

# West Devon Borough Council

South and South-West of Tavistock Masterplan  
Supplementary Planning Document

## Statement of Consultation

April 2013 – Committee Version



West Devon  
Borough  
Council

## **Introduction**

- What consultation has taken place? 2
- Who was consulted? 3
- How were they consulted? 3

## **Appendix 1: List of Consultees**

- Town and Parish Councils 4
- Statutory Consultees 4
- Notified Organisations 5
- Neighbouring Parishes 5

## **Appendix 2: Summary of Consultation Responses**

- The Vision, Planning Policy Context, Site Descriptions, Requirements and Constraints 7
- Land-Use Framework 13
- Design Framework 25
- Delivery Framework – Infrastructure 43
- Delivery Framework – Phasing 48
- General 52

# 1. Introduction

---

- 1.1 This Statement of Consultation sets out how the Council consulted on the draft South and South West of Tavistock Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document. This Statement addresses the requirements of Regulation 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.
- 1.2 The purpose of this statement is to clearly set out details of the consultation that has taken place. The Statement sets out:
  - Who was consulted.
  - How they were consulted.
  - Summary of the main issues raised.
  - How these issues have been addressed in the SPD.

## What consultation has taken place?

- 1.3 Work on the masterplan began with the preparation of the South and South-West of Tavistock Design Brief. During this stage, the local community was invited to two community workshops to talk about their priorities for the town and how the developments could look. A stakeholder workshop was also held to identify the key constraints and opportunities of the development.
- 1.4 These workshops were held on:
  - Stage 1 Community Visioning Event – 10<sup>th</sup> December 2011 at 10am
  - Stakeholder Workshop – 26<sup>th</sup> January 2012 at 1.30pm
  - Stage 2 Community Visioning Event – 29<sup>th</sup> March 2012 at 7pm
- 1.5 The Design Brief was finalised in the summer of 2012 and was subsequently approved by the Community Services Committee on 4<sup>th</sup> September 2012 to be used to inform the preparation of the masterplan. The masterplan was subsequently drafted and was taken to the meeting on the Community Services Committee on 26<sup>th</sup> February 2013 to seek approval for its consultation.
- 1.6 Following Member approval, the SPD was subject to a statutory four week consultation period that enabled all interested parties including statutory organisations to comment on the draft masterplan. The consultation process started on 7 March 2013 and ran until 8 April 2013.
- 1.7 An exhibition was held on Thursday 21<sup>st</sup> March from 11am – 4pm at Tavistock Town Hall. The exhibition material was also made available on the Council's website.
- 1.8 Officers held an informal workshop with Tavistock Town Council on Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> March.
- 1.9 Prior to the public consultation, internal consultation was also undertaken with Elected Members.

## Who was consulted?

1.10 The Council aimed to give all those who wish to comment on the SPD the opportunity to do so. The Council specifically consulted:

- Parish and Town Councils within West Devon
- Local councillors
- Statutory consultees
- Community contacts
- Development industry contacts
- Local interest groups
- Other non-statutory groups
- Neighbouring parishes outside of West Devon

1.11 A full list of consultees is provided in Appendix 1.

## How were they consulted?

1.12 The Council notified people of the consultation by a range of means including:

- Direct mail/email
- The Council's website at [www.westdevon.gov.uk](http://www.westdevon.gov.uk)
- A press release in the Tavistock Times and Okehampton Times

1.13 Copies of the draft SPD were available to view at:

- West Devon Borough Council, Kilworthy Park, Tavistock, PL19 0BZ
- West Devon Customer Service Centre, 10 St James Street, Okehampton, EX20 1DH
- On the Council's website

1.14 A response form was available for completion.

1.15 A summary of the consultation responses and the Council's comments about these are provided in Appendix 2.

## Appendix 1: List of Consultees

---

### Town and Parish Councils

Beaworthy	Belstone	Bere Ferrers	Bondleigh
Bratton Clovelly	Brentor	Bridestowe	Broadwoodkelly
Buckland Monachorum	Burrator	Chagford	Dartmoor Forest
Drewsteignton	Exbourne and Jacobstowe	Germansweek	Gidleigh
Gulworthy	Hatherleigh	Highampton	Horrabridge
Iddesleigh	Inwardleigh	Kelly	Lamerton
Lewdown	Lifton	Lydford	Mary Tavy
Meeth	Milton Abbot	Monokehampton	Northlew
North Tawton	Okehampton	Okehampton Hamlets	Peter Tavy
Plasterdown	Sampford Courtenay	Sourton	South Tawton
Spreyton	Sticklepath	Stowford	Sydenham Damerel
Tavistock	Throwleigh		

### Statutory Consultees

British Gas	Cornwall Council	Dartmoor National Park Authority	Devon and Cornwall Constabulary
Devon County Council	English Heritage	Environment Agency	Exeter City Council
Highways Agency	Heart of the South West Local Enterprise Partnership	Homes and Communities Agency	Marine Management Organisation
Mid Devon District Council	Mobile Operators Association	Natural England	Network Rail
NHS Devon	Plymouth City Council	Secretary of State for Transport	South West Water
Teignbridge District Council	Torrige District Council	Wales and West Utilities	Western Power Distribution

## Notified Organisations

Active Devon	Age UK	Airport Operators Association	Barn Owl Trust
Bere Alston Action Group	British Chambers of Commerce	British Geological Survey	British Toilet Association
BT	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)	CAMRA	Canal and Rivers Trust
Care and Repair	Centre for Ecology and Hydrology	Chemical Business Association	Church Commissioners and Diocesan Board of Finance
Churches Together in Devon	Civil Aviation Authority	CLA	Commission for Rural Communities
Community Council of Devon	Cornwall and West Devon Mining Heritage World Heritage Site	Council of Devon County Agricultural Association	Creating Excellence
Crowndale Recreation Association	Crown Estate Office	Dartmoor Partnership Ltd	Dartmoor Preservation Association
Dartmoor Railway	Department of Communities and Local Government	Design Council CABC	Devon and Somerset Fire and Rescue Service
Devon Archaeological Society	Devon Countryside Access Forum	Devon Disability Network	Devon Early Years Development and Childcare Service
Devon Gardens Trust	Devon Heartlands	Devon Local Access Forum	Devon Playing Fields Association
Devon Racial Equality Council	Devon Rural Transport Partnership	Devon Wildlife Trust	Devon Youth Network
Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee	Eco-nomic Ltd	Equality and Human Rights Commission	Federation of Small Businesses
Forestry Commission	Friends of the Earth	Friends, Families and Travellers	Gypsy Council
Gypsy Traveller Liaison Service	Hatherleigh Community Centre	Hatherleigh Market Town	Homestart
Inland Waterways Association	MABRAKE	National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups	National Grid
OCRA	Officers of the Crowndale Recreation Association	Okehampton Argyle Football Club	Okehampton and District Chamber of Trade
Okehampton Medical Centre	Okehampton RFC	Planning Inspectorate	Play England – South West
RenewableUK	RSPB	Rural Innovation	South Devon and Dartmoor Community Safety Partnership
South West Ambulance Service	South West Lakes Trust	South West Tourism	Sport England

Trust			
Sustrans	Tamar Belle Heritage Group & Tamar Valley Tourism Association	Tamar Estuaries Consultative Forum	TAVI Development Forum
Tavistock Area Support Services	Tavistock BID	Tavistock Chamber of Commerce	Tavistock Community Sports Club
Tavistock Forward	Tavistock Hospital League of Friends	Tavistock Learning Community	Tavistock Rugby Club
Tavistock Taskforce	Tavistock Youth Cafe	The Gypsy Council	The National Trust
The Ramblers Association	The Senior Council for Devon	The Tavonians	The Theatres Trust
Transition Tavistock	United Reform Church South West Synod	West Devon Branch of Small Businesses	West Devon CVS
West Devon Children and Young People's Partnership	Women's National Commission	Woodland Trust	Yelverton Surgery
Young Devon	Tamar Valley AONB	Local Primary and Secondary Schools	

### Neighbouring Parishes

Black Torrington	Bow	Broadhempston	Broadwoodwidge
Buckland Filleigh	Calstock	Cheriton Bishop	Coldridge
Dolton	Dowland	Halwill	Hittisleigh
Huish	Landulph	Lawhitton	Lezant
Petrockstowe	Saltash	Sheepwash	St Dominic
St Giles on the Heath	Stoke Climsland	Winkleigh	Woodland
Zeal Monachorum			

## Appendix 2: Summary of Consultation Responses

### The Vision, Planning Policy Context, Site Descriptions, Requirements and Constraints

Rep number	Section	Comment	Council response	Changes required?
8	1.8 – 1.9	Support for an open minded approach to design.	Comments noted.	N
34 (Trustees to the Crowndale Estate)	1.8	The respondent requests that the Council provides more detail about how sites in multiple ownership will ensure the delivery of infrastructure.	The Council notes the comments. Development will be required to contribute proportionally to the infrastructure that is required as set out in section 7 of the masterplan. This is a matter of detail that will be addressed at the planning application stage.	N
34 (Trustees to the Crowndale Estate)	1.9	The respondent welcomes the general principles and approach to the masterplan, including the lack of prescription which will provide opportunities for flexibility in delivery.	The Council welcomes the support.	N
39, 50	Section 2	The respondents argue that the masterplan re-designates Tavistock as a “market town” whereas the Core Strategy was based on the designation of Tavistock and Okehampton as “main towns”. The respondent cites a recent case in Kent which suggests that the incorrect designation of a centre of population is grounds for the Strategy to be reversed.	The Council would like to clarify that no re-designation of the town has taken place through the masterplan. The masterplan refers to Tavistock as market town which relates to its chartered Market Town designation. The Core Strategy only refers to Tavistock as a ‘main town’ in the context of the settlement hierarchy and the functional classification of the town for the purposes of planning for future growth.	N
39, 50, 52	Section 2	The respondents consider that the identification of Plymouth as the main economic centre and introduction of a commuter train is at odds with the Core Strategy which states that the plan should “enhance the self-containment of Okehampton and Tavistock by promoting closer links between housing, employment and services.” A lot of high street shops have been forced to close due to outside competition. Suggest that the Masterplan	<p>Whilst the comments are noted, the masterplan does seek to enhance local employment opportunities in Tavistock in accordance with the principles in the Core Strategy. This is particularly emphasised within Section 5 which provides the framework for enabling employment development.</p> <p>The relationship with Plymouth is important in terms of the services that it provides and it is this which is acknowledged in the masterplan.</p>	N



		needs to promote increased local employment rather than basing the strategy on linking to Plymouth.		
8	2.7	The respondent suggests the re-wording of some of the bullet points for clarification.	The Council supports a recommended change in the wording and proposes the following, taking on board parts of the respondents suggestions. Bullet point 3 to be amended as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Create buildings which strive to achieve the best and most imaginative design of their time but are inspired by a mix of traditional, local materials and styles in the town.</i></li> </ul> Insert new bullet points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Incorporate the best methods of sustainable design and create a lasting image of Tavistock as a forward thinking community.</i></li> <li>• <i>Avoid streets dominated by parked cars</i></li> </ul>	Y
22	2.7	The respondent suggests an addition to the text regarding crime and disorder.	The Council notes the suggestion and proposes to include the following bullet point at paragraph 2.7: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Maintain low crime rates and the safe environment enjoyed by residents and visitors to the area.”</i></li> </ul>	Y
34 (Trustees to the Crowndale Estate)	2.7	The respondent supports many of the aspirations listed with the exception of the use of traditional local materials as this is often not practical.	The Council notes the comments but considers that, as this section is a reflection of the community aspirations and not a design guideline, the wording as it stands is appropriate.	N
5	2.8	Support for the Vision with the caveat that the size of the development should be scaled down.	The concerns raised by the respondent are noted by the Council. However, this comment relates mainly to the principle of the development which has already been established through the adoption of the Core Strategy and is therefore not part of this consultation.  The Core Strategy provides an explanation about the scale of development proposed.	N
8	2.8	The respondent suggests the re-wording of paragraph 2.8 to make a more positive statement about how developments should be “of our time”.	The Council supports a change in the wording taking on board the suggestions of the respondent. It is proposed to amend the second sentence of paragraph 2.8 as follows: <i>“New development should achieve the best and most imaginative design of its time,</i>	Y

			<i>innovatively incorporating features within landmark buildings, the street scene and public art which are influenced by the World Heritage Site and other architectural qualities of the town.</i>	
53 (Tavistock Town Council)	The Vision	The Town Council suggests the following amendments to the Vision: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Second sentence to read: “new development will contribute to a range of homes, infrastructure...”</li> <li>• Replace ‘diverse’ with ‘stronger’ in the second sentence.</li> </ul>	The Council notes the suggestions and supports the recommended changes. These will be incorporated in the vision as follows, alongside other amendments that have been suggested: <p><i>“...pride in the town. It will contribute to a range of homes, infrastructure, jobs and facilities to help build a stronger community.”</i></p>	Y
8, 29, 33, 42 (Transition Tavistock)	The Vision	Suggests the Vision needs to be amended to take account of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The need to look forwards as well as back for inspiration for design;</li> <li>• The need for new tree planting;</li> <li>• Cycling;</li> <li>• Exemplary development fit for the 21<sup>st</sup> century</li> <li>• Maximising opportunities for a low carbon environment and minimising the use of resources;</li> </ul>	The Council supports a change in the wording of the vision to reflect the respondent’s concerns and suggestions. The Council proposes to amend the wording of the third, fourth and final sentences as follows: <p><i>“The use of modern and imaginative design will be balanced with respect for the past and be inspired by the World Heritage Site and other architectural qualities of the town.</i></p> <p><i>“New planting will add value to the existing trees and hedgerows and together they will feature strongly as part of a well landscaped development, supporting local wildlife and adding interest to the development.”</i></p> <p><i>“New footpaths, cycleways and bus links will connect the development to the rest of the town and, alongside the railway, will provide a range of sustainable travel options for our community. A low carbon development will be achieved through the use of efficient design, renewable energy technologies and quality construction”.</i></p>	Y
13, 14	The Vision	Supports the vision in principle but suggests it is too broad.	The Council welcomes the support for the vision and will be making some changes to the vision as suggested by various respondents throughout the consultation (please see above).	Y
20, 22, 31	The Vision	Support	The Council welcomes the support for the vision.	N
27, 29, 33, 42 (Transition Tavistock)	The Vision	Suggests that more emphasis should be given to integrating the development into the existing Tavistock community and the provision of communal facilities within the development.	The Vision as is currently worded does make reference to new development contributing to the existing strong sense of local community. This is reinforced throughout the design and land use principles of the masterplan which encourage integration with the existing town.	N
43 (Redrow Homes)	The Vision	The respondent suggests that as the allocation was largely based on the	The Council notes the suggestion to include explicit reference to the railway line and considers that it is appropriate to amend the vision accordingly. Alongside other	Y

