further.