



DARTMOOR LOCAL PLAN

guiding planning applications in Dartmoor National Park

Report of Parish/Town Council sites consultation

October 2017 – January 2018

Consultation: Issues for the new Local Plan



March
2018

This Report sets out a summary of the consultation Dartmoor National Park Authority held between October 2017 and January 2018.

The purpose of the consultation was to share with the Town and Parish Council of the larger settlements, the outcome of the [Land Availability Assessment](#) and discuss with those Councils, in a public forum, any initial views they might have on the potential site options. DNPA held these meetings principally with Town and Parish Councils, and invited those councils to consider how they might like to involve their own communities, and to encourage them to promote attendance at the meetings locally. The result was that DNPA took a flexible approach to the meeting based on different circumstances, this varied from a large meeting with more formal presentation requested, to more informal attendance of scheduled Parish Council meetings and open discussion with Councillors and those in attendance.

The following provides an overview of those meetings. It is not intended as a complete record of all comments raised, but seeks to summarise the key points of discussion and issues raised.

Join the discussion:



Twitter@DartmoorPlan



Facebook/DartmoorPlan

www.dartmoor.gov.uk/localplan

forwardplanning@dartmoor.gov.uk

01626 832093

Location	Moretonhampstead Parish Hall
Date/Time	17 October 19:30-21:30
Officers	Dan Janota, Kevin Bishop and Chloe Thomas
Attendance	Approx 150
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public attendees expressed at the scale of development proposed in Moretonhampstead. Officers explained it was not a proposal, but a theoretical capacity from which the community had the opportunity to provide its views on potential preferred sites to be allocated in the Local Plan • A handout (see Appendix 1) was prepared by DNPA which summarises the key points of the DNPA presentation. • Questions were invited which were answered in writing by DNPA and published online (see Appendix 2). Questions were raised in particular, around: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Assumptions around figures in the Land Availability Assessment ○ The process of the Land Availability Assessment ○ The rate of development in Moretonhampstead, and in relation to other parts of the National Park ○ The existing sites ○ Brownfield v greenfield development priorities ○ The weight applied to a petition relating to land at Courtenay Park, and the study commissioned by the Parish Council ○ Local Housing Needs Assessment, and the level of housing need in Moretonhampstead ○ The allocation of properties, the definition of local and of affordable ○ Compulsory purchase ○ Employment opportunities ○ Second home ownership ○ Traffic, transport and other infrastructure needs 	

Location	Buckfastleigh Town Hall
Date/Time	1 November 19:00-21:00
Officers	Dan Janota and Alex Gandy
Attendance	Approx 30 (4 Town Councillors)

- Attendees expressed concerned about parking issues and lack of available on-street parking, particularly at Jordan Street, where poor parking was blocking the road.
- Attendees expressed concern at existing high level of affordable housing stock in Buckfastleigh and the focus of existing and proposed future policy being on further affordable housing delivery, suggesting that market housing could help address the balance as part of mixed development.
- Discussion around Devonia site and the community's disappointment that this site had not come forward. TC asked whether there were opportunities for encouraging redevelopment of the site. Officers informed the PC there was limited scope to require development to come forward and planning policy would support the continued use of the site for employment purposes in principle if that is the landowner's intention. PC requested DNPA discuss the possibility of using a portion of the Devonia site for a community car park.
- Discussion around school capacity and that, whilst the school does have additional capacity, there are fears that it doesn't have sufficient funding to be able to deliver the quality of teaching and facilities desired. DNPA described the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, its purpose and the communication with service providers and communities to identify issues.
- Flooding issues were discussed with a quick exploration of possible mitigation strategies, including through the redevelopment of the Devonia site. There was a discussion around long term mitigation strategies, including through the Authority's current project work through upstream attenuation and peatland restoration
- The TC and public attendees were not overly supportive of the existing site allocations. There was no consensus on a preferred site option of those offered, and the TC requested that DNPA review the LAA result for the site on Duckspond Rd (DNP16-038) looking again at feasibility/viability and highway access.
- Feasibility work has been completed by Sustrans on a cycle path route connecting Ashburton and Buckfastleigh, and continuing on to Plymouth via series of on and off-road paths. Any further progress on the project would be subject to funding. The TC was encouraged to seek planning advice from DNPA at the earliest opportunity.