		<p>requirement for the reinstatement of the railway line, there should be explicit reference to this in the vision.</p> <p>The vision as it is currently worded seems to refer to all new development taking place and should be amended so that it only refers to the allocated sites.</p> <p>Supports the reference to providing a range of houses and the important contribution that affordable housing makes.</p>	<p>recommended changes to the vision, it is proposed to amend the final sentence of the vision as follows:</p> <p><i>“New footpaths, cycleways and bus links will connect the development to the rest of the town and, alongside the railway, will provide a range of sustainable travel options for our community. A low carbon development will be achieved through the use of efficient design, renewable energy technologies and quality construction”.</i></p> <p>With regards to what the vision relates to, it is considered that the aspirations of the community are equally applicable to the allocated sites and any other new development that takes place in the town.</p>	
41 (Bovis Homes)	The Vision	<p>The respondent supports the vision in general although notes the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraph 1.5 should be amended to “...reflects the <b>reasonable</b> aspirations of the local community...”</li> <li>• Supports paragraph 1.9</li> <li>• The summary of community aspirations in paragraph 2.7 must be balanced against the need to deliver sufficient housing and achieve a viable and deliverable development.</li> </ul>	<p>The Council notes the comments and welcomes the support for certain sections. Whilst the Council acknowledges the points made by the respondent in bullet points 1 and 2, it is considered that the masterplan in its entirety provides sufficient flexibility to ensure there is a planning framework within which a viable and deliverable development can be achieved. As such, it is not considered to amend the text in response to these comments.</p>	N
44 (Mercian Developments Ltd)	3.3	<p>Suggests reference is made to the policies of the NPPF in relation to the ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’ and the retailing.</p>	<p>The Council notes the comments made and proposes to include reference to these in the bullet points in paragraph 3.3 with the insertion of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“A presumption in favour of sustainable development, which means positively planning to meet the development needs of the area;</i></li> <li>• <i>Meeting the needs of retail, leisure, office and other main town centre uses and making sure these are not compromised by limited site availability”.</i></li> </ul>	Y
43 (Redrow Homes)	3.4	<p>The respondent notes that the footnote at the bottom of page 9 of the masterplan is inconsistent with paragraph 8.32 of the Core Strategy in relation to reserve sites.</p>	<p>The Council notes the comment made and agrees that further clarification is required to ensure consistency between the masterplan and the Core Strategy. The Council proposes to amend the footnote as follows:</p> <p><i>“The identification of an additional reserve sites(s) will be looked at through the</i></p>	Y

			<i>preparation of a subsequent development plan document and will not form part of this SPD. It should be noted that a reserve site(s) as referenced in SP23 will be required in the event that the allocation cannot deliver the housing and infrastructure requirements identified in the Core Strategy”.</i>			
8	3.4	The respondent suggests removing the reference within the policy on page 9 (1 vii) to junction improvements alone as the whole highway needs improving.	This is the wording of an adopted policy and cannot be changed through this process. However, the specific works required are expanded on in chapter 7.	N		
39	Section 4	The respondent considers that the site constraints need expanding to point out that the local high ground is particularly visible across the valley from The Pimple and Dartmoor. As these are major local tourist sites, attention should be given to light pollution and not just the punctuation of the skyline by building rooflines.	<p>The Council notes the comments raised and considers that the issue of light pollution is adequately covered in paragraph 6.61 bullet point 5. In particular, this promotes low level lighting with downward firing to ensure that limited light escapes into the sky.</p> <p>The Council proposes to amend Section 4a Site Constraints as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>4. Local high ground</td> <td><i>“...local high ground. This is particularly visible from the western edge of Dartmoor, namely Whitchurch Down. To retain this character, new development should not encroach on or over this natural ridge line. Because of this, buildings in Tavistock generally sit below the skyline.”</i></td> </tr> </table>	4. Local high ground	<i>“...local high ground. This is particularly visible from the western edge of Dartmoor, namely Whitchurch Down. To retain this character, new development should not encroach on or over this natural ridge line. Because of this, buildings in Tavistock generally sit below the skyline.”</i>	Y
4. Local high ground	<i>“...local high ground. This is particularly visible from the western edge of Dartmoor, namely Whitchurch Down. To retain this character, new development should not encroach on or over this natural ridge line. Because of this, buildings in Tavistock generally sit below the skyline.”</i>					
39	Section 4	<p>The respondent notes that the site constraints for SP23A refer to Crowndale Farm as a listed building but considers there are two important features that should be identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Mill Barn (Grade 2)</li> <li>• The farm curtilage includes the ruins of the birthplace of Sir Francis Drake. This is not listed and has not yet been subject to archaeological investigation.</li> </ul> <p>Suggests that the possible future tourism opportunities afforded by both of these features should not be adversely affected or constrained by the proposed housing development at SP23A and that preference should be given for sites designs which</p>	The Masterplan appropriately identifies Crowndale Farm as a key feature which needs to be sensitively considered. The farm cartilage and Mill Barn are considered as part of the setting of Crowndale Farm. The principles in the masterplan do not preclude possible future tourism activities and the development itself does not extend into this area.	N		

		enhance the future possible opening-up of Crowndale Farm as a visitor attraction.		
43 (Redrow Homes)	4.1	The reference to extending boundaries in exceptional circumstances is ambiguous and inconsistent with the adopted Core Strategy.	The Council notes the comments but would reiterate that any proposals of this nature would be advertised as a departure from the adopted Development Plan. The reference made to extensions within the masterplan reflects the need for a degree of flexibility that the NPPF promotes.	N
34 (Trustees to the Crowndale Estate)	4a	It should be highlighted that the topography and ground conditions of SP23A are likely to mean higher site delivery costs due to abnormal ground conditions.	The Council notes the comment made and will need to form part of the overall scheme viability exercise at the application stage.	N
44 (Mercian Developments Ltd)	4b	<p>The respondent welcomes the flexibility of uses but objects to the inclusion of the term ‘small proportion’ as the appropriate proportion will need to be tested through a viability exercise.</p> <p>The respondent also objects to the inclusion of the phrase “which has limited impact on the town centre” as this should relate directly to the NPPF requirements.</p>	<p>The Council notes the comments. However, the site is allocated in the Core Strategy for predominantly employment uses and therefore in order to be policy compliant, the majority of the site should be made available and developed for employment purposes. The Council considers that the current wording of ‘small proportion’ is appropriate and that details of overall scheme viability will be addressed at the detail application stage.</p> <p>The Council notes the comments in relation to 4b and proposes to amend the section titled ‘site requirements’ as follows:</p> <p><i>“...housing or other development which does not have any significant adverse impact on the town centre) to enable...”</i></p>	Y

## Land-Use Framework

Rep number	Section	Comment	Council response	Changes required?
13	All	The respondent supports the Land-Use Framework but suggests it could be more robust.	The Council welcomes the support and notes the concerns that the Framework should be more robust. However, it is important that the masterplan contains sufficient flexibility to be able to respond to changing circumstances during the lifetime of the development.	N
16	All	The respondent suggests that new development should be designed in a way that makes best use of public transport links. Suggests that a park and ride facility could be provided to alleviate traffic coming into the town.	The masterplan does promote effective links throughout the developments for public transport use as well as walking and cycling links. There are specific council departments and local groups exploring traffic and travel issues in Tavistock and options such as a park and ride may be considered as part of this. The masterplan does not preclude this type of facility being provided in the town.	N
20	All	The respondent objects to the removal of the link road between Callington Road and Plymouth Road.	The most up to date traffic analysis has shown that the link road between Plymouth Road and Callington Road is not required to accommodate the development. However, provision is made in the masterplan for this to be delivered beyond 2026 if it is required. Various junction improvements to the A390/A386 will be required as part of the first phase of development to accommodate the increase in traffic.	N
31	All	<p>The respondent considers that the distribution of employment and residential uses on SP23B has been sensibly allocated. However, concerned at the increase in population in the town.</p> <p>Considers that the proposals for SP23B are vague and unclear. The current examples of the types of uses proposed are unsightly and provide a poor first impression to visitors. As such, the respondent would be more supportive of B1 and B8 uses.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes the support for the proposed distribution of uses but notes the concerns raised.</p> <p>The planned homes and jobs are required to support local housing and employment needs which are required as a result of natural population change, in-migration and changes in household requirements (e.g. emerging households, divorcing/separating households etc.).</p> <p>It is difficult to be prescriptive within the masterplan about the specific types of uses that will and will not be allowed on the site. This is because the masterplan is intended to set a framework within which opportunities for a range of employment-generating uses can be explored, responding to different demands that may occur during the lifetime of the plan.</p> <p>The approach into Tavistock along the A386 is important and it is considered that further emphasis within the masterplan needs to be given to this. As such, it is proposed to include a section within the Design Framework entitled "Site Entrances". Please refer to comments in the Design Framework section for the suggested</p>	Y

			wording.	
5, 7, 28 (Amethyst)	All	Support.	The Council welcomes the support for this section.	N
34 (Trustees to the Crowndale Estate)	Figure 4	The respondent supports the broad principles of land use as shown on the map.	The Council welcomes the support.	N
47 (Devon County Council)	5.1 and 5.2	The Tavistock Canal (WHS) needs to be set in an area of open space to provide greater opportunity for conservation and appropriate access to, and enjoyment of, the heritage asset. Although indicative, the Land Use Framework shows only a narrow band of green space augmenting the existing woodland. The document refers to 'opening up' both sides of the canal for public access, however indicative plans (Figure 6) show paths/ cycleways within what is a minimal buffer. This buffer could be extended.	The Council notes the comments and considers this to be a question of illustration on the concept map. The area alongside the canal does not lend itself naturally to development due to the topography and open space provision in the form of a buffer will be provided here.  The Council proposes to amend the concept map to indicate a slightly larger buffer alongside the canal.	Y
48	5.1	Figures 4 and 5 (Concept Plans) should be amended to show the physical boundaries of the site, Plymouth Road and Callington Road and the future connections which could link SP23A and SP23B.	The purpose of the concept plans is to provide the broad context in which the development could take place. The details of the development will be determined at the application stage. However, the Council notes the suggestion to include more of the surrounding area and the potential future link connection and proposes to amend the concept maps accordingly.	Y
41 (Bovis Homes)	5.1	With reference to Figure 4, the respondent suggests that the highway arrangement onto Callington Road is amended to show a roundabout as this is more likely to be acceptable to the highways authority.  The hub is likely to require a larger area than shown to accommodate all of the proposed uses.  A second vehicular access at the south of the site is not necessary and is unlikely to	The Council notes the comments raised. Figure 4 is intended to be a conceptual diagram indicating key access points and land uses. Whilst a roundabout may be the preferred option at the detailed application stage, it is considered that it is not necessary to illustrate this on the concept map. The map it is currently drawn would not prevent a roundabout from being implemented if this was agreed as the necessary highway requirement at the application stage.  With regard to the south-western area of the site, a buffer has been included to recognise the potential constraints in terms of ground conditions and to protect the setting of the AONB. However, the Council notes that more detailed landscape and geo-physical analysis has been undertaken in this area and that the extent of the buffer could be less than originally suggested as the level of impact appears to be	Y

		<p>be deliverable. However, a pedestrian and cycle link at the south of the site may be possible.</p> <p>Survey work undertaken on the site by Bovis Homes suggest the land shown as open space on the south-west of the site is developable.</p>	<p>minimal. This area of land is well screened from the AONB and its visibility in the wider landscape is minimal. As such, the Council proposes to reduce the buffer on this side of the railway line to reflect this. However, the buffer to the south of the land east of the railway will remain as there are significant constraints in terms of the setting of Crowndale Farm and the landscape impacts into the AONB.</p>	
34 (Trustees to the Crowndale Estate)	5.3	<p>The respondent is concerned about the potential impact of the re-instatement of the railway on the delivery of the 40% affordable housing target. A Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is not in place in West Devon and as such is not referenced in the SPD. The Council cannot expect CIL payments on top of other S106 payments which are required now. Contributions towards the railway should not be sought solely from development within Tavistock but from the wider area as it will have benefits to the wider district and beyond.</p>	<p>The Council is currently considering the preparation of a Community Infrastructure Levy. However, at this stage there is not one in place for the Borough and therefore the main mechanism for securing infrastructure contributions will be through the use of S106 agreements.</p>	N
10, 20, 27, 28 (Amethyst), 29, 33, 42 (Transition Tavistock), 53 (Tavistock Town Council)	5.5	<p>Respondents raise concern at how affordable housing, design and other infrastructure may be compromised because of the delivery of the railway. The Council should be firm in achieving 40% and this would be more viable if the railway was scrapped.</p>	<p>There are many competing priorities for infrastructure and affordable housing and these will need to be balanced carefully at the time an application is submitted, taking into account viability. The Core Strategy has consistently highlighted the importance of the railway in accommodating further growth in the town and the proposed route does serve key parts of the city where there are significant employment opportunities and services. The Council notes the concerns raised and proposes the following paragraph to be included in the delivery framework after paragraph 7.15 to make sure that the most pressing infrastructure needs can be accommodated:</p> <p><i>7.16 With regards to SP23A in particular, the Council acknowledges that there is a range of competing infrastructure requirements, and that these will need to be managed sensitively to ensure that both the long term aspiration of delivering the railway and some of the more immediate infrastructure and affordable housing needs are met. The consultation on the draft masterplan highlighted this as a key concern within the community and it is therefore important that the Council is able to secure those infrastructure needs that it considers to be most pressing at the time an</i></p>	Y



