

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
PART 1 – INTRODUCTION Susie Colley	Fairly repetitive
PART 2 - USP, KEY ISSUES & ASPIRATIONS Martin Edgell	<p>Support in part : I agree with the need for a plan that provides for and supports economic improvement that supports growth of existing businesses and meets the need of new business looking to relocate to the Bay.</p> <p>I support the need for good sustainable well-paid jobs that will improve the economy of the bay.</p> <p>The Bay has to change and that will mean that many things that the current generations seek to protect perhaps have to be considered as opportunities for regeneration. In many major cities we see fantastic modern buildings sitting alongside the gems of past era. Torbay and its people will need to be more ambitious and be more willing to accept change with provisos around the quality of design and build.</p> <p>I am concerned that aspects of this plan are over optimistic particularly in generation of jobs when the economy is likely to be depressed for much of the plan period. I am concerned that the plan is questioning the Census figures which show that the population is almost static.</p> <p>It would be reckless for a business to have a business plan that was over optimistic it needs to have a plan that is realistic but with the capability to adjust to upturn and downturn.</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012

FORUM VIEW

Consultation Question 1 – Issues set out

Susie Colley

Support ; lacks detail which will be supplied in the NP. Too wordy and gives the impression of “padding” Less would be more. No explanation of how sustainability of the proposals will be achieved. Possibly too much importance is being given to the optimism surrounding inward migration . Development must be achieved but not to the detriment of the existing eco systems and the USP that exists at the moment. If, there are too many houses built too soon they will stand empty until employment is achieved , this has to be avoided as it will send out the wrong message to developers/residents etc On Page 15 “at Torbay’s main gateway” is inaccurate as there are several “gateway’s “ to Torquay.

Alan Griffey

A true and accurate summing up of the bay and it’s aspirations. The team who put this Local Plan together are to be congratulated. On the differing ways “people see the Bay as...” with up market hotels coming to the harbourside the move for the harbour night-economy could be more gentile, with night-clubs, hen-nights, large pubs, casino’s, arcades, bowling alleys, etc. moved out near the McDonalds area of the Newton Road making a mini Las Vegas out there leaving the harbourside for more up-market hotels and eateries.

Julie Brandon

Feel too much reliance on SDLR to change our fortunes – let’s hope we are right. Concerns about how we are going to fund our share of the cost. There were surely cheaper solutions to the problem which would have had less impact on the environment. Also get concerned when housing figures are quoted. Where are the 3500 people on the waiting list currently living? What about the 1400 plus empty homes? How come we were told recently

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p data-bbox="188 432 360 467">Martin Edgell</p>	<p data-bbox="1128 268 2024 405">by Inspector Leisk that it is our oversupply of cheap accommodation which attracts less desirable tenants and perpetuates the supply of poor quality accommodation. What proportion of housing built will meet the housing need and what proportion will add to an oversaturated market?</p> <p data-bbox="1128 443 1509 478">Support most of this section.</p>
<p data-bbox="188 555 1010 590"><u>Consultation Question 2</u> – The big issues & approach to growth</p> <p data-bbox="188 624 353 659">Susie Colley</p>	<p data-bbox="1128 592 2040 949">Objection in part : On the whole the major issues have been discussed. However, it has to be questioned if the recent ONS figures are accurate. The housing allocation appears to be beyond local needs at this time and the foreseeable future. Balance must be brought into the equation. Reason: - All sources appear to show that Torbay’s resident population will reduce through natural change during all periods of the Plan. The quoted Regional Observatory forecast (page 18) and all other official estimates referred to are based on historic and over optimistic in Migration population forecasts that have not materialised by a very significant margin.</p> <p data-bbox="1128 987 2024 1163">Unless great care is take to monitor the provision of jobs and homes anticipated population/retail provision, the consequences may lead to too many houses being built and our USP being irreparably damaged. The monitoring methods suggested on page 29 do not appear to be sufficiently robust.</p> <p data-bbox="1128 1169 2024 1236">Maybe a clear diagram showing the NPPF requirement for jobs and homes, alongside the proposed ‘aspiration’ levels.</p> <p data-bbox="1128 1275 1989 1342">In addition a clear comparison of what methods could be put in place to demonstrate job increase achieved against the direct comparison with</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012

FORUM VIEW

Martin Edgell

homes and population increase achieved (as also required to monitor Policy SDP3)

Support in part There are some good points in this section however I do not believe that jobs will be created in line with the plan, there will not be significant inward migration as the housing market is stagnant making it difficult for people to downsize and move to Torbay to retire. Banks are risk adverse and not lending to businesses to support growth plans. In terms of the housing need why not build just social housing to start to resolve that issue.

Torbay is in competition with other areas of the South West that will also be seeking growth, attracting business and creating jobs.

I think more emphasis is required on the poor road infrastructure across the Bay and how that might be addressed, improvements and regeneration of existing housing stock, addressing lack of cycling routes and facilities for cyclists in our town centres e.g. secure undercover bike parking.

Suggest that it is stated in plain English that the intention will be to achieve job led growth, on which all decisions for further housing land release will depend

Julie Brandon

Ditto above we need to ensure that we protect our green environment. Green spaces will always be special to someone so how do we place greater value on some rather than others. Figures quoted are confusing and need better explanation (possibly table). Page 22 states 2/3 of new housing since 2005 was 1 or 2 bedroom flats – is this the split we wanted and if not why did we allow it. How many second homes are there in the Bay. What measures will be put in place to make sure that homes built are of the correct type? How accurate were past projections?

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>The tourism/bed space position is based on 2005 figures since when tourism in bed spaces has probably shrunk year on year. This is a key error as tourism has been identified as providing expansion for job creation. Without a realistic approach key decisions on hotel mix will be flawed. For instance the oversupply of coaching bed spaces requires attention; also if we are swapping one bed space for another it does not help the overall economy. Small guest houses are an integral part of the mix and spend profits locally.</p>
<p><u>Consultation Question 3</u> – The five key aspirations</p> <p>Susie Colley</p>	<p>Aspiration 1; agree in part but care must be taken that the environment is considered at the same time . Aim would be to achieve a balanced provision of new opportunities</p> <p>Aspiration 2 agree in part Provision of new attractions; this must be done taking into consideration the Habitats assessment ;</p> <p>How is the reduction in dependency on the state to provide jobs going to be achieved? Was not aware that the state was supplying jobs locally?</p> <p>Aspiration 3 Agree</p> <p>Aspiration 4 Agree</p> <p>Aspiration 5 Objection Not acceptable to allow tall buildings in certain locations; Tall buildings policy was written specifically to prevent inappropriate buildings damaging the image of the Bay</p> <p>Objection in Aspirations for Torquay; Page 35/36 there is no mention of protection of green space, , “protect coast line” but no mention of parks/green spaces; needs to be included.</p> <p>From Page 38 delete all the e post card and blog it is totally in appropriate for a official document ie Local Plan .</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012

FORUM VIEW

Alan Griffey

Yes, I agree with them, as long as we don't kill the golden goose by encroaching on green field sites and the coastline.

