

IVYBRIDGE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

KEY ISSUES FOR THE STEERING GROUP – 25th May 2016

ISSUE	RECOMMENDATION
<p>OBJECTIVES</p> <p>1. New key objectives at para 3.4 (distilled from focus groups' aspirations)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree the new objectives.
<p>BRAND</p> <p>2. Consider whether to add a 'brand' for the town as SHDC suggest.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views in the town vary widely. To adopt a brand as part of the plan at this stage could complicate things. No brand.
<p>MAPPING</p> <p>3. Should the town centre area include Stowford Mill or not.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new development at Stowford Mill is approved. It doesn't need to be a part of the defined town centre in order to proceed or succeed. Exclude.
<p>HOUSING</p> <p>1. Should INP2 (east of the river) also propose housing?</p> <p>2. Should INP3 and 4 (Glanville's Mill and North of Fore St) require housing (as they appear to)?</p> <p>4. Does INP6 (Housing and Employment) add anything? Should it be deleted?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SG considered this at length. Housing is neither proposed nor precluded. No change. • To require housing has the potential to enhance viability and bring community life into the town centre. No change. • SG requested a housing policy since they felt the plan was missing something without one. It adds nothing new, but can be left for the examiner to weigh up. No change.
<p>TRANSPORT</p> <p>5. Is it realistic that INP7 (Traffic and movement) requires delivery of the transport solution by a set time?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It must be acknowledged that the target given is unrealistic. The policy is strongly challenged. Removing the target may make the policy more defensible. Remove.
<p>MONITORING</p> <p>6. Agree the monitoring framework which has been added as Appendix D.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree monitoring framework.