

Appendix 2

Relevant Policies in the Adopted
And Emerging Structure Plans

Devon Structure Plan First Review 1995 - 2011

Policies and Proposals Adopted February 1999

Sustainable Development Strategy

Policy S1a

Plymouth and Exeter are defined as Regional Centres which will act as focal points both for new development and the provision of regional services and specialist facilities necessary to meet the needs of their extensive hinterlands.

Barnstaple, Newton Abbot and Torquay are defined as Sub Regional Centres which will complement the role of the Regional Centres by acting as focal points for the provision of new development and major services and facilities within the northern and southern parts of the County.

Policy S1b

Towns that could function as focal points for the provision of local employment opportunities, education facilities and other local services should be identified in Local Plans as Area Centres. Such Centres should

1. be of a sufficient scale to support a range of services and facilities to meet local needs and those of their rural hinterland;
2. be accessible to the communities they serve;
3. be well related to public transport and the High Quality Road Network; and
4. be defined taking into account their location relative to other Area Centres, including those in adjoining Districts.

Policy S1c

The bulk of new development should be accommodated within the Regional Centres of Plymouth and Exeter and their Areas of Economic Activity, the Sub Regional Centres, and the towns of:

- Bideford/Northam
- Exmouth
- Honiton
- Ivybridge
- Okehampton
- Paignton
- Tiverton

Provision for new development should be made at scales and locations that meet transport demands in energy efficient ways, primarily aiming to reduce the need to travel, conserve natural resources of minerals, best and most versatile agricultural land, wildlife and high quality landscape.

Local Centres

Policy S2

Particular rural settlements should be identified in Local Plans as Local Centres. These will form the focal points for a modest scale of development, supporting services and the economic well-being of the hinterland. They should therefore:

5. be accessible to the community they serve and well related to public transport and the highway network; and
6. be defined to ensure that the local needs of all rural areas can be met, taking into account their location relative to other designated Centres, including those in adjoining Districts.

Settlement Self Sufficiency

Policy S5

The self sufficiency of communities should be maintained and enhanced through the provision of a range of local services and facilities. In preparing Local Plans and considering development proposals, local authorities should have regard to the need for community facilities and services, including education, recreation, open space, health and cultural facilities, local shopping facilities, transport infrastructure, employment, housing including affordable housing, and public utilities.

The Urban Environment

Enhancing the Urban Environment

Policy C10

In prioritising initiatives for urban regeneration and enhancement, particular emphasis should be placed on the needs of:

7. the inner areas of the Regional and Sub-Regional Centres;
8. Area Centres or resorts adversely affected by the decline in the traditional tourism industry; and
9. Area Centres which have experienced a relative decline in their general vitality and viability.

Housing Provision

Distribution of Housing

Policy H3

In providing for residential development Local Plans should have regard to the role of the settlement as set out in Policies S1a, 1b, 1c and S2 and the county-wide development strategy. In villages other than Local Centres and in all the settlements in the National Parks, provision for new residential development should only be made where it would help to meet local social or economic needs and be on a scale in keeping with the size and character of the settlement, and the rural character of the surrounding area.

Policies and Proposals for Adoption

(Recommended by the Devon Structure Plan Joint Committee on 10 May 2004)

With reference to the Policies ST5, ST9, ST15, ST16, ST21 the wording agreed by the Structure Plan Joint Committee on 10 May 2004 and recommended to the Structure Plan Authorities for adoption is set out as follows.

Development Priority 2001 to 2016

Policy ST5 (Policy S1c revised)

The Principal Urban Areas of Plymouth, Exeter, and Torbay will be the primary focus for strategic development, while the Sub Regional Centres of Newton Abbot and Barnstaple should be a focus for balanced development to meet sub regional needs.

Area Centres in Devon should seek to achieve a balance of economic, housing and other development which will promote a high degree of self containment and vitality while helping to meet the needs of the wider rural community.

In Local Centres development should be limited to that required to meet local needs and promote rural regeneration, where this can be accommodated without generating unnecessary travel.

In the open countryside, development should be strictly controlled.

Amendment to Explanatory Text

Delete Table 1: Area Centres as defined in Local Plans

Explain that the definition of Principal Urban Areas relates to the existing built up area and its definition on the Key Diagram has no direct policy implication.

Barnstaple Sub Regional Centre

Policy ST9 (Policy S1a revised)

Within northern Devon provision should be made for a balance of economic investment and additional housing to meet the needs of the area. In doing so, the main focus of development will be at Barnstaple, which should maintain and develop its role as a sub regional centre by providing for new development and an increased range of higher order services and facilities. Provision should also be made at Barnstaple for a strategic employment site to accommodate larger scale economic investment. Bideford should meet its own development needs and contribute towards meeting the wider needs of northern Devon.