Julie Brandon

Aspiration 1: agree but we need to focus on affordable public transport, definitely need better rail link and we also need to be aware of the need to protect our marine environment.

Aspiration 2: agree but development needs to be sympathetic to what is already there to ensure that mistakes of the past are not repeated

Aspiration 3: agree.

Aspiration 4: agree

Aspiration 5: building houses is fine so long as we have ensured that we have brought back into use existing buildings first and always look to develop brown field sites as a priority. We need to hang onto and protect our open spaces which attract people here in the first place. Re: Tall buildings – who will make that judgement? Tall buildings strategy is surely there for a reason – we have to protect our vistas too.

Page 37 why compare ourselves to Plymouth/Exeter – we are not a city, our models should be places like Totnes Leamington Stratford etc.

Martin Edgell

- 1 A Better Connected, Accessible Torbay
- 2 Secure Long Term Economic Recovery and Promote Success
- 3 Protect and Enhance our Natural Environment
- 4 Encourage Sustainable Businesses and Aspirational Ideas
- 5 Support Quality Educational Opportunities and Tackle Disadvantage

I do not support the climate change aspiration at all.

Leon Butler

ok

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p>Len Short</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>survey said the population of South Devon is falling, why encourage growth for growth's sake? Brown field sites should be favoured for building houses, not just industry. The coastline and countryside which is exceptional in Torquay should be cherished and protected.</p> <p>No consultation on new marina in inner harbour (has there been?) Likewise Cary Green – only brief mention in Herald Express 30th August. Yes to flats and offices above shops – this should be encouraged with grants etc.</p> <p>I do not believe that it will be possible to deliver these job numbers as the economic climate shows little sign of returning even to 2008 levels in the next five years. The NPPF is a developer's charter.</p> <p>OK</p>
<p>Consultation Question 5 – Policy E1 (Employment) Susie Colley</p>	<p>Objection: Page 51 para 2 and Para 3 are badly worded : what evidence has been shown that the LP supports existing businesses ?</p> <p>The level of financial contribution demanded from Developers must be set at a level that will not discourage moving into the Bay. CIL must be re evaluated to a sensible level for Torbay</p> <p>Objection – Job led growth is supported fully, but not on the scale proposed beyond year 5. Reason: - 3,600 jobs will meet current unemployment needs. More than this will assist poverty pressures and enhance the local economy. However, resident numbers of working age are reducing through natural change. By 2031 there will be 9,000 fewer residents seeking jobs than there are today. Thus seeking 15,000 additional jobs in reality represent a growth in economically active residents that goes significantly beyond local needs. This in turn leads to a</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012

FORUM VIEW

land requirement and infrastructure deficit that conflict with enhancing Torbay's 'English Riviera' identity and USP. Suggested Improvement: - Preparation and publication for comment of an up to date assessment of objectively assessed need for Torbay as required by NPPF14.

Patrick Canavan

E1 does fill in some gaps in SD1 but is totally inadequate. This policy is little more than a 'wing and a prayer'. With the cuts in the TDA and in Torbay Council staffing who is going to drive this? What is the Council actually going to do differently? Need to see some detailed mechanisms and new initiatives. I don't support or object to Policy E1. It's a question of degree.

Alan Griffey

Any operation that comes down here like the Kingskerswell Bypass should (as appears to be) employ local labour and if government has to be lobbied to arrange this, so be it. We are going to get these extra houses therefore we need skilled workers to service them. Where possible always employ local labour. Build a few industrial units in with a housing estate by all means. Don't build up-market houses which will only attract retired people who won't work. Build more affordable houses.

Len Short

At the Mayors Forum they stated 1,000 high tech jobs in Torbay. More of the same if possible, this is the future for the 21s/22nd century.

Martin Edgell

Support the Policy but not the job numbers that the plan expects to create.

Leon Butler

Ok

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012

FORUM VIEW

Consultation Question 6 – Policy E2
(Employment Space)

Kevin Dixon

The recognition of the future importance of provision of work hubs is welcome and possibly indicative of an acceptance that the days of traditional full employment are over – though there is a need for an analysis of income levels related to part-time, mosaic employment. However, we need to better understand the future of income-generating work. Torbay is 20 years ahead of UK in terms of shifting demographics and could be a testing ground for a future economy. We should include investment in research into good practice, and provide advice & consultation services to progress the transition to future innovative ways of working. While recognising positive intent, employment spaces are likely to be lost as local democratic resistance to economic realities (e.g. housing pressures & profit margins) intensifies. Consequent social changes as local businesses decline (shops, small hotels) to be replaced by national employers (Tesco, Travelodge) need to be considered. Loss of retail employment in town centres is likely as housing takes its place.

Len Short

There is very little space in Torquay. Yes to block of offices at Torre Marine – it was in the original plans. Torre Station – mainly small storage! Roebuck House to be converted to flats – socially affordable ok but 8 storeys too high.
WallsHill Quarry

Julie Brandon

If we recognise the need for high quality employment space in our Town Centres we must discourage the conversion of existing commercial property such as Roebuck House into residential. We have sites nearby identified which would be much better suited to residential than this building. Also if we want more diverse Town Centres we need to address parking.

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Support: for all the reasons given in the Explanation especially “regarding the avoidance of redevelopment for residential use from undermining the supply of employment land or premises”</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>OK</p>
<p><u>Consultation Question 7 – Policy E3</u> (Marine Economy)</p> <p>Kevin Dixon</p> <p>Alan Griffey</p> <p>Julie Brandon</p>	<p>The Plan stresses ‘economic benefits’, but there is a need for a holistic view of local communities and their relationship to the marine economy. The danger is of marine settings being controlled and monopolised by short-term finance and elite pastimes – so excluding and alienating communities. We need a recognition of public ownership of the marine economy, to promote access for all and to exploit the health and social benefits of inclusion. The marine economy should be seen as a resource in a cultural and historical setting which empowers all of our communities</p> <p>I strongly support this measure. While supporting the local fishing fleet, inshore fishing should be strongly regulated to preserve the sea bottom. Crabbers especially should only trawl where there is no coral or natural sea bed rocks, etc. Thereby preserving the seabed environment which encourages and nurtures fish and crab growth.</p> <p>P2 paragraph 56 – not acceptable – marine environment must be protected.</p> <p>Objection – The Policy wording is supported.</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012

FORUM VIEW

Len Short

mainly low wage economy our indigenous people can't afford to shop on up-market stores, so £ shops will proliferate.

