

IVYBRIDGE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
MAIN CHANGES AND ISSUES FOLLOWING CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT PLAN
KEY ITEMS FOR THE STEERING GROUP

May 2016

FOR THE STEERING GROUP TO DECIDE

- a) The focus groups' aspirations have been distilled into key objectives for the plan (para 3.4). These need to be agreed by the group.
- b) SHDC suggest that the plan could be enhanced to include building a 'brand' for the town. Is this a job for the plan? Does the group wish to take this forward?
- c) Consultation responses question the wide extent of the town centre area. Should it include the northern extension to Stowford Mill? The planning consent will secure appropriate development of that site. Extending the town centre area so far may dilute the effective regeneration of the central area.
- d) Responses, including comments from SHDC at the meeting on 7th April 2016, raise questions about the housing elements of policies INP2, INP3 and INP4.

INP2: SHDC officers (unfamiliar with the background) query why housing isn't included.

INP3 and 4: In these policies the wording appears to require housing as part of the mixed uses. Is this intended?

- e) At the meeting on 7th April 2016 SHDC officers questioned the need for policy INP6. The policy was included at the steering group's request, but really only repeats the requirements of existing policies in other plans. Similar points are made by Gladman and Hannick Homes. It neither adds to nor undermines other policies. Should it be deleted?
- f) Consultation responses strongly challenge the realism of requiring delivery of the preferred transport solution by 2021. Should this be deleted, altered or remain unchanged?
- g) A monitoring framework has been added as Appendix D, to enable the effectiveness of the plan's policies to be monitored. This needs to be agreed by the group.

FOR THE STEERING GROUP'S INFORMATION

- 1. The plan period is to 2031 or later (to match whatever is finally chosen for SHDC's 'Our Plan').
- 2. For added clarity a new section is added: 'How does the plan relate to other plans for the area?' (paras 1.12 – 1.14).
- 3. Population figure is updated to 2011 Census (para 2.5).
- 4. Ivybridge Community College specialisms updated (para 2.8).
- 5. The plan now makes it clear that it neither constrains development already proposed in adopted plans nor restrains future growth which might be needed. (para 4.3 and elsewhere).
- 6. It will be necessary to try to ensure that the plan is accurate in the way it reflects the current planning situation at the time it goes to print. For example, particularly in relation to the leisure and health hub (para 4.5 and elsewhere).

7. The plan now makes it clear that its shopping policies are not intended to prevent the provision of small scale neighbourhood shops (para 4.6).
8. Policies are reworded (to varying degrees) to make them sharper and stronger, primarily in line with helpful suggestions from SHDC. Their essential aims and content are basically unaltered.
9. Policy INP1 (town centre regeneration) now specifies that the reversal of traffic in Fore Street will mean a flow from west to east. This measure is now included as one of the initiatives that development should support, since traffic management measures cannot be a development plan proposal in their own right. Specific reference to “changes of use” is deleted since these are a from of development and therefore already covered.
10. Policy INP2 (east of the river) now requires development to accord to a previously approved master-plan.
11. Policies INP2 (east of the river) and INP3 (Glanvilles Mill) now include a requirement for improved resistance and resilience to flood risk.
12. Policy INP5 (community facilities) now requires development to contribute to provision or enhancement of facilities in line with “adopted standards and local priorities”. This aims to overcome any risk of conflict between local priorities and the requirements of statutory providers, giving scope for negotiation.
13. Policy INP7 is re-ordered to more closely follow the same pattern as other policies in the plan.
14. Policy INP8 (historic and natural environment) now requires that new development should not damage but enhance the Erme's ecological status.

C:\Users\Lee\Documents\Lee's work\INP\steering group meetings\16.05.06 key matters for SG decisions.doc