Amendment to Explanatory Text

a) Clarify that 'at Barnstaple' refers to the Sub Regional Centre as a whole and includes the wider built up area adjoining and in close proximity to Barnstaple.

b) Emphasise that the scale and phasing of new development at Barnstaple will be dependent on the delivery of major new transport and other infrastructure, including the Barnstaple Western Bypass and Downstream Bridge.

Area Centres

Policy ST15 (Policy S1b revised)

Local Plans should identify towns which provide a strategic focus for the provision of local housing and employment opportunities, education facilities and other local services to meet local needs and those of their rural hinterland, and only those needs. Such Area Centres should:

- 1) be of a sufficient scale to support a range of services and facilities**
- 2) be accessible to the communities they serve**
- 3) be well related to public transport and the Strategic Road Network, and**
- 4) be defined taking into account their location relative to other Area Centres, including those in adjoining Districts.**

Area Centres should be the focal points for investment and development necessary to promote rural regeneration and economic restructuring.

Local Centres and Rural Areas

Policy ST16 (Policies S2 and S4 revised)

Within the rural areas, Local Plans should identify certain villages as Local Centres, which can complement the role of the Area Centres by acting as a focus for essential facilities within rural communities - including affordable housing, small scale employment and other local services. These Local Centres should therefore:

- 1) be accessible to the community they serve and well related to public transport and the highway network, and**
- 2) be defined to ensure that the local needs of all rural areas can be met, taking into account their location relative to other designated Centres, including those in adjoining Districts.**

Outside of the Local Centres, there may be scope for small scale development which supports the need for local regeneration where it recognises landscape and accessibility constraints and overall spatial strategy.

Regeneration Priority

Policy ST21 (Policy C10 revised)

In considering initiatives for economic and social regeneration priority should be given to:

- 1) those parts of the Principal Urban Areas and the Sub Regional Centres which suffer from social exclusion and economic deprivation**
- 2) the tourist resorts of Ilfracombe, Teignmouth, Dawlish, Seaton and Westward Ho! which have experienced significant decline in economic vitality and viability,**
- 3) those Area Centres and their associated hinterlands where a specific need for regeneration has been identified to address environmental, social or economic disadvantage."**

Amendment to Explanatory Text

Add additional text to emphasise that the priorities within Policy ST21 are in order of importance, and to include reference to the wider regeneration context, including rural regeneration, and Policies ST15 and ST16.

Appendix 3

Information Sheet
Market and Coastal Towns Initiative
For the South West

Appendix 4

Demands for Land at
Pathfields Business Park

Appendix 5

Population and Employment Statistics For South Molton

Appendix 6

Travel to Work Indicators

Appendix 7

Extract from Inspectors Report –
North Devon Local Plan Inquiry
Land at Station Road/Parsonage Lane

APPENDIX 7

36.2 Proposal SM1

| | | |
|--------------------------|---------|--|
| <i>Objection</i> | 022-1 | <i>Mr A Chapman</i> |
| | 029-1 | <i>Ms V Hooton & Mr J Harrison</i> |
| | 030-1 | <i>Mr D White</i> |
| | 075-1 | <i>W J Channing & Sons</i> |
| | 075-2 | " |
| | 075-3 | " |
| | 154-5 | <i>J W Sharman Ltd</i> |
| | 163-9 | <i>Lady Wrey</i> |
| | 167-37 | <i>Devon County Council</i> |
| | 168-84 | <i>Government Office for the South West(C)</i> |
| | 169-119 | <i>Toller Beattie Solicitors</i> |
| | 169-122 | <i>Toller Beattie Solicitors</i> |
| | | |
| <i>Proposed Change</i> | AP 36.1 | |
| | AP 36.2 | |
| | | |
| <i>Counter objection</i> | 169-178 | <i>Toller Beattie Solicitors</i> |
| | 169-179 | " " |

Objection issue

36.2.1 Objection to further, excessive development which would damage the character of the town, while existing sites remain undeveloped. Having regard to the past slow build rates, there is an unreasonable expectation that additional sites will be required during this plan-period, particularly as the promotion of housing growth relies upon a high risk strategy of continuing employment growth (022-1, 030-1, 030-2, 163-9, 154-5). Objection to the allocation of sites which are not freely available, unlike land to the west (075-2 & 075-3). Land up to Deershill Lane should be allocated (169-122, 169-178, 168-179). The policy contains unjustified, inflexible requirements and conflicts with Circular 16/91 (168-84). It also fails to mention contributions towards education and library facilities (167-37).

Reasoning & Conclusions

36.2.2 The Structure Plan identifies the town as an Area Centre where population and economic growth is to be directed and encouraged. This strategy seeks to provide for growth in a sustainable manner, rather than a continuation of the historic dispersed pattern of development. The level of growth is, however, a matter for this Plan and has been set by the Council at about 750 additional dwellings during the plan-period.