All future growth TC first policy – 21st Century town centres – too late (horse and stable door). Yes use space above retail areas for housing and employment – make compulsory, encourage grants if possible – rents/rates not realistic – too high!

Julie Brandon

If we are going for a distinctive offer in our Town Centre why on earth are we considering a supermarket here? How will that make our offer distinctive – with space in our Town Centres at a premium we should be aspiring for more.

Paul Raybold

Support proposed plan but need to emphasise the location of a retail unit to attract type of customer. An upmarket edition of a John Lewis to any high street brings other better types of retail to add to the mix on offer

Martin Edgell

Supported

Susie Colley

Objection – Torquay as the key 'town centre' is supported fully, However, the character of many parts of Torquay eg, Babbacombe /Chelston/Torre must be supported to remain as secondary shopping areas :

Reduction of the primary retail frontage is not consistent with the 'town centre first' policy. Additionally, it will lead to reduced public purse income following business rate valuation appeals caused by downgrading frontage locations from primary to secondary but physically suited only to business use conversion at ground floor level.

Amend wording to read : "and to resist out of town, and out of centre, retailing"

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
Leon Butler	OK
<p>Consultation Question 10 – Policy TC2 (Local & Neighbourhood Centre)</p> <p>Paul Raybold</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Support the proposal but who and how will it be adhered to eg who will police it?</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>Support Agree in part with the “Explanation”. “The Willows” serves its customers as an ‘Out-of- town’ retail facility or ‘Retail Park’, this cannot be considered the same as a ‘District Centre’. This should be clearly stated. Therefore on Page 60 – 61 ‘The Hierarchy of Centres’ should be amended in the deletion of “The Willows” (page 63).</p> <p>OK</p>
<p>Consultation Question 11 – Policy TC3 (Retail development)</p> <p>Len Short</p> <p>Paul Raybold</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Anchor store/supermarket in Castle Circus area will need a major/minor development in car park or Factory Row, Temperance Street area with low or free parking. No more out of town retail, this is cause of Town Centre problem and high parking fees.</p> <p>Support the ideal of better shop fronts and a greater ambience will attract a bigger spend.</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>Support</p> <p>OK</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p>Consultation Question 12 – Policy TC4 (Change of retail use within Centres & elsewhere)</p> <p>Patrick Canavan</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Feel TC4 underestimates the problem. Torquay Town Centre needs to be totally remodelled so a more radical approach to change of use is required especially if more modern residential accommodation is to be provided. We have an inflexible retail offer. We need premises that can be adaptable which can attract retailers of different sizes. We only have a small number of 'anchor stores'. If any one of these was to close the result would be catastrophic.</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>Support – for the reasons given in the "Explanation". Especially the recognition that Torquay Neighbourhood Plan and the Council will work together to ensure the definition of primary and secondary shopping frontages are correct (see Question 9-TC1 above)</p> <p>OK</p>
<p>Consultation Question 13 – Policy TC5 (Evening & night time economy)</p> <p>Patrick Canavan</p> <p>Julie Brandon</p>	<p>TC5 says this sector needs careful management but by whom and to what end? Does the council really know what it wants or only what it doesn't want? The night time economy is essential to Torquay's future but there are mixed messages in this policy</p> <p>Key words here are balanced and all ages, beyond 10pm this is not our current offer. Late night shopping would help as they have on the continent. Let's do something better with the 'Opera House' see TTCCP's aspirations for harbour area.</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p>Len Short</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>According to tourism literature Torquay has sufficient variety! It must cater for all ages.</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>Support but with reservations: The award of the Purple Flag adds kudos to the USP but if managed badly will result in the loss of the accolade which will do irreparable damage to tourism. Public toilets must be open for the night time economy for the whole of year. Bars and nightclubs must contribute to the security provision. More pressure must be brought to bear regarding responsibility of “take aways” litter situation.</p> <p>OK</p>
<p>Consultation Question 14 – Policy T1 (Tourism, events and culture)</p> <p>Patrick Canavan</p> <p>Stuart Lewton</p>	<p>Fully support use of Local Development Orders to change the balance of accommodation. Support firm stance against Houses of Multiple Occupation.</p> <p>Object to why no mention of the English Riviera Tourism Company and its role? No mention of a policy on Culture despite the title. We hear of possible expansion of the Theatre but not mentioned here. No mention of the arts or the development of our cultural offer in Torquay.</p> <p>Object: The ‘Turning the Tide for Tourism in Torbay strategy’ (page 9) admits that occupancy within Torbay is on average “at an all-time low of 27.5% in the 4 to 10 bedroom category and occupancy up to 74.1% in the 51 to 100 bedroom category”</p> <p>How can tourism accommodation be improved if it is all retained? Obviously</p>

supply is far out weighing current demand. We may have high occupancy in August and September, but for the rest of the year it is diabolically low, which means that especially in the 4 to 10 bedroom category, the business is not sustainable. Therefore we need to reduce the number of smaller hotels and B&B's.

(c) The change of use of outdated and poorly located stock is unlikely to be allowed due to the criteria set out in Policy T2 change of use of tourism accommodation.

(e) HMO's are already firmly grounded in our CTDA's, of the 39 properties within the Paignton CTDA, 13 already have residential status and 3 of these are HMO's, gained via Certificate of Lawful use (CLU) after 4 to 10 years of occupancy as residential. The imposition of the T2 policy will stop owners from applying for planning permission which is likely to be turned down or expensive to comply with due to the amount of Planning Contribution being required on granting of change of use to residential. Thus the owners will be forced into hiding the true use of the properties for 4 years and then just submitting an application for a CLU

(f) Support for proposals such as the Premier Inn at Whiterock, Paignton and Premier Inn at Goodrington Sands, can surely not be classified as quality tourism. They are budget hotels and are taking business away from the already stretched and struggling 4 to 10 bedroom category of hotels and B&B's as these businesses cannot compete with the advertising budgets of these major chains.

There is very little development land available within the CTDA's especially land which could be developed quickly without the purchase of multiple small properties which will then need demolition before redevelopment.

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012

FORUM VIEW

The worry here is that the land available within the CTDA's that is the cheapest to develop are the open green spaces such as The Pavillion Gardens in Torquay and Paignton Green.

Torbay has the 2nd largest concentration of hotels and B&B's in the country, with 219 listed on <http://www.hudsons.co.uk>, second to Blackpool which has 346. The difference is that Blackpool has approximately 15,000,000 people with a 3 to 4 hour driving radius and Torbay has only 6,500,000.

Turning The Tide for Tourism in Torbay recommends the reduction of bed spaces in the 4 to 10 category by 3500 bed spaces yet there is a gain of (just under 120) bedrooms, 240 bed spaces.