			<i>application is submitted without compromising the long term railway project to which it is committed.</i>	
4	5.5 – 5.7	The respondent questions the need for such a high proportion of affordable housing and suggests that contributions are instead provided to the local housing associations to provide stock in places where it is needed and to re-furbish existing stock.	The Council's evidence (e.g. Strategic Housing Market Needs Assessment) demonstrates a significant amount of affordable housing need for existing and emerging households in West Devon and we have a duty to meet this need. The allocations make provision to address some of this need within Tavistock. The Council's Allocations Policy for affordable housing gives priority to local residents (i.e. those with a West Devon connection).	N
8, 29, 33, 42 (Transition Tavistock)	5.6	Suggests provision should be made for alternative ways of meeting affordable housing need (e.g. Community Land Trust, self-build etc).	The Council is currently looking at affordable self-build options/models and this will be discussed in subsequent planning documents.	N
39	5.6 & 5.7	The respondent considers that paragraph 5.6 comprises more comment than guidance in discussing the challenging nature of delivering affordable housing. Concerned that paragraph 5.7 goes a step too far and is already ceding the Council's negotiating position in favour of the developers before discussion on the S106 has commenced.	The Council is bound by issues of site viability. An objective of the Core Strategy is to deliver the development we need, to the best possible standard, alongside the accompanying infrastructure. The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that viability is a key issue – <i>“To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable”</i> (NPPF para 173). The Council has undertaken strategic viability testing of the Tavistock sites, under a variety of market scenarios. The master planning document has to be sufficiently flexible to be deliverable in a range of different economic scenarios.	N
41 (Bovis Homes)	5.8	The respondent suggests that reference is made in bullet point 2 of paragraph 5.8 to an extra-care housing scheme being acceptable in either SP23A or SP23B.	The Council notes the suggestion and considers that clarification is necessary as this use could come forward on either site, providing it is well related to facilities, is easily accessible and is near other residential development. The Council proposes to amend the wording of paragraph 5.8 bullet point 2 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>“An extra-care housing scheme providing between 50 to 60 units is also required. As above, this should be situated in an accessible location. It is considered that this type of use would benefit from being closely related to facilities and other residential development”.</i></li> </ul>	Y
41 (Bovis Homes)	5.9	The respondent questions whether the desire to secure a focal point for community interaction would allow for the	The Council notes the question and considers that the dual use of buildings can be an effective use of space and should be promoted where it is appropriate to do so. It is proposed to include an additional bullet point in paragraph 5.9 as follows:	Y

		possible dual use of the buildings and outdoor areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Dual use of facilities where appropriate”</li> </ul>	
29,33, 39, 42 (Transition Tavistock)	5.9	Suggests this section should include the need for a community building/facility.	Whilst this could help to encourage community interaction, it is not a policy requirement of the Core Strategy. However, the masterplan as currently worded does not preclude this type of use coming forward. It is important that a balance is achieved between providing basic local facilities within a close proximity to the new development whilst also ensuring that they become part of the existing town by using facilities already provided.	N
53 (Tavistock Town Council)	5.9	The Town Council proposes that the hub site could incorporate an area of green and/or open space.	The Council notes the suggestion and considers that as this is the central area of the community it would be appropriate to encourage this type of use in the hub area. The Council proposes to include reference to this is paragraph 5.9 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“...development of SP23A. These range from a small neighbourhood shop and open space to educational facilities and a railway station. There is the potential...”.</li> </ul>	Y
47 (Devon County Council)	5.11	This paragraph includes reference to the facilities which should be incorporated into the delivery of the railway station. Reference should also be made to the need for the facility to include provision of a bus stop and space for bus turning.	The Council agrees with the suggestion and proposes to amend the wording of paragraph 5.11 as follows: <p>“...as indicated on the concept map (figure 4). The terminus will need to be accompanied by a station facility, sufficient car parking, a bus stop and space for bus turning. The station facility will...”</p>	Y
20	5.11	Concerns that the cost implications of the railway have not been identified and consulted upon fully. As such the respondent is concerned that the railway is not viable and therefore unsustainable.	Both viability appraisals and evidence of delivery of the railway proposals have been provided alongside the preparation of the Core Strategy to demonstrate how it will be achieved. This is an on-going project for which the development will be expected to fund a significant proportion of. Devon County Council (as lead organisation) is looking at other sources of funding specifically for transport infrastructure projects to assist in its deliverability.	N
39	5.11 & 6.42	The respondent considers that the provision of a car park with only 70-100 spaces is inadequate and that if DCC are promoting the railway on the basis of free parking, then a far greater number of spaces will be required, particularly when there are likely to be cars in the car park using other hub facilities.	Some initial work has been undertaken to assess the likely number of car parking spaces required. The number of spaces has been calculated on the basis of potential patronage of the railway in future together with assumptions regarding the likely modes of transport which people will use to travel to the station site. This has been calculated on the basis of data for similar stations from the National Rail Travel Survey. Further assessments will be undertaken as the project moves forward.	N
8, 29, 33, 42 (Transition Tavistock)	5.11	If the rail link is not completed, the respondent asks what would happen to the car park and suggests that there could be	Adequate car parking needs to be provided in association with the station and the other uses of the Hub to ensure that the railway and area is accessible for a number of users. The provision of a car park is accompanied by new cycle ways and	N

		<p>other options to avoid car use (e.g. a mini bus link from existing car parks to co-ordinate with the train times).</p> <p>The respondent suggests that the money could be more wisely spent on safe bicycle lanes into Plymouth.</p>	<p>footpaths. The amount of spaces provided has been advised by Devon County Council as the highways authority. The situation will be monitored throughout the development period and if not all of the planned car parking spaces are required, the Council would need to discuss with the community and other stakeholders what alternative uses could be suitable.</p> <p>The National Cycle Network Route 27 currently links Plymouth to Tavistock and work is being undertaken to provide more traffic-free sections of this route. The planned development will be required as per the masterplan to link to NCN route 27.</p>	
15, 18, 24, 35, 45, 49, 55	5.11	<p>The respondent is concerned about the railway for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cost of it will be at the expense of the ratepayers;</li> <li>• It does not cater for people working at Derriford Hospital;</li> <li>• The locations of the stations will be outside of the centres of both Tavistock and Plymouth.</li> <li>• Questions who would use the train and whether it offers a realistic alternative to the private car – the current assessment of capacity seems optimistic.</li> </ul>	<p>The railway will be funded through new development that takes place in the town as well as other transport infrastructure grants that may be available. The railway will link to the city centre where there is a significant employment and service base which a number of people will use. There are many links (public transport, pedestrian and cycle ways) from the station to other areas of the city. Plymouth city centre is within a short walking distance from the station. Alternatively, there is a good bus service from Tavistock to the Derriford area of Plymouth.</p> <p>Various studies have already been undertaken about the viability, deliverability and use of the railway, including assessments of likely levels of passenger use. A range of documents are available on the Council’s website which provide this information. The Council proposes to include specific reference within the masterplan to these as follows:</p> <p>Insert after paragraph 5.12:</p> <p><i>“5.13 A range of studies and surveys have been undertaken which provide information and evidence to support the railway proposals. Devon County Council is continuing to gather and update information as it progresses the project to deliver the railway. These documents are available on the Council’s website at <a href="http://www.westdevon.gov.uk">www.westdevon.gov.uk</a> and include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <i>Tavistock Route Re-Opening: Option Refinement and Business Case (October 2012)</i></li> <li>– <i>Tavistock to Bere Alston Community Rail Project – Evidence of Deliverability (April 2009)</i></li> <li>– <i>Tavistock to Plymouth Corridor – Analysis of A386 and Proposed Rail Scheme (September 2010)</i></li> <li>– <i>Affordable Housing Viability Assessment – Strategic Sites in Okehampton and Tavistock (October 2012)”</i></li> </ul>	Y

			Devon County Council is continuing to develop the evidence base on the railway project and any publicly available reports will be provided on the County Council's website - <a href="http://www.devon.gov.uk/tavistock-bere-alston-railway">http://www.devon.gov.uk/tavistock-bere-alston-railway</a> .	
45	5.11	The respondent considers that the location of the railway line will have limited value as it is not central to Tavistock as a whole.	The Council notes the comments raised. Whilst the location of the station will be on the outskirts of the town, there will be associated car parking and a range of bus, footpath and cycle links which will provide alternative ways of accessing the station.	N
29, 33, 42 (Transition Tavistock)	5.12	It is important that the railway is provided early on in the development.	The plan to deliver new homes and employment opportunities alongside the reinstatement of the railway line provides a sustainable option for new growth in the town. However, the residential development itself is not dependent on the railway line being in place in the earlier stages. As with all infrastructure, its delivery relies on funds being secured before it can be put in place.	N
43 (Redrow Homes)	5.12	The respondent expresses concerns about the viability of the railway line and that evidence commissioned by themselves estimated the costs to be higher than those estimated by Kilbride/DCC.  There is no information about how the railway will be delivered in tandem with the development.	Various studies have already been undertaken about the viability, deliverability and use of the railway, including assessments of likely levels of passenger use. A range of documents are available on the Council's website which provide this information. The Council proposes to include specific reference within the masterplan to these as explained above.	N
41 (Bovis Homes)	5.12	The respondent suggests that the mechanism by which other developments in the town will contribute to the railway should be clarified.	The Council notes the comments and considers that further clarification would be useful. However, it is considered that this is relevant to all infrastructure (not just the railway) and therefore the Council proposes to amend paragraph 7.9 as follows:  <i>"...It refers to both SP23A and B but is also relevant to other development coming forward in the town and appropriate provision should be made in accordance with Core Strategy Strategic Policy 4. Where the requirements are...."</i>	Y
47 (Devon County Council)	5.13	This paragraph includes reference to the need for the development not to preclude the delivery of the railway line back towards Okehampton in future. This is supported in principle, but it should be noted that the deliverability of reinstating the line back to Okehampton would be very challenging and is currently not being developed as part of the on-going rail project.	The Council notes the comments and suggests adding the following wording to the end of paragraph 5.13 as follows:  <i>"...and rail link to Okehampton. However it is important to note that this will be challenging to deliver and is not currently being developed as part of the on-going rail project."</i>	Y
41 (Bovis	5.14	The reason why neighbourhood shopping	The Council notes the comments and agrees that clarification is required. The Council	Y

Homes)		facilities should demonstrate that there is no impact on the town centre should be clarified.	proposes to amend paragraph 5.14 as follows:  <i>"...and scale to the development. Any proposals for food and/or non-food retail units over the locally set threshold will need to demonstrate that it will have no significant adverse impact on the town centre in accordance with local and national policy".</i>	
46 (Marchfield Properties)	5.14	The masterplan states that a competing centre to the town centre should not be created within SP23A. As such, the respondent suggests that a floorspace cap (e.g. 300m <sup>2</sup> ) should be introduced to remove the ambiguity relating to the potential quantum of floorspace in this area. A cap of 300 m <sup>2</sup> would achieve the Council's ambition of servicing the needs of new residents whilst maintaining the character and function of the retail floorspace as a local facility.	Any proposals for retail development within the allocated sites will be assessed in accordance with relevant local and national policies, including the emerging 'Assessing the Impact of New Retail Development SPD' which sets a local threshold for assessing significant adverse impact. This will ensure that any neighbourhood retailing facilities are of an appropriate scale.	N
8, 29, 33, 42 (Transition Tavistock)	5.14	The respondent suggests that the neighbourhood retailing facility could be provided as a "community" enterprise.	The masterplan does not preclude this type of shop from being developed but the onus would be on the community to provide and manage this facility.	N
49	5.14	Provision of retail is unlikely to be viable as shown by the closure of shops at Greenlands and Bishopsmead.	The masterplan provides a framework to enable a small scale neighbourhood retail facility to be provided. Such a facility will be considered as part of the overall viability of the scheme and is likely to only be pursued where there is a viable market for it.	N
34 (Trustees to the Crowndale Estate)	5.15	The respondent agrees with the principle of providing a site for a primary school but its delivery should be linked to a proven need, with the site considered for alternative uses if it is not required for the development. Any financial contributions to secondary and primary school provision will need to be justified.	The Council notes the response and considers that the suggestions made are sufficiently covered in the existing wording of the masterplan in paragraphs 5.15 to 5.19.	N
39	5.15 – 5.19	The respondent notes that during the work on the Design Brief, there was considerable support for the primary school to be located at the top of SP23A where the land is flatter, the sports field area could encompass the "high ground" thereby mitigating the problem of roofs	Various areas within SP23A have been looked at for the school. The key consideration is to make sure the school is as centrally located as possible so as to be a focal point for the community. The masterplan proposes that this is located reasonably near the north of the site within the Hub and through the general principles of the masterplan, we would expect the building to be designed taking into account its visual impact.	N

		punctuating the skyline and there would be less light pollution in this location, thereby diminishing the intrusiveness of buildings being visible from Dartmoor across the valley.		
29, 33, 42 (Transition Tavistock)	5.20	Care should be taken not to lose the opportunity to provide storage and workspace for SMEs.	The Council agrees with the comments and considers this is sufficiently covered within paragraphs 5.20 – 5.23.	N
49	5.20	The respondent notes that there are already many empty employment units and questions who will use the new units.	The Council notes the comments. However, evidence shows that there is a need to provide more serviced employment land in the town and that the demand for smaller office development is likely to increase in the future. It is therefore important that a range of employment opportunities are enabled to support Tavistock in the future and encourage more job growth in the town.	N
44 (Mercian Developments Ltd)	5.21	In the second sentence the word ‘business’ should be replaced with ‘employment’.	The Council notes the comment and agrees that the wording of paragraph 5.21 should be amended as follows:  <i>“...the type of employment uses that would be acceptable....”</i>	Y
44 (Mercian Developments Ltd)	5.23	The specification of particular uses that may be appropriate may lead to a mis-application of the document.	The Council notes the comments and proposes to amend the wording as follows:  <i>“...forward across SP23B. This could include small workshop spaces, live-work units, light industry, storage and office development. “</i>	Y
53 (Tavistock Town Council)	5.24	The Town Council would like provision to be made within SP23B for a multi-use facility that could incorporate a relocation of the cattle market and a park and change facility. There could also be opportunities for a coach/lorry park and cycle destination.  There should also be provision for a much needed budget hotel.	The Council notes the comments and considers that the masterplan as it is currently worded would not prevent these types of uses coming forward, subject to standard planning policies.	N
40 (Boyer Planning on behalf of Cavanna Homes (South West) Limited)	5.25	The respondent considers that the inclusion of residential units on SP23B could give rise to a number of difficulties, particularly around the impact on residential amenity issues such as noise and light pollution, while the proximity of	Any residential development provided on SP23B will need to be appropriately planned to ensure that it does not compromise the operation of surrounding employment uses. The Council notes the comments raised and proposes to acknowledge this within paragraph 5.25 bullet point 1 as follows:  • <i>“...employment development. Any residential development will need to be</i>	

		the residential units could mean that the allocated employment areas are less attractive to potential operators due to constraints that they may have placed on them, such as limited operating hours. It is therefore suggested that this element of the draft Masterplan is removed and the SP23B area is allocated for employment purposes only.	<i>appropriately planned to ensure that it does not compromise the operation of surrounding employment uses. The scale of residential development..”</i>  Through the Core strategy, SP23B was allocated for <i>predominantly</i> employment uses and therefore the overarching policy does not preclude this type of use from taking place where it is in line with the masterplan and helps to achieve the overall requirements of SP23.	
47 (Devon County Council)	5.25	This paragraph makes reference to the potential for enabling uses to be delivered on SP23B. The level of development on this site should not undermine the need for development on SP23A.	The Council notes the comments and proposes to add the following text to paragraph 5.25 bullet point 1:  <i>“...proportion of other uses to be accommodated on the site. This will need to be considered alongside any proposals on SP23A to ensure there is not a significant oversupply or undersupply of the required amount of residential units and so that it does not compromise the delivery of other stated objectives. Any residential development...”</i>	Y
43 (Redrow Homes)	5.25	The respondent is concerned about allowing residential development on SP23B in order to cross-subsidise employment development. If there is a significant amount of residential on this site then this will be contrary to SP23 which states that the residential development will be predominantly located in SP23A. Clarity on the amount of residential development to be allowed in SP23B is necessary.	Through the Core strategy, SP23B was allocated for <i>predominantly</i> employment uses and therefore the overarching policy does not preclude this type of use from taking place where it is in line with the masterplan and helps to achieve the overall requirements of SP23. As per paragraph 5.25 (bullet 1) of the masterplan, it is only expected that a <i>“small amount of residential development could be provided”</i> .  To clarify this, the Council proposes to include the following at the beginning of bullet point 1 of paragraph 5.25:  <i>“The majority of residential development should be located in SP23A (in accordance with Core Strategy Strategy Policy 23). However, a small element of residential development may be appropriate within the western area of SP23B where it would help to deliver the employment land. The scale of...”</i>	N
44 (Mercian Developments Ltd)	5.25	Any reference to impact (arising from town centre uses) should adopt the test of the NPPF (namely ‘significant adverse impact’).  (NB: the respondent would like to record that it does not support the conclusions of the 2012 Town Centre and Retail Study).	The Council notes the comments and considers that the relevant wording relating to this in paragraph 2.5 (bullet 2) addresses this sufficiently by referring to the appropriate policy documents.	N
29, 33, 42	5.27	The provision of allotments and community	The Council agrees that reference to this is appropriate and proposes the following is	Y