36.2.3 The Plan indicates that the majority of the sites required are already allocated in the adopted local plan, committed or developed. The deposit Plan therefore identifies land for an additional 300 dwellings, although only 222 are needed to meet the Council's apportionment of the structure plan target. This over-allocation of about 10% would, the Council maintain, provide a choice and range of sites.

36.2.4 The general strategy has previously undergone scrutiny and is accepted by the County and District Councils as part of the wider Regional and Sub-regional planning framework. Account has already been taken of the implications for car commuting, in terms of the impact upon the travel to work patterns and the concentration of development along transport corridors. Thus further commentary

upon these strategic arguments would not be appropriate. However, bearing in mind the lack of building progress within the town on those sites allocated in the adopted plan and on derelict sites within the urban area, there is understandable concern that further allocations should not be made during this plan period.

36.2.5 The Council accepts that there are a number of previously allocated sites which may come forward for development and which could meet any demand arising during the remaining plan-period based on past build rates. I share the view that there is no reasonable expectation that all the allocated sites will be built-out by the end of 2001 and that there is a risk that the larger greenfield sites will be 'cherry picked' in preference to other sites.

36.2.6 Concern has also been expressed that employment growth relies upon a high risk strategy dependent upon a small number of firms. It is suggested that this should reduce demand for housing. However, I find no compelling reasons to cast doubt upon the Council's longer term expectations that the employment strategy, supported by various funding mechanisms and the completion of the North Devon Link Road, will fail to materialise. Nevertheless, I share objector's views that unless the new housing is employment led, or at least in balance, the development of South Molton would be unsustainable and lead to greater car commuting.

36.2.7 I am aware of criticism of the Council's selection of housing sites process, but it appears to have followed appropriate consultation exercises and been conducted upon a rational basis. I find no reason to doubt the propriety of those members of the Town Council, who were involved in the decision making process. The process sought to identify the town's main topographical and transportation constraints, and expressed a desire to satisfactorily integrate land uses wherever possible. The Plan repeats the town's western boundary indicated in the 1990 adopted local plan. To the north, concern for the retention of the east-west ridge and the separation with the industrial area influenced selection choices.

36.2.8 The allocation of any additional land for housing represents a balancing of competing demands and objectives. Only two of the sites listed in Policy SM1 are in fact new allocations (sites f & g). The remainder are brought forward from the 1990 local plan, and I find no compelling reasons why they should not be included in this Plan, although I consider that the Plan should highlight the need for development briefs to ensure that boundaries with the countryside are well defined.

36.2.9 Proposed changes AP 36.1 & 36.2 would overcome the objection that the policy includes unjustified, inflexible requirements and that developer contributions would be sought beyond the scope of the current circular advice (Circ.1/97). It would be inappropriate to include within the policy a "shopping list" of facilities towards which contributions would be sought, without regard to whether they would be related in scale and nature to the development proposed. This matter is also addressed in respect of Policy DCF1 and at Policy SM17 & SM18.

36.2.10 The largest new greenfield site to be proposed in the Plan is SM1(g), lying between Parsonage Lane and Station Road. Comprising undulating pasture with no clear northern boundary, this would extend the built-up area into the countryside, but would not breach the east-west ridge to a material degree. Unlike land to its north and south, the allocated site is not of high agricultural land quality. Moreover, whilst recognising the hilly and sometimes narrow characteristics of the roads, given its proximity to the town centre and to the industrial areas to the north, I share the Council's view that the site represents a well placed housing site.

36.2.11 I am aware of the constraints relating to the ownership of the site access, but do not consider that this need represent such a fundamental obstacle

that the land's allocation would be unrealistic. As to concerns that any housing development would be out of keeping with that adjoining, it is clear that the sloping nature of the land would pose different design problems, than on flatter land to the west of the town and involve significant highway works. Although representing an attractive system of valleys and rolling slopes, there is no reason to conclude that detailed design would be unable to address these matters to provide an appropriate interface and gradation of densities, a variety of house types and a firm boundary to the countryside to the north.

36.2.12 Nevertheless, the site is open countryside beyond the existing urban area. Bearing in mind the Government's objective of encouraging the reuse of developed land within urban areas before further encroachments are permitted, the allocation of this site should be supported by justifiable reasons. Likewise, the larger part of the proposed allocation SM1(f) is a greenfield site leading up to the east-west ridge. Its development would have a limited impact upon the surrounding countryside and I note that the Council expect its development to bring much needed highway benefits to Gunswell Lane. As such, provided the need for housing land is justified, this too would represent an acceptable site.