How does the council know that it has increase the quality and allowed poor accommodation to be lost?

PHAA's were not policed over the past 20 years or more and due to this many properties within the areas already have changed to residential and HMO use via CLU. To instigate and enforce the new CTD's would be a case of 'shutting the gate after the horse has already bolted', especially as owners now only have to prove use over a 4 year period.

We have too many properties in Torbay for the council to ever be able to check up on them all and having CTD's is just like having prohibition, it pushed developments underground, meaning properties will change use without the relevant planning permission or building regulations.

Martin Edgell

Support the comment from Mr Stuart Lewton in respect to this Policy. There is no reference to the South West Coastal Path which needs to be

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012

FORUM VIEW

Len Short

maintained and improved.

Sports Arena, Ice Skating Rink, - where? Clennon Valley. Updated 33m-50m pool/diving, update sports hall etc – Clennon Valley. Walls Hill Quarry – Otter Nursery

Leon Butler

Cockington should be removed from T1 (T2) as the area is a conservation area and a day time visitor venue that is an established contrast to the hustle and bustle of Torquay – effectively its USP. Providing such sweeping powers as T1 could destroy what makes Cockington special and well regarded with visitors.

Secondly is the oversupply of coaching bed spaces that devalue Torquay's offering. By ring fencing Belgravia this will only exacerbate the problem of lack of investment, better to have a policy that recognises a need to rebalance the tourism offering to achieve better quality and higher prices/profits that would further increase investment and quality.

T1 Policy means that Cockington will be open to substantial development. Cockington has been included in the Core Tourism Development Areas (Policy T1) this could allow substantial development above and beyond the Sea Change development. It is not necessary to include Cockington or it should better define the impact for Cockington as the Policy appears to have been established for the old accommodation areas or areas requiring development.

I also note there is no specific protection or definition suggested for Cockington Country Park or other Country Parks either as Urban Landscape Protection Area (Page 92) or under Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (Page 91) and it is not mentioned in the Countryside Policy C1 (Page 94).

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p>Consultation Question 15 – Policy T2 (Change of use of tourism accommodation & facilities) Patrick Canavan</p> <p>Len Short</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Think this is a good start but needs to go further and faster. Can't be here in 20 years time with still too many out-dated B&Bs.</p> <p>5-6 new hotels built – how many old ones changing to residential flats? Good marketing brings in the visitors eg Grand Hotel, TLH, Torbay and other coach visitors (Shearings numbers are up) Premier, Rutland</p> <p>Support the comment from Mr Stuart Lewton in respect to this Policy. A harbour extension is not required for Cruise ships. Go to Cannes, St Tropez or Villefranche on the French Riviera they all moor off and use boats to bring passengers ashore.</p> <p>Supported in part. Object ; to “Development of Harbour Extension for Torquay.” This could only be considered if it is acceptable to the Habitats assessment and does not breach EU marine law. Local Plan out of date as the “Ark Royal” is no longer available and it is uncertain if a similar vessel can now be acquired; fully support this if one can be found for all the environmental reasons that were initially published.</p> <p>Once again Cockington village is special because of the ‘Old England’ preserved village ethos, allowing some unsightly or oversupply of catering/retail outlets to revert to residential would enhance the ‘historic village’ status. There is nothing stated in projects that justify Cockington being on the listed areas.</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012

FORUM VIEW

Consultation Question 16 – Policy TA1
(Transport & accessibility)

Pauline Baker

Supported in part : Agree with need to keep a frequent bus service. Need to add installation of dedicated cycle racks at key locations. Mentions 'walking minimises the impact on the highway network '- to do this requires improved maintenance of back street pathways especially steep steps which link roads leading to main Town centre and beach areas (currently in poor state repair and prohibit rather than encourage walking).

Martin Edgell

Partially support. Cycling facilities need to be class leading with secure undercover storage in town centres at Stations etc. Cycling routes should be properly developed and not created by putting green grit on badly maintained roads. Exeter, Barnstaple, Exmouth and Padstow show how it should be done.

Susie Colley

Objection: There is no mention of changes in the work situation ie more people working from home as a result of internet etc as encouraged by NPPF29 . Also no mention of the impact some alterations in the modes of transport will have on local character and environment. Unknown at this time the level of impact the new "bypass" will have on Edginswell. Suggested altering to Policy TA1 - last sentence of first paragraph to read "*promoting Torbay's economic competitiveness, and reducing the need to travel, and environmental impact of travel*"

Leon Butler

OK

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012

FORUM VIEW

Consultation Question 17 – Policy TA2
(Strategic transport improvements)

Pauline Baker

Objection in part : No mention of what may happen to Torre station if new station is created at Torquay Gateway. Agree with new station at the gateway but needs to encompass 1. Covered and secure cycle parking facility. 2. Park and Ride 3. Taxi Rank. 4. Adequate car parking. It should be a Gateway transport hub. Agree with all year round regular ferry service - will need assurance that the sea bed is protected if considering a faster service. Page 87 - confirms funding is available for fast ferry infrastructure from Dept. Transport.

Len Short

Object: 'SDLR will bring us all prosperity' That was said about RICC too! It will bring more local pinch points and very little if any time saving. Free park and ride (like Exeter)(3+1 on the way). Rail station Edginswell Park (Scotts/Browns Bridge Area, Willows, Torbay Hospital etc (Large employment area) Number 12 buses adequate (Newton Abbot to Brixham – every 10 minutes and popular. More car sharing too and cycling routes.

Julie Brandon

Object: Disagree with claims about SDLR. Improving rail link needed – waiting times at Newton Abbot unacceptable and frequency of trains poor.

Martin Edgell

Partially support. The plan needs to include a park and ride for Torquay. The plan needs to tackle the Shiphay Lane/Newton Road junction and improved roads from Riviera Way to St Marychurch, Plainmoor and Babbacombe