(Transition Tavistock)		orchards should be included.	included within the first bullet point:  <i>"...wider countryside. Such areas could be used as communal spaces for growing food through allotments and community orchards. There are areas..."</i>	
41 (Bovis Homes)	5.27	The text should clarify that the public open space provision relates to 750 dwellings.  The requirement for 1 hectare of equipped play areas appears to be at odds with Local Plan policy H26.	The Council notes the suggestion to highlight that the public open space provision relates to 750 dwellings and proposes to amend paragraph 5.27 as follows:  <i>"...In line with the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan and its local assessment of needs, a development of 750 homes would require the following public open space provision: "</i>  The quantity of public open space required by the masterplan is based on policy H26 of the local plan and uses a 2.3 occupancy rate. This equates to 0.69 hectares.  The Council proposes to amend paragraph 5.27 bullet point 3 accordingly:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>"Approximately 0.7 hectares of age appropriate equipped play and recreation..."</i></li> </ul>	Y
10	5.31	The respondent agrees that any enhanced health provision should be accessed on Plymouth Road.	The Council welcomes this support.	N
53 (Tavistock Town Council)	5.31	The Town Council stresses the importance attached to maintaining provision for health and social care facilities both now and in the future.	The Council notes the comments and agrees that future health and social care provision is important in the town. The provision of such facilities is the responsibility of the health service (now the Northern Eastern and Western Devon Clinical Commissioning Group) and the Council works with them to plan for the future needs of the town. The masterplan sets out the current situation relating to the future provision of health and social care facilities in Tavistock in paragraph 5.31.	N
46 (Marchfield Properties)	5.25	In light of the foodstore proposals being brought forward at the former Focus DIY site on Plymouth Road, the masterplan should limit the amount of food retail floorspace on SP23B and explicitly set out that only non-food bulky goods retail will be acceptable.	The Council notes the comments. However, the Council wishes to be flexible around the mix of uses on the site to ensure that employment land can be delivered. Any proposals for food and non-food retail development within the allocated sites will be assessed in accordance with relevant local and national policies, including the emerging 'Assessing the Impact of New Retail Development SPD' which sets a local threshold for assessing significant adverse impact. This will ensure that any retailing facilities on SP23B are of an appropriate type and scale.	N
34 (Trustees to the Crowndale Estate)	5.27	The document appears to contradict itself by saying that 2.5 hectares of playing pitches are required and then saying that off-site contributions to the existing Crowndale pitches may be suitable.	The Council does not consider that the masterplan is contradictory in this respect but considers that it provides flexibility and sets out a number of options for delivering public open space. This is a matter of detail and will be determined through the application stage.	N



		Respondent suggests that financial contributions to the undevelopable land in the floodplain where the existing pitches are would be more appropriate.		
--	--	--	--	--

## Design Framework

Rep number	Section	Comment	Council response	Changes required?
5, 22, 28 (Amethyst)	All	Support.	The Council welcomes the support for this section.	N
7, 45	All	Respondent would like to see the development more dispersed around the site by providing green areas between sections of housing rather than around the edges. Suggest the allocation of the recreation areas 'appear to be designed simply to use sloping land unsuited to building'.	<p>The Council recognises the importance of providing both functional and recreational green open spaces. Much of the green areas proposed in the masterplan reflect where the main constraints to development are. Where there are opportunities to do so, informal recreational areas can be a good use of space on land that is undevelopable.</p> <p>Within the development, usable open spaces will be required but this needs to be balanced with achieving a layout that is typical of Tavistock's urban form and providing necessary amounts of development required by the Core Strategy. A range of public open spaces will be provided across the development including equipped play spaces which are easily accessible and in suitable locations for their use.</p>	
13	All	<p>The respondent supports the design framework and encourages an emphasis on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A pedestrian access from the north-east corner of the site for access into the town;</li> <li>• Gardens of adequate size;</li> <li>• Installation of PV panels and south facing roofs;</li> <li>• Homes suitable for older people with mobility problems;</li> <li>• Good public transport; and</li> <li>• Electric car charging points.</li> </ul>	The Council welcomes the support for the Design Framework and considers that the points raised by the respondent are currently adequately covered in the draft version of the masterplan.	N
17	All	The respondent welcomes the intention to keep existing trees and hedgerows as a way of softening the impact of the large scale development. Requests that the development of land between the A390 and railway embankment be restricted to buildings of low height with adequate	<p>The Council welcomes the support for the retention of trees and hedgerows. The Council also notes the request for adequate screening and considers that greater acknowledgement of the design of the entrances into both SP23A and SP23B could be made in the masterplan. Changes are proposed to the masterplan with particular reference to building height, ridge lines and landscaping at the site entrances.</p> <p>Insert section in Design Framework titled "Site Entrances" as follows:</p>	Y

		screening.	<p><i>“Both sites are situated along main routes entering the outskirts of the town. Currently, these sites form part of the rural landscape and as they are developed, the nature of these approaches will change to a more urban setting. It is therefore important that however these sites are developed, the entrances need to be safe, attractive and sensitive to neighbouring properties, uses and landscapes.</i></p> <p><i>In particular, these site entrances should be developed in accordance with the following principles:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Where buildings are located directly adjacent to the roads of the A390 or A386 they should provide a cohesive street scene and acknowledging the scale and character of neighbouring properties and the transition from the countryside to the town.</i></li> <li>- <i>On SP23A, buildings along the A390 and further into the development on higher ground should be no more than two storeys in height and avoid the ridgeline to protect the residential amenity of nearby properties and lessen the visual impact of the development.</i></li> <li>- <i>On both sites, the entrances should act as a transition between the rural and urban landscapes by being fully interspersed with a strong landscaped frontage.</i></li> <li>- <i>On SP23B, it may be necessary due to the nature of some commercial uses proposed for buildings to have suitable amounts of visibility from the main road. In these instances, the Council would expect the buildings to be of a design that compliments the site’s rural setting and for the incorporation of suitable landscaping.</i></li> </ul>	
31	All	<p>The respondent considers that overall the principles seem well intentioned except for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Wholeheartedly disagrees with the highways analysis on the A386 and the assessment;</li> <li>- Concerns that development of SP23B will mean that the adjoining landscape will be ruined. Supports proposals to improve on existing boundaries and tree lines and welcomes the recommendations regarding in-site character areas;</li> <li>- Concerns around drainage from</li> </ul>	<p>The Council notes the concerns raised.</p> <p>With regards to the highways analysis, this has been commissioned by Devon County Council using a robust and standard methodology. It has assessed a range of options and has concluded that junction improvements, alongside the reinstatement of the railway line, will be able to accommodate the increased traffic as a result of the development. The Council proposes to include reference to the relevant reports within the masterplan so that this evidence is sufficiently signposted for members of the public.</p> <p>Insert after paragraph 6.5:</p> <p><i>“This is provided in the following reports which are available on the Council’s website at <a href="http://www.westdevon.gov.uk">www.westdevon.gov.uk</a>:</i></p>	Y

		<p>SP23B and that development will significantly add to the risk of flooding in the Tiddybrook estate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Tavistock Highway Improvements – Traffic Analysis Report</i> (March 2010)</li> <li>- <i>Tavistock to Plymouth Corridor – Analysis of A386 and Proposed Rail Scheme</i> (September 2010)</li> </ul> <p>The Council notes the support for the retention of existing boundaries and trees and the use of character areas. These principles, alongside the proposals to create sensitive site entrances, protect ridgelines from development and provide new functional footpaths and cycleways are all intended to contribute to protecting the surrounding landscapes.</p> <p>Section 6 (M) provides the context in which drainage and attenuation will be managed. It is also a policy requirement within Core Strategy Strategic Policy 23 that the development incorporates the latest sustainable development principles available during the period of development.</p>	
53 (Tavistock Town Council)	All	<p>The Town Council notes the following in relation to the Design Framework:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scheme should have appropriate road links both within the development and to the existing highway network;</li> <li>• Access to superfast broadband should be made at the design stage;</li> <li>• Appropriate use of pv cells and the orientation of buildings should be encouraged;</li> <li>• On-street parking should be discouraged and adequate parking should be provided throughout;</li> <li>• The provision of enhancements to Crowndale is widely supported;</li> <li>• The use of west country slate could be used where appropriate.</li> </ul>	<p>The Councils welcomes the comments and the support for various sections of the Design Framework. Many of the comments raised are included within the current wording of the masterplan and therefore no changes are proposed to points 1 – 5.</p> <p>The Council notes the comment relating to west country slate and proposes to reference this within paragraph 6.19 as follows:</p> <p><i>“conservation area. Typical materials that have been used historically are Hurdwick stone, Dartmoor granite, copper, local slates and timber. New development should...”</i></p>	Y
39	All	The respondent does not agree with the	The Council notes the concerns raised regarding three storey dwellings around the hub	Y

		<p>Design Framework for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 6.23 – does not consider that three storey houses are appropriate around the hub as this land already towers above the housing at the bottom end of Deacons Green. Suggests that housing in this location should be low/squat as to minimise visual intrusion to the existing residents of Deacons Green.</li> <li>• Para 6.53 – considers that although the Core Strategy dictates a 10% local generation requirement, this is still light in terms of the current building technologies. Suggests that there are opportunities on SP23A to favour designs which utilise community-based multi-dwelling schemes, such as a wood-chip boiler providing heat to a cluster of 10-20 dwellings.</li> </ul>	<p>and acknowledges that there may be visual impacts relating to these in certain locations. The Council proposes to change the wording of paragraph 6.23 to reflect this as follows:</p> <p><i>“6.23 The provision of two storey houses is considered to be appropriate for Tavistock. Well proportioned, three storey dwellings may be considered appropriate but only in locations where they do not compromise the amenity of neighbouring properties (i.e. by overlooking), have minimal impact on the landscape and contribute in a positive manner to the quality of design and local street scene.”</i></p> <p>With regards to paragraph 6.53, there are statutory standards for development which are set within Building Regulations and not development policy.</p> <p>The Core Strategy requires each phase of development to achieve at least the standards in force at the time it is delivered.</p> <p>On a strategic site of this scale, it is more likely to be appropriate and cost effective to consider low-carbon or renewable district heat supplies as is outlined within section 6l. In terms of this approach, this will need to be considered as part of the overall viability of the scheme.</p>	
43 (Redrow Homes)	All	The long list of design guidelines is likely to make the development unviable and could delay its delivery further. This means that the need to identify reserve sites is more urgent.	The Council notes the comments. Design quality is important in ensuring a sustainable development. The Council does not consider that the principles overburden the developers as they will all need to be considered as part of the overall viability of the scheme. As such, the development should not be delayed as a direct result of this.	N
56 (English Heritage)	All	English Heritage is concerned that the SPD does not devote sufficient attention to the wider historic and heritage assets of the town and a greater interpretation of these assets (and the WHS) in the design and layouts proposed.	The Council notes the comments made by English Heritage and in particular the concern raised that there is not sufficient incorporation of heritage considerations in the masterplan. The Council acknowledges that there is not a specific section about this (other than to reference the WHS considerations) but considers that a lot of attention has been given to heritage and history throughout the remaining design principles. For example, this is considered within the boundary treatments, building materials and styles, development height, street layout, street furniture, historic views etc. We will also be looking to see where enhancements can be made to help the interpretation of the WHS. As such, the historic elements of the evidence base (Tavistock Conservation Area Management Plan, WHS Management Plan, Design Brief etc.) have been included as a running thread throughout the document. The masterplan has been written as a framework document which means that it is not intended to be prescriptive about how	N

			new development should be designed and therefore considers that the plan as it is currently written provides sufficient scope for any developer to respond to the historic cues that have been outlined in the document.	
44 (Mercian Developments Ltd)	Figure 5	The respondent objects to the specific identification of 'light industry' on the indicative concept plan as other employment uses (e.g. offices, warehousing, sui generis) may be equally applicable to this area of land. This labelling should be replaced with 'employment generating uses'.	The Council notes the objection and considers that the current map could be clarified. The Council proposes to amend Figure 5 appropriately to reflect this.	Y
23 (Devon Wildlife Trust), 25 (Woodland Trust), 26 (Natural England), 29, 33, 38 (RSPB), 42 (Transition Tavistock), 57 (WDBC Natural Environment and Recreation Manager)	6.03	<p>Respondents suggest greater emphasis on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific provision for a wildlife network – a new category entitled "Biodiversity" should be included.</li> <li>• Tree planting and the "Trees in Townscape" document;</li> <li>• The NPPF biodiversity policies;</li> <li>• The England Biodiversity Strategy;</li> <li>• Benefits of trees on air quality;</li> <li>• Consideration of tree species that can yield fruit and nuts and other edible produce;</li> <li>• Reference to three Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) in the local area;</li> <li>• How the negative impacts in terms of environmental criteria are mitigated for;</li> <li>• The Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report undertaken alongside the Core Strategy;</li> <li>• Green Infrastructure;</li> </ul>	<p>The Council notes the suggestions and acknowledges the need for more reference to biodiversity be included and proposes the following:</p> <p>Insert new section titled "Biodiversity".</p> <p><i>Biodiversity</i></p> <p><i>Chapter 4 identifies the key sensitivities and constraints of both SP23A and SP23B. In particular it notes the presence of woodlands, hedgerows, trees granite hedgebanks and watercourses which currently act as important wildlife corridors, as well as providing an important means of landscaping. In particular, applications for development will need to have regard to the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>On both sites, woodlands, hedgerows, trees, granite hedgebanks and watercourses should be retained and enhanced to provide continuous and varied open space networks for wildlife. In any circumstances where these are likely to be breached to achieve access, these should be limited in their extent and appropriate alternative corridors should be provided.</i></li> <li>• <i>There are opportunities for structural tree planting in SP23A and SP23B. This provides benefits in terms of improvements to air quality, local ecology and wildlife corridors and overall design quality. In particular, trees typical of the area should be used, notably purple beech, beech and lime.</i></li> <li>• <i>Sufficient buffering of hedgerows, hedgebanks and woodlands should be ensured for minimal disturbance of the wildlife corridors, recognising the importance of maintaining them as unlit corridors.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Tavistock Canal runs along the eastern corridor of SP23A. It is an important area for biodiversity both in terms of the water course and its surrounding</i></li> </ul>	Y