36.2.13 Several objectors suggest that land to the south of Deershill Lane should be allocated for housing. However, this land's development would conflict with the objective of safeguarding the east-west ridge line and would visually intrude into the countryside to the north of the town. I find no reasons to disagree with the appeal decisions relating to the eastern-most site in this regard. I do not consider that the alleged highway benefits would outweigh this harm.

36.2.14 Land to the west of the town has also been suggested as suitable for housing in addition to that currently allocated. However, this would represent a major incursion into the countryside, which would be unconstrained by natural or man-made features. Moreover, the land is classified as the "best and most versatile" agricultural land, which should be developed only if lower grade land was unavailable. In addition, housing development would be some considerable distance from the town's main employment area and the town centre facilities. This would tend to encourage cross or in-town car usage. I therefore regard further development in this direction less suitable than the sites SM1(g) and (f).

36.2.15 I am well aware of the Council's objectives of promoting South Molton as an Area Centre, in accordance with the Structure Plan strategy and diverting development pressure away from Barnstaple. I am also mindful of the need to provide sites of a suitable size to enable the thresholds relating to affordable housing provision to be triggered. However, bearing in mind the lack of building progress so far during this plan-period, the ample supply of building land already allocated or capable of redevelopment within the urban area which offer a range of building opportunities, I find no sound reasons to support the over-provision made in the Plan. Moreover, given these factors, I find insufficient justification for supporting further the encroachment into the surrounding countryside during this plan-period. Accordingly, I recommend the deletion of SM1(g) and the northern part of SM1(f).

RECOMMENDATION

36.2.16 I RECOMMEND THAT THE PLAN BE MODIFIED IN ACCORD WITH PROPOSED CHANGES AP 36.1 & 2, EXCEPT THOSE PARTS RELATING TO THAT PART OF SM1(f) TO THE NORTH OF GUNSWELL LANE AND TO SM1(g) WHICH SHOULD BE DELETED. PARAGRAPH 8.11 OF THE PLAN SHOULD BE MODIFIED ACCORDINGLY.

Appendix 8

Employment Land Allocations
and Commitments at
Pathfields Business Park, South Molton

APPENDIX 8
Employment Land Commitments at
Pathfields Business Park, South Molton

| Application No. | Site | Description |
|------------------------|---------------------|---|
| 35605 | FR-HITEMP | ERECTION OF B1, B2 & B8 FACTORY & OFFICE BUILDINGS WITH CAR PARKING & LORRY SERVICING AREA INCLUDING ACCESSES, DRAINAGE, SERVICES & SITE FENCING (AMENDED DESCRIPTION) |
| 37348 | FR-HITEMP | ERECTION OF B1, B2 & B8 FACTORY & OFFICE BUILDINGS WITH CAR PARKING & LORRY SERVICING AREA INCLUDING ACCESSES, DRAINAGE, SERVICES & SITE FENCING |
| 31270 | Mole Valley Farmers | ERECTION OF BUILDINGS FOR RETAIL, STORAGE & OFFICE USE & CONSTRUCTION OF NEW ACCESS ROAD |
| 33580 | RGB | ERECTION OF OFFICES, BUILDERS MERCHANTS DEPOT & YARD & CHANGE OF USE OF LINHAY BUILDING TO FORM RECORDS STORE TOGETHER WITH ERECTION OF 16 NO. INDUSTRIAL STARTER UNITS, ACCESS ROADS, SEWERS AND CAR PARKING |
| 36846 | RGB | ERECTION OF OFFICES, BUILDERS MERCHANTS & INDUSTRIAL UNITS INCLUDING ACCESS ROADS, SERVICES & PARKING PLUS CHANGE OF USE OF LINHAY FOR STORAGE (REVISED APPLICATION TO PLANNING CONSENT 33580) (AMENDED PLAN) |
| 30781 | Land at Pathfields | APPROVAL OF DETAILS IN RESPECT OF JOINERY WORKSHOP (AMENDED PLAN) |
| 33679 | Plot 5, Pathfields | DEVELOPMENT OF INDUSTRIAL UNITS CLASSES B1 B2 & B8 |
| 32762 | Land at Pathfields | FORMATION OF LORRY PARK & COAL DEPOT |
| 33638 | Plot 3A, Pathfields | ERECTION OF NEW INDUSTRIAL UNIT |
| 29479 | Land at Pathfields | ERECTION OF LIGHT INDUSTRIAL UNIT (AMENDED PLANS) |
| 32621 | Land at Pathfields | ERECTION OF LIGHT INDUSTRIAL BUILDING FOR USE AS MAIL SORTING OFFICE & FOR CLASS B1, B2 & B8 USES |
| 31459 | Land at Pathfields | ERECTION OF INDUSTRIAL UNIT & ASSOCIATED OFFICE |