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Support in part</p> <p>No mention of improving the Fleet Street shopping experience by either introducing smaller buses (pedestrian friendly) or bringing back “trams” or similar eco friendly and pedestrian friendly transport.</p> <p>OK</p>
<p><u>Consultation Question 18</u> – Policy IF1 (Infrastructure, phasing & delivery of development)</p> <p>Pauline Baker</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Supported in part; Necessary infrastructure should also include healthcare provision (currently only mentions education). Any major development should only be allowed if there is an agreed timescale for the provision of necessary infrastructure.</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>Objection Nothing has been mentioned about the near capacity of Brokenbury . This has to be a major issue to forthcoming developers as the lack of sewerage capacity that exists and implications this will have on the deliverability and timing of 8-10,000 additional homes proposed overall in the Plan (Infrastructure Delivery Study January 2012, paragraph 5.4.7) (see also Habitats Regulations Assessment below)</p> <p>OK</p>
<p><u>Consultation Question 19</u> – Policy IF2 (Information & communications technology)</p> <p>Pauline Baker</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p>	<p>Supported : the most up to date ICT must be supported - the suggested criteria is very acceptable.</p> <p>Supported</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Supported</p> <p>Ok</p>
<p>Consultation Question 20 – Policy IF3 (Development access))</p> <p>Pauline Baker</p> <p>Alan Griffey</p> <p>John Doherty</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p>	<p>Support : Agree with the Travel Plan.</p> <p>Support : Agreed. More PARK’N’WALK should be encouraged. ie you park walk to your place of work (maybe 500 yards away) this is good for your health, reducing heart trouble and diabetes. Car parks on waste land near housing estates reducing parking outside front doors, trolleys in the car parks which would be hired to wheel your shopping etc. to your front door. Certainly park’ n’ walk to your place of business to improve your health.</p> <p>Supported in part Policy IF3 with some changes, we need to recognise that the car is here to stay, and to penalise people who travel alone, will be counter productive, and create and maintain the town centre that we have today, transport will evolve into energy saving cars. If the current enforcement people, were to enforce NO SINGLE OCUPANTS IN CARS we would have no town to plan for, please re-visit this</p> <p>Partially supported. A 50% travel plan needs a park and ride facility in Torquay otherwise employees without a parking space use local streets to park.</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Partially supported : Object to : Reduction of single car occupancy will (a) attract negative publicity (b) impossible to police</p> <p>OK</p>
<p><u>Consultation Question 21</u> – Policy IF4 (Parking requirements)</p> <p>John Doherty</p> <p>Julie Brandon</p> <p>Len Short</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p>	<p>Support : glad to see that there is now required parking when building new houses, further new out of town retail should be required to provide Park and Ride for town centre</p> <p>Support in part Also glad to see that there is required parking when building new houses and this should be free. Understand in order to meet need for parking with the Roebuck House proposed development use of multi storey car park is being considered – this would not be free and totally impractical.</p> <p>Object: Let's have reasonably priced annual parking permits for residents – not £510 per annum - to encourage people to use facilities in and around our Towns.</p> <p>Object : Needs free or very low priced park and ride at Willows or Edginswell Park. Exeter has three and one on the way.</p> <p>Supported</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Supported</p> <p>Requirement for hotels to have 1 coach space per 15 bedrooms is outdated – remove School should have 1 space per member of staff</p>
<p><u>Consultation Question 22</u> – Policy EN1 (Natural environment) Margaret Forbes-Hamilton</p> <p>Len Short</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Object – delete all words after first sentence of item 2 (page 89). Insert the word “only” so that the first sentence reads “Development proposals outside the AONB will only be supported where they conserve or enhance the landscape character of Torbay. There is no mention of the very valuable Conservation Area Character Appraisals, nor of Natural Heritage. There needs to be special mention of Maidencombe</p> <p>Object We must protect environment (natural) though many don’t really appreciate it, it is what makes Torquay special. Advertise the more out of the way areas, especially coastal zone. Also Cockington Woods, Preston, Scadson, Occombe.</p> <p>Object: Why is the photo of the River Dart? The AONB should be extended between Brixham and Paignton to replace the area lost to development on the edge of Brixham.</p> <p>Gallows Gate –where has this come from as it is not identified else where?</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p><u>Consultation Question 23</u> – Policy EN2</p> <p>(Green Infrastructure)</p> <p>Margaret Forbes-Hamilton</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Support – for the reasons given in the “Explanation”.</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>Cockington Country Park needs specific mention to ensure its protection</p>
<p><u>Consultation Question 24</u> – Policy EN3 (Urban Landscape Protection Areas)</p> <p>Margaret Forbes-Hamilton</p> <p>Julie Brandon</p> <p>Len Short</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p>	<p>Support – for the reasons given in the “Explanation”, but would question why there is no reference to the Tall Buildings Policy</p> <p>Objection in part: Why no mention of Abbey Park, Promenade, Cary Green</p> <p>Objection in part Scotts Meadow is ULPA ! – some protection! No mention of Cary Green, Abbey Park, Walls Hill – are they covered elsewhere? Who decides what is suitable development in these areas. Remember Council, TDA and Planning committee thought three blocks of flats, shops etc on Princess Gardens/Prom?Walk was ok!</p> <p>Objection: ULPA. This is not strong enough protection</p> <p>Object: Tall buildings strategy no mentioned. Cockington and Scadson Woods, Ilisham Valley, Crematorium and all Cemeteries no mentioned</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Include Cockington Village and immediate parkland in this category to give it protection</p>
<p>Consultation Question 25 – Policy C1 (Countryside, strategic green wedges & the rural economy)</p> <p>Margaret Forbes-Hamilton</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p>	<p>Object– addition required. Reason: There needs to be reference to the importance of land supply for food production. There also needs to be reference to the “health benefits” of the countryside, physical, mental and emotional. It is not sufficient to cite the TLCAA – other Torbay environmental policies as well as national policies must be named here.</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>Objection : Remove the “normally” in the first sentence. Remove the “generally” in the first line of second paragraph</p>
<p>Consultation Question 26 – Policy C2 (The coast)</p> <p>Margaret Forbes-Hamilton</p> <p>Julie Brandon</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p>	<p>Object – on page 97 there needs to be included the local, national and international policies and laws that protect this environment. On page 98, the working harbours might not be covered by the SAC, but there are certain species within the harbour areas that have their own specific international protection e.g. seahorses and eel grass. This must be included in the local plan for clarity</p> <p>Object in part :Talks about considerations for development on coast to include impact of development on views – why is this only a consideration on coastal developments surely it should apply to all developments.</p> <p>Supported</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Cockington Country Park should not be designated under this but redesignated as above</p>
<p>Consultation Question 27 – Policy NC1 (Biodiversity & geodiversity)</p> <p>Margaret Forbes-Hamilton</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Object – I have concerns that the second paragraph gives an impression of presumption of development, rather than protection. There needs to be shown a will to preserve sensitive locations, and to encourage development elsewhere.</p> <p>Avoidance and mitigation MUST be sufficient, as mitigation is often impossible. Recreating habitats is extremely difficult especially for the more delicate and rare species, both on land and in the marine environment. Off-setting must not lie with the council, but with the National Bodies that have drawn up policies to protect the environment.</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>OK</p>
<p>Consultation Question 28 – Policy HE1 (Conservation & the historic environment)</p> <p>Margaret Forbes-Hamilton</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p>	<p>Support – for the reasons given in the “Explanation”. However, the Tall Buildings Policy should be cited as one of the documents that should be referred to.</p> <p>Supported. Regarding the projects listed, I would question whether cycle</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>hire at Maidencombe is realistic and for that matter the cycleway to Maidencombe. The road hills in and out are some of the steepest and narrowest in Torbay.</p> <p>OK</p>