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ecology (in particular bats).</li> </ul>	<p><i>woodland. Any development that occurs in the adjoining area should be mindful of its impact on this important landscape feature and take into consideration the management of surface water, drainage, ground water supplies and recreational use.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Opportunities to maximise the biodiversity value of open space, footpaths, cycleways and allotments will be sought in terms of their connectivity, planting and maintenance (e.g. by including fruit and nut trees).</i></li> <li>• <i>Within the buildings themselves, opportunities will be sought to incorporate provision for bats and birds, with the provision sensibly located or grouped to support various species (e.g. located to provide easy access to linear features or wooded areas, or grouped as some bird species prefer).</i></li> <li>• <i>The presence of bats, particularly along the route of the canal, railway and hedgerows will need to be surveyed and appropriately located dark buffer zones and/or additional tree planting along these routes may need to be provided.</i></li> <li>• <i>Further assessment of the railway line will be required to determine whether there are any species along the track and alternative wildlife corridors may need to be identified to reduce adverse impacts.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>In accordance with the Core Strategy, all applications will need to demonstrate any potential impact on wildlife and biodiversity value and mitigatory measures will need to be put in place as required.</i></p> <p>In addition, the Council proposes to include further detail about the presence of internationally and nationally designated sites and watercourses in relation to the development area within Chapter 4a as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="952 1037 1960 1292"> <tr> <td data-bbox="952 1037 1198 1292">7. Tavistock Canal</td> <td data-bbox="1198 1037 1960 1292">Tavistock Canal runs along the eastern corridor of SP23A. The canal is bordered by dense woodland which provides important habitats for local biodiversity. In addition, the canal itself is an important watercourse and downstream links with the River Tamar at Morwellham Quay. This area is included within the Tamar Estuaries Special Protection Area (SPA).</td> </tr> </table> <p>The text below should be inserted before Section 4c as follows:</p> <p><b>c. Designated Sites</b>  <i>The Core Strategy is accompanied by a Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) Screening</i></p>	7. Tavistock Canal	Tavistock Canal runs along the eastern corridor of SP23A. The canal is bordered by dense woodland which provides important habitats for local biodiversity. In addition, the canal itself is an important watercourse and downstream links with the River Tamar at Morwellham Quay. This area is included within the Tamar Estuaries Special Protection Area (SPA).
7. Tavistock Canal	Tavistock Canal runs along the eastern corridor of SP23A. The canal is bordered by dense woodland which provides important habitats for local biodiversity. In addition, the canal itself is an important watercourse and downstream links with the River Tamar at Morwellham Quay. This area is included within the Tamar Estuaries Special Protection Area (SPA).				

			<p><i>Report which assesses direct and indirect impacts on internationally and nationally designated sites. Of relevance to the Tavistock development is the Plymouth Sound and Estuaries Special Area of Conservation (SAC), the Tamar Estuaries Special Protection Area (SPA) and the Dartmoor Special Area of Conservation SAC. The HRA has been agreed with Natural England and concludes that the allocation should not have any adverse effects on the integrity of these sites within and adjacent to its boundaries provided that the policies within the plan are implemented successfully. The principles and guidelines included within this masterplan seek to ensure that this is achieved in practice.</i></p> <p><i>There are a number of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) under 4km away from the allocated sites. These include the Grenofen Wood and West Down SSSI, the Whitchurch Down SSSI and the Tamar-Tavy Valley Estuary SSSI. It is important to note the presence of these protected sites, but given their distance away from the allocated land, it is considered that there are no direct impacts on them.</i></p> <p><i>The Council has undertaken a Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) Screening Report of this SPD to establish whether or not a full SA is required. This Screening Report concludes that separate SA/SEA is not required as the SPD does not result in any additional significant effects to those already identified in the higher level SA/SEA. This Screening Report is available alongside the masterplan. “</i></p>	
34 (Trustees to the Crowndale Estate)	6.05	<p>Clarity is required with regard to the timing of improvements identified in the DCC Traffic Analysis Report.</p> <p>The future link road between SP23A and B should not place any financial burdens on the development as it is not needed in the plan period.</p>	<p>The Council notes the comments. However, it is considered that Table 2 sets out that the provision of off-site highway improvements are required in the first phase of development and the detailed arrangements will be made at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The Council notes the comments in relation to the link road. The masterplan does not require any contributions to the link road other than to ensure that both allocations do not prevent a link from being delivered beyond 2026 if it is required.</p>	N
27, 29, 33, 42 (Transition Tavistock)	6.05 & 6.08	<p>Concerns about increased congestion around Drakes Monument and Drakes Spar shop and suggest this may be alleviated by a shuttle bus service, communal facilities and pedestrian and cycling links.</p>	<p>The Council notes the concerns. Both the Land Use Framework and Design Framework take these into consideration including through the provision of a “Hub”, walking and cycling links and a bus link to the town centre.</p>	N
41 (Bovis Homes), 47 (Devon	6.06	<p>This section identifies that a vehicular crossing of the former railway line north of the future station will be required as a</p>	<p>The Council considers it necessary to ensure that this access is provided in the first phase to enable development of land east of the railway to come forward. However, the Council notes the comment made and proposes to clarify this position within bullet</p>	Y



County Council)		first phase of development. Although this link will be required it will be required in phase with development to the east of the former railway line and in phase with the development of the railway and other facilities as provided at the hub. It may therefore not be required with the first phase of development.	point 3 of paragraph 6.6 as follows:  <i>“Access to the land east of the railway can be achieved from a road link across the disused railway line. Provision for future access will be required as part of any first phase of development which ensures that land to the east of the railway is not prevented from coming forward for development.”</i>	
47 (Devon County Council)	6.06	This section implies that with local junction improvements, there may be sufficient capacity on the highways to accommodate the entire development. The railway reinstatement, alongside the local highway measures, is required to mitigate the impact of the development. This should be clarified.	The Council notes the comments and agrees that clarification is required and suggests the following addition to paragraph 6.6:  <i>“...new development in the area. This shows that local highway improvements, alongside the reinstatement of the railway line will be required to mitigate the traffic impacts of the development. With particular reference to the highway improvements, various options...”</i>	Y
47 (Devon County Council)	6.06	The document makes several references to a need to maintain the option to have a link between SP23A and SP23B. Such a link would have to run through or over the WHS, which would therefore be a very material planning consideration. This is not given consideration in these sections of the document.	The Council notes the comments raised and proposes to add the following text to paragraph 6.6 bullet point 4 as follows:  <i>“...required beyond 2026. Such a link would need to carefully consider how it would impact on the World Heritage Site, Crowndale Farm and the Tavy Valley which lies between the two development sites.”</i>	Y
48	6.06	Consideration must be given to the route of any road linking SP23A and B to ensure that a repeat of the Tiddy Brook/Buzzard Road issue is not repeated.	The route of the possible future link will be largely dependent on engineering restrictions and other various constraints in the area (e.g. Crowndale Farm, the Tavy Valley and associated flood zone). Devon County Council has previously modelled a number of possible routes and will be consulted fully at the time an application is submitted to ensure that an appropriate future link can be delivered if and when it is required. It is important to note that any route of this nature would not be a residential street, unlike the Tiddy Brook/Buzzard Road street.	N
49, 53 (Tavistock Town Council), 55	6.06	The respondents raise concerns about the increase of traffic on the local road network, particularly on Callington Road and Drake’s Statue. The levels on the development site will not encourage walking or cycling.	An assessment of the impact of the development on the local roads has been commissioned by Devon County Council. Using a robust and standard methodology, this has assessed a range of options and has concluded that junction improvements, alongside the reinstatement of the railway line, will be able to accommodate the increased traffic as a result of the development. The Council proposes to include reference to the relevant reports within the masterplan so that this evidence is sufficiently signposted for members of the public (see above).	Y

			Footpaths and cycleways will be provided both as functional and recreational routes and designed in the most appropriate way to encourage people to use these instead of the private car where it is suitable to do so. These will link to existing networks where possible.	
53 (Tavistock Town Council)	6.06	The Town Council requests that the plans associated with the development show the prospective route of, and protect the land designated for, a future link road between Callington Road and Plymouth Road.	<p>The route of the possible future link will be largely dependent on engineering restrictions and other various constraints in the area (e.g. Crowndale Farm, the Tavy Valley and associated flood zone). Devon County Council has previously modelled a number of possible routes and will be consulted fully at the time an application is submitted to ensure that an appropriate future link can be delivered if and when it is required.</p> <p>The Council notes the suggestion to show the potential future link connections and proposes to amend the concept maps accordingly.</p>	Y
14	6.07	The respondent is concerned that the main access entering the A386 in two places will create congestion.	As referenced in section 6.5 – 6.7 of the masterplan, Devon County Council has advised that the land at SP23B can be adequately accessed.	N
14	6.08	The respondent is concerned that the canal footway will be ruined by the creation of a new cycle path.	The new cyclepath is proposed within the development area along the western edge of the canal. The route along the eastern edge of the canal will be unaffected by the development. Any development in this area will need to respect the setting of the World Heritage Site.	N
22 (Police Architectural Liaison Team Leader)	6.08	The respondent suggests reference should be made to designing footpaths so that they do not encourage crime, disorder and nuisance behaviour.	<p>The Council notes these suggests and proposes the following amendments to paragraphs 6.8 and 6.9.</p> <p><i>6.8 Excellent footpath and cycle connections should be made to make it easy to move around the development, particularly between homes, play areas, key facilities, the wider countryside and existing footpaths and cycleways. Consideration should be given to natural ‘desire lines’ and, where possible, the routes should be overlooked to create safe links. Paths situated to the rear of properties are actively discouraged as these have been proven to generate crime.</i></p> <p><i>6.9 Both sites have a mix of steep and gentle slopes and consideration should also be given to how people with mobility issues can effectively use these routes. Options such as appropriately placed rest areas and routes which follow gentle inclines should be explored. Level footpaths and pavements should also be promoted wherever possible and unnecessary steps should be avoided. For ease of use by all types of users, cycleways and footpaths should be clearly segregated.</i></p>	Y
36 (Devon	6.08	The Forum agrees with the general	The Council welcomes the support and considers that the masterplan incorporates all	N

Countryside Access Forum)		<p>policies in the masterplan which relate to sustainable travel and recreational access.</p> <p>The Forum has sent its standard position statement which advises Councils on the necessary principles to include within plans for new development. Please refer to the full representation available on the Council's website for details.</p>	of the relevant guidance as provided in the position statement.	
57 (WDBC Natural Environment and Recreation Manager)	6.08	Gaining high quality and Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) compliant pedestrian and cycle access is crucial to the sustainability of the site.	<p>The Council notes the comment and proposes to include reference to this as an additional bullet point under paragraph 6.10 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>"Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) compliant pedestrian and cycle access"</i>.</li> </ul>	Y
22 (Police Architectural Liaison Team Leader)	6.10	Add in "secure cycle storage"	<p>The Council proposes the following amendment to paragraph 6.10 bullet point 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>"Developers are encouraged to provide safe and secure covered cycle storage..."</i></li> </ul>	Y
29, 33, 42 (Transition Tavistock)	6.11	Concerns that a footpath link is missing from Figure 6 that was previously identified in the Design Brief (i.e a link running across the railway cutting between the west and eastern sections of the development in SP23A).	The Masterplan makes provision for a circular footpath/cycleway which links the eastern and western sections at the south of the site. Whilst it does not preclude alternative links from being made, such a link across the railway cutting will be costly and may not be practical.	N
22 (Police Architectural Liaison Team Leader)	6.12	Include reference to the fact that good boundary treatments increase security for householders.	<p>The Council proposes to add in a reference at paragraph 6.12 as follows:</p> <p><i>"6.12 Boundary treatments are essential in providing clear definition to public and private spaces and can increase security for households...."</i></p>	Y
45	6.18	Support most elements of the design framework but are concerned that there is a tension between using good building materials and affordability.	The Council notes the comments made. This will need to be considered as part of the overall viability of the scheme.	N
41 (Bovis Homes)	6.24	It is not clear how applicants will be required to demonstrate this requirement.	The Council notes the comment and agrees that this sentence is ambiguous. The Council considers that this requirement is covered in more detail through many of the design principles and therefore proposed to delete paragraph 6.24.	Y
41 (Bovis	6.27	It is considered that the reference to	The Council considers that the design and placement of windows is a key part of	N

