

## NP Report for PC – January 2020

A letter from Mr Dixon in response to the word change proposals for policies SNP8 and SNP9 in SNP was received during the Christmas holiday.

In the letter Mr Dixon acknowledges the revised wording proposals provide his clients with an opportunity for further discussions to take place.

Mr Dixon continues to have viability concerns with CFF site despite the majority of the word changes reflecting those submitted by Mr Dixon. In particular, the proposed car park and the number of second homes with a residency restriction.

Mr Dixon has also requested details of likely conditions and costs that might be applied by SHDC in connection with development in CFF. In particular, education, leisure and recreation facilities as well as Section 106 conditions.

SHDC have replied with the following:

*Normally a scheme such as this would include the 106 obligations:*

- 1) *i) Education infrastructure contributions if there is no capacity in local schools  
ii) Education transport to school contribution  
Devon County Council (education Authority) determine the amounts.  
Please contact Mark Andrews at DCC to obtain details.*
- 2) *Contributions towards open space, sport a recreation dependent on what is proposed to be provided on site and adequacy of local facilities – Amount is currently calculated based on adopted OSSR SPD (approx. £900 per bed space if full amount is required....and commonly it is), however the emerging SPD has a new formula for calculating payments*
- 3) *Management company for POS and SUDs in public areas*
- 4) *It is likely (but not certain) that a site like this would need a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP)– the content of which would normally be agreed by condition – but is likely to contain recommendations about future management of public landscaped areas, hedgerow boundaries etc to maximise biodiversity and landscape benefits – the on-going implementation of such a plan is usually ensured by a 106 Obligation.*

*You should also factor in a likely requirement for natural slate roofs given the site's location.*

Mr Dixon has also requested that the whole of CFF site be included in the plan and that agreed wording be included in policy SNP8 to support this.

In reply it has been suggested that the eventual policy to reflect that development can be accommodated within the whole of CFF site without necessarily including all of the land in the built development seems reasonable. In addition, Mr Dixon has been informed that it should be borne in mind that the areas to the west of the site have been precluded from the

plan as a result of concerns from Historic England and others during the consultation period. It will be necessary, therefore, to ensure that any proposal for this larger area is worded in the Plan to meet those concerns and be agreed before inclusion.

A formal request has been submitted to Deborah McCann, the Examiner, requesting approval for and extension to the examination suspension period until the end of April 2020 to enable Mr Dixon sufficient time to undertake a detailed viability analysis on the policy word change proposals submitted.

Support for the proposed viability analysis process together with the objective of enabling the examination process to resume asap has been confirmed to the Examiner.

Confirmation of this extension was received on Monday 13<sup>th</sup> January 2020.

In correspondence received this week from Mr Dixon he has subsequently requested that further revised wording be submitted in respect of widening the CFF site to include those areas within the Conservation Area to avoid further delay for consideration of the revised plan.

Mr Dixon has been asked to undertake his viability assessment based on the changes and potential cost implications he has received before further changes to the plan are submitted for consideration.

If CFF site is widened to include the areas within the Conservation Area I have been advised that the current examination would need to be cancelled.

To continue, the plan would have to be re-drafted to include all the changes, including a revised site plan, that would then be subject to another Regulation 15 consultation period of 6 weeks.

Whilst this is exasperating for all involved, to achieve an end result, it is currently recommended that negotiations with Mr Dixon should continue.