<p>Consultation Question 29 – Policy EG1 (Sustainable construction & design) Pauline Baker</p> <p>Alan Griffey</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p>	<p>Support: Agree with all recommendations. There needs to be some consideration of wording changes to make a more positive statement. Page 106 'A sustainable checklist will be expected.... needs to read 'a sustainability checklist MUST accompany planning applications'. Page 107 'Developers should aim to achieve the highest feasible environmental.... needs to read 'developers MUST aim to achieve.... also 'consideration MUST be given to achieving the maximum' Page 108 'A sustainability checklist will be required... needs to read 'A sustainability checklist will act as supporting...'</p> <p>Support : Let's get back to building terrace houses with small gardens – you get more to the acre, and they are more economical re heating. They knew what they were doing when they built those.</p> <p>Supported: but this should be retitled to reflect energy efficiency and environmental aspects not climate change</p> <p>Supported in part: Alter wording of the last line of Policy EG1 to read “with a floor space of to 100m2” this will correlate with the size of one or more residential units quoted.</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>OK</p>
<p><u>Consultation Question 30</u> – Policy EG2 (Designing for low carbon development & climate change)</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Supported: but this should be retitled to reflect energy efficiency and environmental aspects not climate change</p> <p>Supported in part: Alter wording in third para to read “ New development “must” ... replacing should. Also in line 3 of the same para replace “should” with “must”</p> <p>OK</p>
<p><u>Consultation Question 31</u> – Policy EG3 (Renewable & low carbon infrastructure)</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Supported</p> <p>OK</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p><u>Consultation Question 32</u> – Policy ER1 (Flood risk)</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Supported</p> <p>Objection: No mention of the state of Brokenbury and how the influx of additional grey water/sewage/flood water which would be produced when new developments are built. Are new developers to look at alternatives for Brokenbury?</p> <p>OK</p>
<p><u>Consultation Question 33</u> – Policy ER2 (Water management)</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Supported</p> <p>Objection: Clarity regarding Development proposal no 4 due to the sewerage capacity constraint (seeIF1 above and ER2); Maybe add to Development proposal no 4 <i>“For additional residential development, this will require evidence to be submitted that confirms the equivalent amount of surface water has been removed from the combined sewerage system served by Brokenbury treatment works to enable the additional sewerage to be accommodated.”</i></p> <p>Upgrading of current foul/surface water drainage systems</p>
<p><u>Consultation Question 34</u> – Policy ER3 (Contamination)</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p>	<p>Supported</p> <p>Objection :</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Some insurance must be put in place by Developers in the event of ramifications occurring regarding contamination within a 30 year plus time frame. This would safe guard house holders in the event of radon gas contamination or similar occurring in the future</p> <p>Add in #2 can be satisfactory overcome...without risk to the health of surrounding population</p>
<p>Consultation Question 35 – Policy ER4 (Ground stability)</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Supported</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>OK</p>
<p>Consultation Question 36 – Policy W1 (Waste management & development)</p> <p>Alan Griffey</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Support: The new recycling system in operation now is brilliant. Try not to go the way of incinerators there's a lot of scientific evidence that these are highly dangerous leading to cancers and dementia. Bottom ash from incinerators is highly toxic and difficult to dispose of, very fine ash if blown it can enter the blood stream through the skin.</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>OK</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p>Consultation Question 37 – Policy W2 (Water audit for major development)</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Supported</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>OK</p>
<p>Consultation Question 38 – Policy W3 (Existing waste management facilities in Torbay)</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Objection in Part Facilities are required in Torquay. The link road will make it even easier to use the Newton Abbot facilities.</p> <p>Does not consider the environmental impact of existing facility vs local town satellite facilities</p>
<p>Consultation Question 39 – Policy W4 (Proposal for new waste management facilities)</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Supported</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>Ok</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p>Consultation Question 40 – Policy W5 (Waste treatment facilities)</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Supported</p> <p>Support :(Subject to Objection IF1 and ER2 above). Developers within the Torquay gateway area will need to be advised of this situation at the onset of a proposal</p> <p>OK</p>
<p>Consultation Question 41 – Policy M1 (Mineral extraction)</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Supported</p> <p>OK</p>
<p>Consultation Question 42 – Policy M2 (Maximising the use of secondary & recycled aggregates)</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Supported</p> <p>OK</p>
<p>Consultation Question 43 – Policy M3 (Preserving & safeguarding of limestone resources & key local building stone)</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Supported</p> <p>ok</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p><u>Consultation Question 44</u> – Policy SC1 (Sustainable communities)</p> <p>Alan Griffey</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Support: agree wholeheartedly with Policy SC1. Worth considering: a lot of people retire to bungalows, while easier to maintain the lack of stairs to walk up and down each day could contribute to weakening health for the elderly due to lack of exercise. Bungalows also take up more land. Local 'good' cafes like the Rendezvous at St.Marychurch and the Baytree also at St.M become good 'meeting places' for the people of all ages in the neighbourhood - like the old coffee-bars of the 'fifties.</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>Supported: More emphasis should be given to the work done by the TDA in bringing back properties in to use with the help of the Shekinah Mission and the Roote Centre</p> <p>Also need to include the probable propensity of "homeworkers" therefore reducing the need to travel.</p> <p>OK</p>
<p><u>Consultation Question 45</u> – Policy SC2 (Sport, leisure & recreation)</p> <p>Len Short</p> <p>Julie Brandon</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p>	<p>Object: Sports Hall at Walls Hill Quarry? Sports Arena at Clennon Valley? Babbacombe? Update Acorn Club facilities and Swim Torquay. Childrens play park on Torre Abbey Gardens (balloon site) (old putting course)</p> <p>Support in part : Re suggestion above for play park – see also TTCCP submission</p> <p>Supported</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Support in part : In last paragraph re word ; remove the word “functional” , to read “The Council will not seek to protect leisure and recreational facilities where they no longer provide a benefit to amenity, biodiversity or other benefits.” Otherwise could lead to loss of land with amenity value unjustifiably.</p> <p>OK</p>
<p><u>Consultation Question 46 – Policy SC3</u> (Healthy bay)</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Supported</p> <p>Support in part: Health and well being is essential for all ages; walks along the promenade are possible all that some of the older residents can manage. Now due to the onerous parking charges this activity is now under threat. Parking charges must be reviewed for this reason as it has far reaching affects.</p> <p>OK</p>
<p><u>Consultation Question 47 – Policy SC4</u> (Child poverty)</p> <p>Len Short</p>	<p>Objection Poverty caused by ‘low wage’ syndrome and excessive rents and house prices. New 1 and 2 bed roomed flats in St Helens Town Centre £55k!!! Older 2 bed roomed houses (not slums) £80k In Torquay circa £120k/£140k – no sea views. New 2 bed houses £160k no sea views. Reductions for on benefit families at sport and leisure facilities –</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>stigma?</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>OK</p>
<p><u>Consultation Question 48</u> – Policy DE1 (Design)</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Supported</p> <p>Supported</p> <p><u>OK</u></p>
<p><u>Consultation Question 49</u> – Policy DE2 (Development amenity)</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Supported</p> <p>Supported</p> <p><u>OK</u></p>
<p><u>Consultation Question 50</u> – Policy DE3 (Development amenity)</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p>	<p>Supported</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Support in part: On the Torre Marine site there were issue regarding windows of the new properties overlooking existing buildings I; therefore “visual intrusion must be included in the term “nuisance”</p> <p>OK</p>
<p>Consultation Question 51 – Policy DE4 (Building heights)</p> <p>Julie Brandon</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Object: Concerns about impact on Pavilions of tall hotel adjacent to it. See TTCCP submission</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>Object: Requires amendment to the wording to support the Tall buildings strategy as understood by the Community Partnerships. The Policy would allow high building on socioeconomic grounds even if in conflict with sound urban design. This would be unacceptable. Reword second paragraph of Policy DE4 replace “<i>sound urban design or socio-economic reasons</i>” with amended wording “<i>sound socioeconomic and urban design reasons</i>” also in point 5. replace “<i>wider urban design or socio-economic benefits</i>” with amended wording “<i>wider socio-economic and urban design benefits</i>”</p> <p>This too loose – in general the presumption should be to keep within the existing build height but with strict conditions if not. Don't see a need for exclusions to this and certainly not stations</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012