Homes)		<p>'significant detail and distinctiveness' is too vague and unnecessarily onerous.</p> <p>The following text should be inserted at the end of paragraph 6.28: "wherever possible having regard to other site constraints".</p>	<p>achieving a high quality design and that the inclusion of this requirement in the masterplan is appropriate. It is not considered necessary to be prescriptive regarding specific design types.</p>	
20, 29, 33, 42 (Transition Tavistock)	6.28	<p>Windows must be used to maximise opportunities for natural daylight and reduce the need for artificial lighting. This should be reflected in this section.</p>	<p>The Council suggests amending paragraph 6.28 taking into account the respondents suggestions.</p> <p>Delete final sentence of paragraph 6.28. Insert new paragraph as follows:</p> <p><i>"Both the size and positioning of windows are important in maximising the provision of natural light into buildings. The use of well proportioned and well positioned windows is strongly encouraged as it reduces the requirements for artificial lighting and therefore improves the energy efficiency of the building."</i></p>	Y
22 (Police Architectural Liaison Team Leader)	6.29	<p>Suggests reference to avoiding blank elevations to help prevent crime and anti social behaviour.</p>	<p>The Council notes the suggestion and agrees that paragraph 6.29 can be strengthened as follows:</p> <p><i>"6.29 All elevations should usually contain windows that are located in a regularly patterned, well proportioned manner. Blank elevations should be avoided as windows offer natural surveillance opportunities and therefore help to prevent crime and antisocial behaviour."</i></p>	Y
26 (Natural England)	6.30	<p>Natural England welcomes the protection given to the skyline from intrusion from development.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes this support.</p>	N
50, 52, 55	6.30	<p>The respondents are concerned that building on the western edge of SP23A will impact on the natural ridgeline and the approach into Tavistock from Callington Road.</p>	<p>The Council notes the concerns and agrees that there is a natural ridgeline running along the north-western edge of the site. Development on this ridgeline could be both prominent in the wider landscape and could impact on the amenity of surrounding properties. The Council acknowledges this in several places throughout the masterplan with an emphasis on keeping the development below the ridgeline. In response to similar concerns of this nature, the Council proposes to include a section in the Design Framework relating to site entrances (see above) and will also amend the concept map (Figure 4) to show an extension of the ridgeline along the north-western boundary of the site.</p>	Y
43 (Redrow Homes)	6.30	<p>The respondent comments that there is no illustration or plan to demonstrate the character areas as suggested. This does</p>	<p>The Council notes the comments and proposes to include plans within the final version which demonstrate where the different character areas could be located. The Council also proposes to insert relevant diagrams and photographs from the Design Brief to</p>	Y

		not provide the necessary clarity needed for an SPD.	illustrate what is meant by the different character areas.	
4	6.30 - 6.33	The respondent is concerned that the density of development could be too high and that there are examples of recent high density developments which have resulted in poor quality design.	<p>The Council notes the respondents concerns and considers it appropriate to include design guidance about density within the masterplan which reflects Core Strategy Strategic Policy 6.</p> <p>It is proposed to rename section e within chapter six as “Character Areas and Development Density” and to insert the following wording after paragraph 6.30:</p> <p><i>“The Council has an adopted policy (SP6) to manage the density of housing development. This policy states that developments at less than 30 dwellings per hectare will generally be resisted but that lower densities may be acceptable where there is an existing strongly defined low density character.”</i></p> <p>Amend paragraph 6.31 as follows:  <i>“6.31 There should be different character areas providing a mix of densities throughout the allocation...A mix of styles, design and density will be encouraged to provide diversity and distinctiveness to the different parts of the development and to help ensure good quality living environments...”</i></p>	Y
49	6.34	The respondent considers that the open spaces and play areas are desirable but is concerned about who will maintain them.	Appropriate management arrangements for open spaces and play areas will need to be secured to ensure the long-term future of such facilities. Such arrangements can be made with public sector organisations (e.g. the town council), private management companies or community groups (e.g. a community interest company). Such management arrangements will be required as part of the application and the Council considers that this issue is sufficiently covered in paragraph 6.37 of the masterplan.	N
53 (Tavistock Town Council)	6.34	The Town Council would like the masterplan to encourage the movement of people to the Meadows to use the facilities there. This would promote community cohesion by acting as a focal point for the eastern and western areas of the town.	<p>The Council notes the comments and agrees that a key aim of the development is to ensure that the new development integrates well with the rest of the community. The proposed footpath and cycle routes will be required to link with the National Cycle Network 27 which provides an off-road link directly to the Meadows. The Council proposes to acknowledge the importance of the new developments linking with this important area of open space by including a paragraph in section 6(f) after paragraph 6.35 as follows:</p> <p><i>“The town benefits from a centrally located park (the Meadows) which includes play facilities, teenage recreational areas (e.g. the BMX and skate parks) and a large area of open space. Wherever possible, the provision of new play and recreation areas, open spaces and footpath and cycle links should complement the facilities already provided in the Meadows and encourage the movement of people to the area. This will help to build</i></p>	Y

			<i>community cohesion, fulfilling a key aim of the masterplan which is to integrate new development effectively with the existing town."</i>	
57 (WDBC Natural Environment and Recreation Manager)	6.34	<p>The SPD should require a positive design and function for all public open space to avoid an oversupply of poorly located and isolated spaces. An open space strategy should be a requirement of a planning application. Such a strategy should bring forward a comprehensive layout of the allocated sites and address the long-term management and maintenance of the public open spaces.</p> <p>In terms of equipped areas of play, the SPD could usefully reference the Fields in Trust guidance note ("Planning and Design for Outdoor Sport and Play") which indicates that locally equipped play areas should be within 400m of each property.</p> <p>There should also be reference to teenage recreational facilities that are available in the Meadows (e.g. BMX and skate parks) so these would not necessarily need replicating on the allocated site. It is more appropriate to provide play areas targeting the under 12's with particular opportunities where appropriate for some teenage use, including kickabout areas.</p> <p>Play areas should be appropriately located to allow for informal supervision but with adequate separation from residential properties.</p>	<p>The Council notes the comments and proposes to amend paragraph 6.37 as follows:</p> <p><i>"6.37 Applications for residential developments within SP23A and B should be accompanied by an open space strategy. This will need to address the layout and function of public open spaces and make appropriate arrangements for their long-term management and maintenance."</i></p> <p>The comments relating to teenage facilities have been noted and amendments have been made after paragraph 6.35 as set out above in response to the Town Council's comments.</p>	
22 (Police Architectural)	6.35	Suggests including reference to a safe and secure environment that does not	The Council notes the suggestion and proposes the following amendments to paragraph 6.35:	Y

Liaison Team Leader)		attract nuisance behaviour.	<i>“The location and siting of open spaces should be integral to the development. They should be well related to nearby development to provide natural surveillance and help to create safe and secure environments which do not attract nuisance behaviour.”</i>	
41 (Bovis Homes)	6.38	The respondent notes that this section does give enough recognition to the challenging topography of SP23A and that this will key bearing on design.	The Council notes the comments and considers it appropriate to include reference to this. The Council proposes to amend the first bullet point of paragraph 6.38 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Local topography and contours: the topography of both sites, particularly SP23A, is challenging and this will have a significant influence on the design of the development. As such, a street layout is promoted which reflects how Tavistock has been developed in the past, through a layering effect up the valley sides. This will help to reflect the traditional urban form in Tavistock with lower density properties further up the slope and higher densities towards the valley floor. The north-western parcels...”</i></li> </ul>	Y
20	6.39	The respondent considers that parking will continue to be a problem on new estates unless there is a better property layout. Similar designs to the Westbridge, Fitzford and Parkwood Road developments could be used which incorporate car access without making the streets a permanent garage.	The Council notes the respondents concerns and agrees with the concerns expressed. However, it is considered that the masterplan as it is currently worded addresses this and encourages as much on-plot parking as is compatible with the design and layout and the avoidance of ad-hoc on-street parking.	N
4	6.39 – 6.42	The respondent is concerned that there is not enough private parking and that usage of the railway line will mean that more parking is required.	The respondents comments are noted.  Within section 6(h), the masterplan makes provision for as much on-plot parking as is compatible with the design and layout of the development and acknowledges the high local dependency of the private car and there is provision around the hub for sufficient parking for railway use.	N
8	6.42	The respondent suggests that mention should be made of providing under-house parking.	The masterplan would not preclude underhouse parking, but this would need to be balanced with the overall character and design of the development e.g. if this were to result in three storey buildings.	N
29, 33, 42 (Transition Tavistock)	6.42	Provision should be made for individual electric vehicle charging points.  Easy access to car parking spaces for car clubs must be included.	The Council considers the point relating to electric car charging points is appropriately covered in bullet point 5 of paragraph 6.42. Car club parking could be provided within the public use parking outlined in bullet 3 and specific reference will be made to this as follows:	Y

			<i>"Adequate provision for public use car parking (e.g. visitors, care providers, delivery vehicles, car club)."</i>	
8	6.50	The respondent suggests that an over emphasis on through-routes should be avoided for safety and amenity reasons. The respondent questions why cul-de-sacs have been discouraged.	The masterplan's "main routes" are not proposed to be "through-routes" as the respondent suggests. They are intended to be used to define a sense of place rather than create a continuous residential estate. The defined routes will help to make the development easier to get around and the smaller shared streets will feed off these main routes for the calmer environment that the respondent mentions.	N
47 (Devon County Council)	6.50	This section identifies the potential need for a circular vehicular route on both sides of the development. Although this principle is supported, it is likely to be challenging to deliver because an at-grade crossing of the railway line is unlikely to be acceptable in terms of rail safety. Furthermore, bus service options may not require a circular route. A circular route should therefore not be an absolute requirement of the development but should be strongly considered. The masterplan should provide for the provision of an alternative, emergency vehicular access to the site should the access off Callington Road be out of use.	This comment is noted and the following amendment to bullet point 2 of paragraph 6.6:  <i>"...service the allocated development other than sufficient emergency routes as required."</i>  Amend bullet point 1 of paragraph 6.50  <i>"...west of the disused railway line. Appropriate routes for emergency access will need to be provided as required by the highways authority. Opportunities for..."</i>  The Council considers that the current wording relating to the circular bus service does not make it an absolute requirement and provides sufficient flexibility, so proposes no further changes.	Y
8	6.53	No mention is made of creating "passive" housing design. Good design of the house in the first place is more efficient than alternative energy sources.	The Council agrees with the respondents comments. The fabric first principle is promoted in the masterplan as suggested. However, the Council can only require the current building regulation standards and therefore it is not appropriate to make it a policy requirement to achieve passive housing design.	N
12	6.53	The respondent agrees with the principles for sustainable energy in this section and that energy supply is key to affordability. The respondent raises concerns that the developers will not meet the requirements.	The Council welcomes the support for this section of the masterplan.  The Council will work with the developers to ensure that the principles of the masterplan are implemented in as much as they are viable and appropriate for the overall development.	N
29, 33, 42 (Transition	6.53	This section reinforces a weak commitment to sustainability. The	There are statutory standards for development which are set within Building Regulations and not development policy.	N



Tavistock)		<p>Council should set a minimum standard of Code for Sustainable Homes level 5 and see how the market responds.</p> <p>The way this section is worded suggests that developers do not even have to try to meet the principles. The developer should be asked to bring forward proposals for such infrastructure to serve each phase as it is built.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy requires each phase of development to achieve at least the standards in force at the time it is delivered.</p> <p>The Council considers that this is sufficiently covered in paragraph 6.54.</p> <p>The Council will seek to achieve all of the benefits listed. However, if they cannot be met to the standard sought, then there is inevitably a trade off to be negotiated that reflects the Council's priorities. In this scenario the Council could negotiate for the development to be 'future proofed' so that decentralised or renewable energy systems could be retrofitted if commercially viable at a later date, even if it could not be provided at the outset.</p>	
41 (Bovis Homes)	6.53	The respondent suggests that this should include reference to viability in accordance with Core Strategy Strategic Policy 2.	The Council considers that viability is sufficiently considered within paragraph 6.54.	N
34 (Trustees to the Crowndale Estate)	6.53	The respondent suggests that Policy SP2 of the Core Strategy is no longer fully consistent with the NPPF. There should be more flexibility in order to be consistent with the NPPF with a greater emphasis on the thermal efficiency of new buildings.	The NPPF continues to promote a positive approach to low carbon development and the supply of renewable and low carbon energy. In accordance with the NPPF, the masterplan does promote the 'fabric first' principle and this is set out in paragraphs 6.54 and 6.55 of the masterplan.	N
48	6.56	<p>Rainwater harvesting should be fitted as standard.</p> <p>Any solar pv panels fitted should be non-glare so that there is no visual intrusion from the Whitchurch Road area.</p>	The Council notes the comments but considers that this is a matter of detail which will be taken into account at the detailed design and application stage.	N
4, 48	6.59	The respondents raise concerns about Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems and how they can become an issue if not built properly or adopted by SWW. The additional contribution of surface run-off to the Tavy floodplain must be fully considered.	<p>The Council notes the comments. However, it is important to clarify that SWW does not adopt SUDs systems.</p> <p>The Environment Agency and the Council's Senior Engineer will be consulted on applications for development and will object/raise concerns if there is likely to be a problem.</p>	N
54 (Environment	6.59	Suggest this section is strengthened by including the following:	The Council notes the suggestions and proposes to delete paragraph 6.59 and replace it with the following:	Y

Agency)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The importance of open drainage features for both storage and conveyance;</li> <li>- A presumption for infiltration and ground investigations early in the planning process;</li> <li>- A SUDS masterplan to be produced for each phase of the development;</li> <li>- Combine open spaces with storm water storage for storms up to an including the 1 in 100 year storm category;</li> <li>- Robust features that are able to cope with drainage system blockages or over design events.</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	<p>6.59 <i>“Infiltration and ground investigations should be undertaken early on in the planning process to understand the drainage issues of the development sites. For each phase of development, the Environment Agency encourages a Sustainable Urban Drainage systems (SUDs) masterplan to be prepared to demonstrate how it will address surface water conveyance and storage.</i></p> <p>6.60 <i>SUDs will need to be used to reduce the rate and volume of surface water run-off as a result of the development. Options such as swales, open drainage features and filter drains for surface water conveyance are encouraged and detention basins, permeable paving or soakaways for surface water attenuation and/or infiltration should be explored. These will need to be capable of accommodating storm water and made with robust which are able to cope with drainage system blockages and other unforeseen circumstances.</i></p> <p>6.61 <i>SUDs can also offer benefits for the local environment and biodiversity of the development, alongside improved flood management. There are opportunities to integrate SUDs with wider landscaping and open space provision and this should be considered at the early stages of design. “</i></p>	
22	6.61	Add in reference to street furniture which should be appropriately located so as to not encourage inappropriate loitering or inappropriate behaviour.	<p>The Council notes the suggestion and proposes the following amendments to paragraph 6.61.</p> <p>New bullet point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Street furniture should be appropriately located so that it does not encourage inappropriate behaviour thus affecting the quality of life of local residents.”</i></li> </ul>	Y
47 (Devon County Council)	6.62	This paragraph identifies positivity regarding the Cornwall & West Devon Mining Landscape World Heritage Site (WHS) and the need to have regard to it and its setting. This is welcome. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identifies that Local Plans should set out ‘a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment’. Although the masterplan is not a Local Plan, it should set out a more coherent strategy identifying how the development will meet the requirements of the NPPF to maximise both the conservation of the	<p>This section sets out the broad principles for having regard to the World Heritage Site. It is not proposed to expand on this section as suggested, but to provide reference to the Tavistock Conservation Area Management Plan and the West Devon and Cornwall Mining Landscape World Heritage Site Management Plan.</p> <p><i>6.64 Applicants should have regard to the Tavistock Conservation Area Management Plan and the West Devon and Cornwall Mining Landscape World Heritage Site Management Plan when demonstrating the above.</i></p>	Y

		heritage asset and the opportunities for heritage led regeneration that are available here to conserve and enhance the Outstanding Universal Value of the WHS. This should develop the concept of an appropriate buffer for the WHS.		
--	--	--	--	--

## Delivery Framework – Infrastructure

Rep number	Section	Comment	Council response	Changes required?
7	All	Support.	The Council welcomes the support for this section.	N
47 (Devon County Council)	All	Given the WHS status, Section 7 should include a greater reference to the need for works on and off site that interpret and enhance the WHS (e.g. developing WHS hub facilities within Tavistock and access to them from the sites).	The Council notes the aspiration but does not consider that it is a direct requirement of the development and therefore should not be included within the critical items of infrastructure. There is the potential for this to be listed as a desirable item of infrastructure but the current information provided does not give the evidence for this. It is suggested that DCC supply the Borough Council will further information with a view to this being incorporated if appropriate within subsequent reviews of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	N
39	All	The respondent does not agree with this section and considers that the use of the site was originally proposed on the understanding that the railway would be reinstated. Any S106/CIL monies required for the railway should be ring-fenced and not used to satisfy other requirements. Suggests that any developer proposing to build on SP23A or B or within reasonable commuting distance of Tavistock Station should satisfy at the outside the conditions necessary to ensure that the rail link is completed.	The Council is committed to the delivery of the railway, but there is only a finite amount of financial contributions which can be made available for infrastructure due to development viability. As such, the Council has to balance the contributions required for the railway alongside other infrastructure requirements such as education provision and open space provision.	N
45	All	There is no consideration given to the impact on Derriford Hospital which is already overstretched.	The Council has consulted with the health service (now the Northern Eastern and Western Devon Clinical Commissioning Group) throughout the preparation and adoption of the Core Strategy. The requirements of the health service are outlined in paragraphs 5.31 and 5.32 of the masterplan.	N
45	All	There is no consideration given to the additional pressure on town centre car parking.	The masterplan encourages effective walking, cycling and public transport routes into the town centre to avoid the need for increased town centre car parking.	N
41 (Bovis Homes)	7.10	The text in the third bullet should include “wherever possible” in case the lead delivery organisation is unable to engage	The Council notes the comment. However in nearly all instances, the lead delivery organisations are statutory organisations it is unlikely that they will be unavailable for discussion.	N

		in detailed discussions.		
1 (South West Water)	Table 1	<p>South West Water advise that it will be necessary for the foul sewerage capacity to be assessed, and necessary improvements made (funded by the developer/landowner) for development to progress.</p> <p>Employment uses (B1, B2 and B8) will be supported within current infrastructure capacity.</p>	<p>Amend row 3 column 2 of Table 1 to include the following:</p> <p><i>“Applicant of residential sites required to undertake and fund (as directed by SWW), an assessment of the foul sewerage capacity.”</i></p>	Y
4	Table 1	<p>The respondent considers that the development is being sold on the promise of a new rail link but has concerns about the railway as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The stations at Bere Alston and Gunnislake are easily accessible and could be used instead.</li> <li>• People still prefer to travel by car</li> <li>• The cost of the railway could be better spent on the link road between Callington Road and Plymouth Road.</li> </ul>	<p>There are various reasons why the railway is important and why it forms part of the future strategy for development in Tavistock. The Council proposes to include a series of Frequently Asked Questions alongside the masterplan so that this information is available for anyone viewing the document.</p> <p>Whilst the link road does not form part of this development because the evidence suggests that it is not required, provision will be made within the allocations to ensure that it could be delivered if it is required beyond 2026.</p>	N
4	Table 1	<p>The respondent does not consider that any of the desirable infrastructure will be delivered.</p>	<p>The Council can only require developers to pay to make contributions to or provision for the infrastructure that is directly related to the development. However, it is important to record the items of desirable infrastructure so that they can be delivered if funding becomes available.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 7.7 bullet point 3 to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Desirable: all other infrastructure requirements which would have benefits for the community but which are not needed to support the new development e.g. library provision, youth facilities etc. It is important that the items of desirable infrastructure are recorded in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan so that they can be delivered if funding becomes available.”</i></li> </ul>	Y
5, 24, 31	Table 1	<p>Objections to the delivery of the railway on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New owners and their families</li> </ul>	<p>There are various reasons why the railway is important and why it forms part of the future strategy for development in Tavistock. More information about this is contained in the Council’s Frequently Asked Questions which are available on the Council’s website</p>	N

		<p>will be unlikely to use the railway line to get to Plymouth because of the journey times, which include travel to and from the station at each end. It is more attractive for people to use the car in terms of cost and comfort.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no analysis of journey times, cost of journeys, viability of the railway line or provision for subsidy of the railway line by building contractors.</li> <li>• There are “get-out” clauses which will mean that the development of the railway line will be “wriggled out of” by the building contractors.</li> <li>• Should the railway be a viable option and will significantly reduce car use on the A386, it should be provided before a single house is sold as should the completion of the new school and the hub.</li> <li>• Affordable housing, the school and hospital should not be compromised by the railway being restored.</li> <li>• The benefits of the railway have been over-emphasised and leaves a significant concern for the ability of the current road network to cope with increased demand.</li> </ul>	<p>alongside this consultation.</p> <p>There is evidence on the Council’s website and Devon County Council is currently undertaking more up-to-date surveys to provide information about the use and viability of the railway. Any publicly available documents will be displayed on their website at <a href="http://www.devon.gov.uk/tavistock-bere-alston-railway">http://www.devon.gov.uk/tavistock-bere-alston-railway</a></p> <p>The masterplan does include an element of flexibility around the delivery of infrastructure because economic circumstances can change and affect viability of schemes. The flexibility therefore allows the Council to negotiate with developers when applications are submitted.</p> <p>The railway is expected to be delivered in phase with new development and, as with the other items of infrastructure, an element of development is required to fund its delivery. The Delivery Framework sets out the phasing of when different items of infrastructure are required taking into consideration viability and when facilities such as new schools will be required. This is explained in more detail in chapter 5.</p>	
20	Table 1	The respondent queries why there is no mention of employment opportunities as it is vital that job opportunities are available early in the development.	The Council agrees with the need to encourage employment opportunities in the town. However, this is development in its own right and is not therefore considered to be “infrastructure” as is defined in the masterplan. The Land-Use Framework (chapter 5) provides information as to how the council will facilitate the development of	N

			employment land.	
23 (Devon Wildlife Trust)	Table 1	Respondent suggests adding “wildlife habitat enhancement” to the “Landscaping and informal open space provision” infrastructure requirement.	The Council notes the comments. Any landscaping in relation to the public open spaces and boundaries will be expected to enhance and be in keeping with the existing landscaping and that opportunities will be sought to manage and enhance the landscaping for the benefit of wildlife. It is considered that this is sufficiently covered in the Design Framework.	N
41 (Bovis Homes), 47 (Devon County Council)	Table 1	Localised highway improvements on the A390 / A386 corridor could be provided by the developer. As such, the developer could potentially be required to undertake the works themselves in lieu of a financial contribution.	These comments are noted and the table will be amended to read “ <i>off-site provision</i> ” which will allow for the works to be undertaken by the developer.	Y
47 (Devon County Council)	Table 1	The wording in relation to the contributions requirement for the railway should be revised to provide greater flexibility in relation to which development types may be required to provide contributions. It would be more appropriate not to differentiate between different development types in this context.	The comments are noted and the Council proposes to amend paragraph 7.9 as set out earlier in this statement.	Y
37 (Network Rail)	Table 1	Network Rail requests that policy is incorporated which includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A requirement for development contributions to deliver improvements to the rail network where appropriate;</li> <li>• A requirement for Transport Assessments to take cognisance of impacts to existing rail infrastructure and any necessary developer contributions made; and</li> <li>• A commitment to consult Network Rail where development may impact on the rail network</li> </ul>	<p>The first bullet relates to a request for developer contributions to improve the existing rail network. In the case of Tavistock, the railway is not yet in place and is therefore considered that the items of critical infrastructure listed in Table 1 are currently appropriate. The Council will monitor and review the infrastructure delivery plan which is included within Chapter 7 to ensure that it is updated as necessary so that when the railway infrastructure is in place, on-going contributions may be sought as appropriate.</p> <p>As above, the railway is not yet in place. We will encourage Transport Assessments to look at the positive role that the future reinstatement of the railway could have on the local road network. The scope of a Transport Assessment will be agreed at the pre-application stage.</p> <p>Network Rail is a statutory consultee and is consulted as part of the Council’s standard procedures in accordance with the regulations.</p>	N

48	Table 1	The respondent notes that Devon County Council is now the lead organisation for delivering the railway and that this means it will be funded by the tax payer and not the developer.	Devon County Council is the lead delivery organisation which means that it will be responsible for coordinating the project to deliver the railway. However, new development in the town will be required to contribute to it as is set out in Section 7 of the masterplan.	N
43 (Redrow Homes)	Table 1	The respondent is concerned about the manner in which the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) has been updated and considers that it would have been more appropriate to have consulted on a revised version of the 2010 IDP. Table 1 omits reference to other infrastructure which was included in the 2010 version, including the expansion of Whitchurch School which was previously identified as critical.	<p>The IDP is a living document that sits alongside the Core Strategy. It relates to the infrastructure requirements that are needed to accommodate planned increases in population as a result of development. It was envisaged that the IDP would be updated throughout the plan period as it was required to take into account changing circumstances. The preparation of this masterplan has enabled the Council to get a better understanding of the demands of the planned development and has consulted with the local infrastructure providers to incorporate the requirements that they have requested. With reference to primary school provision, the information we have been provided by DCC (as education authority) is that the planned development may require a new school towards the end of the plan period. The preferred approach to accommodating this is through the provision of a new school within the new development as part of the objective of creating a sustainable community.</p> <p>If any other sites come forward in the town through the reserve sites process then the IDP will be updated accordingly at the time.</p>	N
41 (Bovis Homes)	Table 1	The respondent suggests that reference to playing pitches should include on site provision as well as off site contributions.	The nearby Crowndale playing pitch facilities are within a short distance from the development area and it is considered that it would be more appropriate for contributions to be made to this facility than on-site provision. This is particularly important given the challenges with topography and constraints to the development area.	N



## Delivery Framework – Phasing

Rep number	Section	Comment	Council response	Changes required?
7, 31	All	Support.	The Council welcomes the support for this section.	N
20	All	<p>The respondent has no major concerns about the phasing proposed with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The railway should be built in the early phases of development;</li> <li>• Provision of employment is excluded from the infrastructure phasing requirements; and</li> <li>• All critical infrastructure should be provided first or very early in the development.</li> </ul>	<p>The plan to deliver new homes and employment opportunities alongside the reinstatement of the railway line provides a sustainable option for new growth in the town. However, the residential development itself is not dependent on the railway line being in place in the earlier stages. As with all infrastructure, its delivery relies on funds being secured before it can be put in place.</p> <p>The Council agrees with the need to encourage employment opportunities in the town. However, this is development in its own right and is not therefore considered to be “infrastructure” as is defined in the masterplan. The Land-Use Framework (chapter 5) provides information as to how the council will facilitate the development of employment land.</p> <p>Not all of the items listed as critical infrastructure are required to be delivered before development can commence but should be provided when there is demand for it as a result of the new development. This is explained in more detail in the Land Use Framework.</p>	N
28 (Amethyst)	7.11	The respondent considers that the phasing is unrealistic given past building rates and the site specific challenges.	The phasing in the masterplan is indicative and there is a commitment to review and monitor this through the plan period.	N
47 (Devon County Council)	7.11	In general terms, it would be helpful if the wording in Section 7 of the masterplan could explicitly identify that the all development phases will be required to provide contributions to the relevant elements of infrastructure. Currently, it could be read in a manner which implies that development from only some of the phases will be required to contribute to specific infrastructure requirements (for example, development in phase 2 would still be required to	<p>The Council notes the comments raised and proposes to include a new paragraph 7.13 as follows:</p> <p><i>“This information is based on best knowledge available at the time the document was adopted. As with Table 1, this will be monitored and updated as necessary through regular monitoring reports. This list should not be seen as exhaustive and each phase will be subject to discussion with relevant infrastructure providers in pre-application stages.”</i></p>	Y

		contribute to potential localised highway infrastructure improvements).		
40 (Boyer Planning on behalf of Cavanna Homes (South West) Limited)	7.12	The respondent notes that the Core Strategy states that SP23 is to be developed during the period 2011 – 2019, but the masterplan proposes a much longer period. This has implications for the site and wider supply of housing within the Borough. The suggested phasing timetable set out in the Core Strategy plays a major role in determining the Council's overall housing trajectory. Concerned that the Council's short term housing land supply requirements will not be met. Considers that house building rates of over 100 units per annum is optimistic in current market conditions. It is therefore suggested that the reserved housing sites identified in the SP23 should be brought forward through the new Local Plan in the short term in order to alleviate the potential housing supply issue.	The Council notes the respondents reference to the Core Strategy. Paragraph 4.17 of this document states that the detailed phasing will be determined through the SPD. This is therefore clarified through the masterplan in paragraph 7.12 which proposes a build out rate of between 60 – 80 homes per year. This should not be considered in isolation to other housing supply which comes forward in other areas of the Borough. The Council will be preparing a Housing Position Statement which will provide the most up to date information in relation to the Borough's five year land supply.  As per the Inspectors Report, the Council is required to identify alternative reserve sites in the town to help to support the provision of the railway, affordable housing and other infrastructure if it is required to do so. The identification of these sites will be undertaken as part of the new Local Plan.	N
43 (Redrow Homes)	7.12	The respondent considers the timescales for delivery are unrealistic as it will take at least 2 years for the delivery of homes to start. This will mean that the reserve sites are required more urgently. The respondent is concerned that the process of identifying reserve sites is being delayed and is now being carried out as part of the new Local Plan which will delay the process further.	The Council is engaging with the developers of SP23A and understands that an application for the site is expected imminently. As this is the allocated site and it has been tested through a public examination, the Council will be pursuing its development ahead of identifying reserve sites. It is important to note that the Inspectors Report requires reserve sites to be brought forward to supplement its housing supply and support infrastructure needs only where some or all of SP23 fail to come forward as anticipated. As such, part of the process of identifying reserve sites will be to understand whether there will be, if any, a shortfall in the infrastructure and/or affordable housing provision as part of the development of the allocated site.	N
34 (Trustees to the Crowndale Estate)	7.15	The respondent suggests that the Council should adopt the conclusions of the 2010 Affordable Housing Viability Assessment that recommended assessments be made at appropriate trigger points to	Viability will be managed through a regular review process and details will be discussed at the application stage.	N

		assess viability, rather than adopting a rigid framework of contributions upfront as proposed by the Council.						
47 (Devon County Council)	Table 2	Each phase of development should include the provision of the appropriate section of the development access roads.	The Council notes the comments and proposes to include reference to this as an additional row under Servicing and Utilities Infrastructure in table 1.  Table 1 <table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>Highways infrastructure</i></td> <td><i>On-site</i></td> <td><i>All</i></td> <td><i>Developer DCC</i></td> </tr> </table>	<i>Highways infrastructure</i>	<i>On-site</i>	<i>All</i>	<i>Developer DCC</i>	Y
<i>Highways infrastructure</i>	<i>On-site</i>	<i>All</i>	<i>Developer DCC</i>					
47 (Devon County Council)	Table 2	Phase 1a should make reference to the need for the provision of land for an additional primary school.	The Council considers that this is adequately covered under the fourth bullet point in section 1a.	N				
47 (Devon County Council)	Table 2	Phase 1b includes reference to the need for a potential access road between SP23a and SP23b. At this stage, a potential route for this access has not been decided upon and therefore this principle should also apply to the provision of development access in other phases of the development, particularly phase 1c.	Whilst the Council acknowledges the comments, it appears to contradict an earlier statement made by the County Council in relation to a circular route – that “it is likely to be challenging to deliver because an at-grade crossing of the railway line is unlikely to be acceptable in terms of rail safety.”					
47	Table 2	Phase 1b should make reference to the provision of pedestrian and cycle links to routes outside of the development site, particularly the canal and Tavistock College.	The Council agrees with the comments and proposes to add the following text to Table 2, phase 1b bullet point 11 as follows:  <i>“...land west of the railway, the canal and Tavistock College.”</i>	Y				
47	Table 2	All phases should make reference to the need for contributions to bus services.	The Council agrees with the suggestions and proposes to add the following bullet point in table 2 Phase 1a: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>“Financial contributions to town bus services and on-site provision of bus stops and routes.”</i></li> </ul>	Y				
39	Table 2	The respondent does not agree with the phasing proposed and considers that the phasing implies that the railway is still receiving contributions right through to 1c. Suggests the wording needs changing to ensure that the railway is being built by this time, not merely awaiting contributions from the third phase.	All phases of the development will be required to contribute to the delivery of the railway and the Council considers that the current wording of Table 2 is appropriate and will enable contributions to be secured as required.	N				