FORUM VIEW

Consultation Question 52 – Policy H1
(Housing provision)

Julie Brandon

Object:

Would question some of the figures re housing. We have over supply of rented accommodation much of it of poor quality. Much accommodation available above shops – need to be put to use. 1300 empty homes, numerous brown field sites identified, 1,000's properties for sale on the open market. Re statement page 143 from Bill Cawse as to why house prices high is not solely because of shortage but more to do with 2nd home ownership. Why are we only looking to bring back into use 150 empty homes a year – what is stopping us from doing more?

Martin Edgell

Object : Not convinced by argument on population or number of new jobs that will be created.

Susie Colley

Object in part and only to the figures 8-10,000 homes (not otherwise) scale of growth as SD1 and E1 above (Questions 4 and 5). Reason: -same as for Objections 4 and 5 above (Policy SD1 and E1). Suggested Improvement: - as in response to Questions 4 and 5 above, plus redrafting the "Introduction" (pages 143/144) and "Explanation" (pages 145/146). Concerns are that financial incentives for areas that embrace growth will influence commonsense

Leon Butler

Ok but should specify how the creation/reduction of jobs is measured

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p>Consultation Question 53 – Policy H2 (Five year housing land supply)</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Object Not convinced by argument on population or number of new jobs that will be created.</p> <p>Object Need more evidence to be convinced of the figures As in Questions. 4 and 5 above (Policy SD1 and E1). above, Delete paragraph 3</p> <p>OK</p>
<p>Consultation Question 54 – Policy H3 (Application for new homes)</p> <p>Alan Griffey</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Support: Policy H3 (page 148) is to be HIGHLY COMMENDED. If the jobs aren't there the houses shouldn't be built – and just building work units along with the houses is no guarantee of firms moving into those units. The jobs should be there before the houses are built, not provided afterwards.</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>Support in part: Add "Other policies in the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan...." As the Torquay Neighbourhood Plan when adopted will be part of the Local Plan. Torquay Neighbourhood Plan mentioned in the explanation so must be included in the Policy wording</p> <p>Need to restrict this to brown field sites</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p><u>Consultation Question 55</u> – Policy H4</p> <p>(Affordable housing)</p> <p>Julie Brandon</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Partly Support: Whilst it is commendable that we want affordable housing wouldn't an aspiration of better pay be preferred.</p> <p>Object No confidence that this will deliver the number of affordable homes needed.</p> <p>Object to the split of percentage provision proposed as sites of 15+ dwellings would need to provide more than 30% to ensure the scale of provision required. Alternative to prevent problems ensuing would be an up to date assessment of objectively assessed housing needs and affordable housing supply proposed as required by NPPF47.</p> <p>Delete 3 to 5 category as it will put off brown field small developments that could add significantly to the housing stock</p>
<p><u>Consultation Question 56</u> – Policy H5 (Houses in Multiple Occupation - HMO's)</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Supported</p> <p>Supported In view of the impending commencement of an officer to inspect rented accommodation (as agreed by Mayor Oliver) it would appear that any previous concerns will be allayed .</p> <p>OK</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p>Consultation Question 57 – Policy H6 (Sites for gypsies and travellers) Martin Edgell</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Supported</p> <p>OK</p>
<p>Consultation Question 58 – Policy H7 (Housing for people in need of care) Alan Griffey</p> <p>Martin Edgell</p> <p>Susie Colley</p> <p>Leon Butler</p>	<p>Supported : Residential Homes should be regularly inspected. And there should be a helpline (like childline) for all residential home guests. These homes need plenty of support from the council.</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>Supported</p> <p>OK</p>
<p>Consultation Question 59 – Policies SDT1, SDT2, SDT3, SDT4. (Torquay) (Torquay Town Centre & Harbour) (Torquay Gateway) (Babbacombe & St Marychurch)</p> <p>Alan Griffey</p>	<p>Objection:</p> <p>SD(T 1 Page 160) TORQUAY Should be developed in keeping with what it is: a beautiful seaside resort hoping to provide for it's children when they grow up. Not an ever ending expanding 'city' not stopping until it reaches it's boundaries. The fact that you have kept the original government dictate down from 800 new homes per annum to 200 is to be highly commended. Hopefully many of this 200 will be gained from converting large buildings</p>

and hotels when they close to there bedroomed family flats. I could introduce you to a woman who with her husband brought up three extremely successful children in a one bedroom flat and said they were the happiest days of her life. Many more of the 200 requirement will be found from brown field sites, infill (in large gaps between houses) and large verges of roads like the St.Marychurch road running down by the golfcourse. Eyesores like that block of Cavana houses just down from the Warberry Copse (Stalag Luft IV, as it's known) should be painted by a commissioned famous artist like David Hockney so that instead of being an eyesore it becomes a famous art installation and visitor attraction.