41 (Bovis Homes)	Table 2	<p>The phasing strategy is generally supported.</p> <p>The supporting text to Figure 6 should clarify that phases 1b and 1c can come forward simultaneously or in any order.</p>	<p>The Council welcomes the support.</p> <p>The Council considers that the request to clarify the phasing of 1b and 1c is sufficiently covered in this respect in the third footnote to Table 2.</p>	N
34 (Trustees to the Crowndale Estate)	Table 2	<p>The respondent does not consider that the phasing is appropriate as the initial phase of the development will have to bear a disproportionately high amount of costs for delivering the site as a whole.</p>	<p>With any development, there are standard infrastructure requirements that will need to be provided for alongside new development. The impact of these requirements on the viability will be tested when any application is submitted to ensure the overall scheme is viable.</p>	N

## General

Respondent number	Paragraph	Comment	Council response	Changes required?
3	All	<p>The respondent objects to the SPD on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of a greenfield site</li> <li>• Continued development in the town which is unsustainable</li> <li>• A satellite community would spoil the character of Tavistock</li> <li>• Unsuitable location for the railway station</li> <li>• Development should be concentrated on brownfield sites in Plymouth to reduce commuting distances and carbon footprint.</li> </ul> <p>The respondent supports the smaller scale SP23B development with more affordable housing alongside employment uses.</p>	<p>The concerns raised by the respondent are noted by the Council. However, these comments relate mainly to the principle of the development which has already been established through the adoption of the Core Strategy and is therefore not part of this consultation.</p> <p>The Core Strategy and the masterplan do provide explanations and information as to why the development is required and the ways in which it will contribute to a sustainable future for the town.</p>	N
4	All	<p>The respondent suggests that “the scheme is more about attracting funding, boosting Council taxes and making profit for the home builders than answering a need in the community”.</p>	<p>The Council’s adopted Core Strategy has made the allocations for development in Tavistock based on evidenced need of housing and employment requirements. More information about this is contained in the Council’s Frequently Asked Questions which are available on the Council’s website alongside this consultation.</p>	N
7	All	<p>The respondent is concerned about the financial viability of the railway and therefore encourages WDBC to ensure a frequent and cheap commuter railway service and put pressure on the railway providers to enhance the tourism trail on the railway.</p>	<p>These comments are noted and will be passed on to Devon County Council who are the Highways Authority and are leading the project to deliver the railway.</p>	N
8, 20, 29, 33,	All	<p>The respondent suggests that a Design</p>	<p>This is something that the Council is exploring as part of the pre-application</p>	N

42 (Transition Tavistock)		Review Panel should be established to objectively and professionally assess the design principles of development.	process. It is important to note that any Design Review Panel or such forum which may be established would be required to assess applications against the guidance and principles in the adopted masterplan.	
10,11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 24, 27, 35, 55	All	<p>Objections to the SPD on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scale of development concentrated in one part of the town and dispersed development would have been a better option;</li> <li>• No through road between Plymouth Road and Callington Road;</li> <li>• Traffic congestion on the A390;</li> <li>• Lack of parking in the town for additional homes;</li> <li>• There is a lack of emphasis on the consequences of extra traffic/lack of schools/support services;</li> <li>• The railway should be provided before the homes;</li> </ul>	<p>The concerns raised by the respondent are noted by the Council. However, this comment relates mainly to the principle of the development which has already been established through the adoption of the Core Strategy and is therefore not part of this consultation.</p> <p>The Core Strategy provides an explanation about the scale of development proposed. The Council proposes to include a series of Frequently Asked Questions alongside the masterplan so that this information is available to anyone reading the document.</p> <p>The most up to date traffic analysis has shown that the link road between Plymouth Road and Callington Road is not required to accommodate the development. However, provision is made in the masterplan for this to be delivered beyond 2026 if it is required. Various junction improvements to the A390/A386 will be required as part of the first phase of development to accommodate the increase in traffic. Reference to the studies that have been undertaken will be included within the final version of the masterplan, as noted in the comments relating to the Design Framework above.</p> <p>The masterplan encourages effective walking, cycling and public transport routes into the town centre to avoid the need for increased town centre car parking.</p> <p>The Delivery Framework (chapter 7) sets out how the infrastructure requirements have been considered and what improvements/new infrastructure will be needed to effectively accommodate the development.</p> <p>The plan to deliver new homes and employment opportunities alongside the reinstatement of the railway line provides a sustainable option for new growth in the town. However, the residential development itself is not dependent on the railway line being in place in the earlier stages. As with all infrastructure, its delivery relies on funds being secured before it can be put in place.</p>	Y
15, 35	All	The respondents were disappointed with the exhibition arrangements i.e. that it took place on a week day and from the hours of 11am – 4pm. The	The consultation that was carried out was relative and proportionate to the type of document that was being consulted on. A significant amount of public consultation had taken place to prepare the masterplan and it was considered that a one day event would be suitable for sharing the draft plan with the	N

		respondent suggests that at the Community Services Committee (26 <sup>th</sup> February) it was agreed that the Officers would be available throughout the consultation period for discussion.	community. However, we appreciate the concerns and will take them into consideration when undertaking future consultations.  For clarification, it was agreed at the Community Services Committee to look at the consultation arrangements and venues outside of the meeting. Officers were available at Kilworthy Park throughout the consultation period for anyone wishing to discuss the masterplan.	
29, 33, 42 (Transition Tavistock)	All	Considers that much of the masterplan is positive but the language used does not appear to be enforceable. Questions whether things “should” be considered....or “must” they be put in place. Many of the requirements are qualified by statements (e.g. subject to viability) that give the developer an option to “explain them away”.	The masterplan is a <i>framework</i> for development, rather than being a prescriptive set of rules. There has to be sufficient flexibility to allow the developer to creatively respond to the requirements we set and to demonstrate the outcomes sought from the policy are met.  The Council is bound by issues of site viability. An objective of the Core Strategy is to deliver the development we need, to the best possible standard, alongside the accompanying infrastructure. The National Planning Policy Framework makes it clear that viability is a key issue – “ <i>To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable</i> ” (NPPF para 173). The Council has undertaken strategic viability testing of the Tavistock sites, under a variety of market scenarios. The master planning document has to be sufficiently flexible to be deliverable in a range of different economic scenarios.	N
35	All	Respondent notes that Bovis Homes has stated it will be building to their development standards. Is concerned that no account will be taken of the aspect, site, history, sustainability etc.	The development is required to be built in accordance with the Council’s adopted policy (namely Core Strategy Strategy Policy 23), current Building Regulations and the masterplan. As such, any development will need to be delivered in accordance with these.	N
37 (Network Rail)	All	The respondent requests that Network Rail is specifically consulted where a proposal impact on a level crossing and would like this to be stated through planning policy.	The Council notes the request and has confirmed with Devon County Council that the proposed route of the railway line will not affect or include any level crossings and that the planned development will not have an impact on any existing level crossings.  For clarification, the masterplan cannot set policy, but the Council will bear this in mind when preparing new policies.	N
40 (Boyer Planning on	All	The respondent notes that there does not appear to be any explicit reference	The Council notes the comments. In line with the Core Strategy, the reinstatement of the railway line alongside local highway improvements will be	N

<p>behalf of Cavanna Homes (South West) Limited</p>		<p>in the masterplan to the railway line being built as part of the strategic allocation. It is acknowledged that throughout the masterplan there is proposed reference to residential development making off-site contributions to the funding of the railway line but there does not seem to be any direct link between the two. Concerned that the lack of delivery of the railway could result in a substantial residential development to the south of the town without a sustainable transport solution, exacerbating current traffic issues facing the town.</p> <p>Client considers that the SPD does not accurately reflect the debate at the Core Strategy and is contrary to the justification used to support the strategic allocation and if the railway were not forthcoming, it would raise significant doubts about the soundness of the adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>Suggests that if new residential development will solely help fund the railway, this role could easily be undertaken by other sites such as New Launceston Road.</p>	<p>required to mitigate the impacts of the development.</p> <p>There are many references in the masterplan which link the reinstatement of the railway line and new development in the town and emphasises the significant role that the allocation will play in providing it. This reflects the policy requirement of SP23. As per the Inspectors Report, the Council is required to identify alternative reserve sites in the town to help to support the provision of the railway, affordable housing and other infrastructure if it is required to do so. The identification of these sites will be undertaken as part of the new Local Plan and the Council notes the availability of land at New Launceston Road which will be taken into consideration.</p>	
<p>45</p>	<p>All</p>	<p>There is insufficient explanation in the masterplan about why the development has been allocated and contains no consideration of the impact of development on the town. Because these issues are not addressed in the masterplan, the impression is that they have not been considered.</p>	<p>The Council notes the objections raised and considers that it is a valid point that explanations about why the allocation was made should be included within the document. Whilst it is not usually necessary to repeat information which is provided in other plans, the Council considers that it would be useful in this instance to help provide context to the allocation. As such, the Council proposes to include a set of 'Frequently Asked Questions' alongside the masterplan. This will provide explanations behind the decisions made in allocating the new development in Tavistock.</p>	<p>Y</p>



45	All	Respondent is concerned that there will be traffic problems as a result of new development and this will lead to a new supermarket on the western fringes of the town.	The Council notes the comments. The masterplan makes provision for a small-scale neighbourhood retailing facility but there are no proposals for a supermarket. Any proposals of this nature would need to be considered in the context of local and national policies.	
51	All	<p>The respondent objects to the masterplan on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 750 homes is excessive;</li> <li>• Doubts that the railway will happen; and</li> <li>• The traffic will be horrendous.</li> </ul>	<p>The concerns raised by the respondent are noted by the Council. However, this comment relates mainly to the principle of the development which has already been established through the adoption of the Core Strategy and is therefore not part of this consultation.</p> <p>The Core Strategy provides an explanation about the scale of development proposed. The Council proposes to include a set of Frequently Asked Questions alongside the masterplan so that this information is available to anyone reading the document.</p> <p>An assessment of the impact of the development on the local roads has been commissioned by Devon County Council. Using a robust and standard methodology, this has assessed a range of options and has concluded that junction improvements, alongside the reinstatement of the railway line, will be able to accommodate the increased traffic as a result of the development. The Council proposes to include reference to the relevant reports within the masterplan so that this evidence is sufficiently signposted for members of the public (see above).</p>	Y
43 (Redrow Homes)	All	<p>The respondent considers that the document is too vague and lacks detail about the sites' constraints, phasing, railway link and affordable housing requirements. Considers that the document should be reviewed and re-consulted on.</p> <p>The reference to the Design Brief and its status is ambiguous. If due weight is going to be given to it, it should form part of the SPD.</p>	<p>The Council notes the comments. However, as explained in the introduction, the purpose of the masterplan is to set the context in which the development can take place and not to be prescriptive about the detail of the development. This is particularly important given the scale and nature of the development proposed. Flexibility is a key theme of the NPPF and the masterplan responds to this requirement accordingly. It is therefore not considered appropriate to amend the emphasis of the document and re-consult.</p> <p>The Design Brief was undertaken to inform the masterplan and Members of the Council formally agreed to use it in this manner. It forms part of the evidence base alongside other documents of this nature. Much of its content has been reflected in the draft masterplan. There have been a number of responses to the consultation suggestion that further references are made to the Design Brief and changes will be made to reflect these suggestions where it is appropriate to do so.</p>	N

43 (Redrow Homes)	All	<p>The SPD does not reference the need to 'significantly boost' housing supply in accordance with the NPPF. The respondent is concerned that the limited housing delivery in the town over the past few years is set to continue. It is clear that reserve sites are urgently needed now. The site at Tiddy Brook is available, suitable and deliverable and should be identified as a reserve site urgently.</p>	<p>The Council notes the comments. However, it is considered that the masterplan is not the appropriate document to look at housing supply. The masterplan (as a supplementary planning document) can only provide detail to existing policies and does not go into the realms of setting or amending existing policies, such as housing requirements and targets. This will be reviewed as part of the preparation of the new Local Plan.</p> <p>It is important to note that 731 homes have been completed in Tavistock between 2006 and 2012 and therefore the Council does not agree with the statement that there has been limited housing delivery in the town over the past few years. It is also important to note that housing supply in Tavistock should not be considered in isolation to other housing supply which comes forward in other areas of the Borough. The Council will be preparing a Housing Position Statement which will provide the most up to date information in relation to the Borough's five year land supply.</p> <p>The identification of reserve sites will be undertaken as part of the new Local Plan and the Council notes the availability of land at New Launceston Road which will be taken into consideration.</p>	N
-------------------	-----	---	--	---