SDT2 (Page 160) TORBAY TOWN CENTRE AND HARBOUR I like a lot of the plans here. I would add: clear traffic parking in Higher Union Street and make it a two way traffic flow down through Castle Circus and up Torre Hill Road; and down the top of Abbey Road; Shedden Hill; all the way to the Sea Front and Harbourside (two-way traffic all the way). This would give visitors a nice entrance to the town and they would see where everything is. It would also fill the multi-story car parks, if they're not full already. Torquay Inner Harbour should be made a community asset so that it can't be sold off and made into a marina (two marina's are enough already). More should be done to encourage young people to use the inner harbour and via it the bay. Sea Scouts and Guides are an admirable movement, but yachting generally has a snobbish image more should be done to make the inner harbour (and therefore the bay) available/attractive to working class kids, with rowing boats, etc. (it would keep them off the streets). I am not against enlarging the Palace Theatre in it's own footprint.

Julie Brandon

Support in part: If we are going to try to encourage families into residential areas created in our Towns' it will be necessary to ensure the provision of open spaces and schools.

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p data-bbox="188 331 362 363">Martin Edgell</p> <p data-bbox="188 435 358 467">Susie Colley</p> <p data-bbox="188 571 331 603">Leon Butler</p>	<p data-bbox="1128 268 1854 300">Existing buildings of architectural merit should be preserved.</p> <p data-bbox="1128 336 1281 368">Supported</p> <p data-bbox="1128 440 1787 472">Object: - see SD1 and E1 above (Questions 4 and 5)</p> <p data-bbox="1128 603 1173 635">Ok</p>
<p data-bbox="188 751 1034 847"><u>Consultation Question 60</u> – Policies SDP1, SDP2, SDP3, SDP4. (Paignton) (Paignton Town Centre & Seafront) (Paignton North & Western Area) (Clennon Valley Leisure Hub)</p> <p data-bbox="188 882 362 914">Martin Edgell</p> <p data-bbox="188 986 331 1018">Leon Butler</p>	<p data-bbox="1128 882 1281 914">Supported</p> <p data-bbox="1128 986 1173 1018">OK</p>
<p data-bbox="188 1062 1048 1158"><u>Consultation Question 61</u> – Policies SDB1, SDB2, SDB3. (Brixham) (Brixham Town Centre, Harbour & Waterfront) (Brixham Urban Fringe & Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)</p> <p data-bbox="188 1193 362 1225">Martin Edgell</p> <p data-bbox="188 1265 331 1297">Leon Butler</p>	<p data-bbox="1128 1193 1281 1225">Supported</p> <p data-bbox="1128 1265 1173 1297">OK</p>

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012

FORUM VIEW

PART 4 – IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LOCAL PLAN

Mike Lister

Talks about delivery through partnership with the Neighbourhood Plan but there is no detail on how this is to happen. The NP can make suggestions for sites and development, are we being asked to find developers/develop ourselves too? It does mention Neighbourhood Development Orders, more explanation needs to be given to us on how these can be implemented and what they can achieve.

The NP cannot suggest development, are we being dictated too? However NPs will take precedence over Local Plan, this is a positive step to giving local people more power and say.

There does not seem to be a definition of 'Sustainable Development' will this lead to a free for all or potentially the opposite? This could be tightened up. Is SD2 considered a strategic policy and therefore ranked about the NP in terms of weighting. Clarification needed.

It says the council and TDA will promote Local Development Orders. Where will these be? Will there be consultation with the NPs? Seems to overlap with some of the work of the NP.

CIL – will the council specify a minimum percentage rather than stating 'meaningful proportion'? It is also our understanding that local groups such as parish councils or neighbourhood plans will have a say in some of the distribution of these funds yet there is no mention of this. Please clarify.

There seems to be a contradiction between the S106 legal obligations and what it can be used on. If it must be directly related to the development

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012

FORUM VIEW

Leon Butler

how can it be pooled with others?

It appears the New Homes Bonus is not as great as first glance suggests as the money is not ring fenced and may have to come from other council budgets. There is no mention of where this money will be spent or which community groups will be consulted on how it is to be spent.

If there are sufficient approved applications for housing over the next 5 years will/can the council refuse Greenfield applications on that basis? What if the application is sustainable, does this mean the council has to approve it? Concerned this could lead to a flood of applications.

Post 2026 'urban extensions will be implemented' unless objected by the NP. Will we need to show alternatives?

With regards to monitoring what happens if a target is missed and where will they be published?

The list of priority infrastructure projects is very confusing. Are the key sites supposed to fund those specific infrastructure projects? What does 'Cost of Critical Insurance' mean?

OK

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
APPENDICES Susie Colley	Object: see Question 9 and Question 14
SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL – NON TECHNICAL SUMMARY Susie Colley	Findings Supported to the best of my ability
SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT	
<u>Consultation Question 1</u> – Feedback on the SA Report: Strategic Direction & Sustainable Development Policies Susie Colley	Accepted – subject to the above objections listed
<u>Consultation Question 2</u> – Feedback on the SA Report: Strategic Direction & Delivery Policies Susie Colley	Accepted – subject to the above objections listed
<u>Consultation Question 3</u> – Feedback on the SA Report: Place making delivery areas Susie Colley	Accepted – subject to the above objections listed
<u>Consultation Question 4</u> – Feedback on the SA Report: Key Findings Susie Colley	Accepted – subject to the above objections listed
<u>Consultation Question 5</u> – Feedback on the SA Report: Monitoring Framework Susie Colley	Accepted – subject to the above objections listed
SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL APPENDICES	Accepted – subject to the above objections listed
HABITATS REGULATION ASSESSMENT – Non Technical	Observations: (a) On Page 24 and Page 27 of the document it states that “The

LOCAL PLAN Consultation Draft: September 2012	FORUM VIEW
<p>Summary Susie Colley</p>	<p>assessment has assumed the risk of surface water run-off pollution on Lyme Bay and Torbay cSAC occurring as a result of new development suggested by the Local Plan will be minimised by Policy ER1 which promotes the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) in relation to controlling runoff pollution. Environmental assessment and Habitats Regulation Assessment of Neighbourhood plans and projects would prevent this risk from occurring as a result of new development.</p> <p>However there is no explanation of how developers will deal with acceptance of further foul sewerage output from the scale of additional development proposed. If it is assumed that the council will implement a solution I am unable to find any details of how, where, and when this will be achieved.</p> <p><i>(b) NPPF119 clearly states "The presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 14) does not apply where development requiring appropriate assessment under the Birds or Habitats Directives is being considered, planned, or determined." As the Local Plan requires a Habitats Assessment, this raises the fundamental question about the extent to which the Local Plan can rely on the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF.</i></p>
<p>HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT Susie Colley</p>	<p>See above</p>