Location	The Old School Centre, South Brent
Date/Time	13 November 19:30-21:00
Officers	Dan Janota and Chloe Thomas
Attendance	Approx 35 (7 Parish Councillors)

- Social and affordable housing was discussed
- Sustainability was raised as important, particularly with the loss of Code for Sustainable Homes
- The problem of site allocations increasing land value was raised, was there potential that preference is given to a Community Land Trust rather than a developer?
- It was questioned whether there are enough services and infrastructure (such as parking, school spaces and doctors) to support more houses – DNPA described the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which plays a key role in understanding and assessing this issue, and that all Parish Councils have been asked to identify issues through the Settlement Profiles.
- Parking was raised as a problem in South Brent, particularly at the western edge of Station Park
- The sites to the south of the village (close to the A38) are likely to increase the parking issue as residents would drive into the village rather than walk and it was felt they were unlikely to use the local shops. The attractiveness of wanting to live adjacent to the A38 was also questioned. The current allocated site and the land adjoining Palstone Lane were favoured at this stage.
- It was recommended by a Parish Councillor that the population figure for South Brent should be changed from 2165 to 2822
- Attendees were concerned at allocating enough land for the next 10 years as it was felt it would be likely to come forward in one single development, rather than meeting need over time.
- The idea of co-housing was raised and discussed
- Housing Needs Surveys were discussed and it was agreed that now is not the time for a refresh (due to the current development). It was suggested that in a future survey the aspirations of families should be considered. For example if a couple does not currently have children but plan to have them soon to account for future requirements

Location	Ashburton Town Hall
Date/Time	14 November 19:45-21:00
Officers	Chloe Thomas and Chris Hart
Attendance	Approx 40 (11 Town Councillors)

- Views were expressed around the need for affordable housing and poor past delivery
- Views that the development at Longstone Cross should be affordable housing only
- A need for social rented homes was raised, rather than affordable as 80% of open market was not considered affordable
- It was suggested that car parking should be the first priority in the centre of the town
- Access for ASH2 and the bridge use for access to the Tuckers site discussed
- An update of the situation with regards to the railway at Chuley Road was requested, it was confirmed that no further proposals from the group had been received and the route has not currently been safeguarded
- The potential for Community Infrastructure Levy was suggested
- Site specific concerns for current applications were raised e.g. access to the former Outdoor Experience site and related traffic for this and any further Chuley Road development
- Concerns were raised regarding Dolbeare Meadow and if DNPA can force anything on this site. Could a temporary car park be put here? A conversation with the site owner was requested to try and turn the development from employment use to social housing use, however it was confirmed that as the planning permission is for employment the site owner is able to proceed with this use
- In the Chuley Road area it was stated that it is Balland Culvert that is the flooding problem, not the stream, more housing in this area will make the problem worse
- Some help to steer the community regarding what they could wish for was requested, some parameters for them to work within
- Kenwyn was discussed with Blue Cedar confirming they had an interest in the site and would come to the Town Council with their proposals before submitting a planning application
- The ASH2 Employment Land boundary on the settlement profile was questioned as there is a house in this area

Location	Clearbrook Village Hall (Yelverton)
Date/Time	21 November 19:30
Officers	Dan Janota
Attendance	Approx 50 (Approx 7 Parish Councillors)

- Queries around the infrastructure capacity in Yelverton, in particular highway capacity but also medical facilities, car parking (around the forecourt), and the fact there is not a school in Yelverton. DNPA described the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, the role it plays and the opportunity for agencies/organisation and communities to feed into that.
- Question around why previously discounted sites through the Land Availability Assessment are now included. DNPA described that amendment had been made to the submissions this time which overcame the technical issues around highway access.
- DNPA described the role and purpose of Land Availability Assessment, and in particular how it is a consideration of whether sites 'could' be developed in technical terms, and that it is for the Local Plan to identify whether they 'should'.
- Concerns expressed around highway safety and traffic levels on Meavy Lane and Gratton Lane.
- Clarification that the Leg O' Mutton area is not currently identified for development as the finance needed to facilitate a 'bypass' road for Yelverton would not likely come from public funding, nor is it likely that the scale of development necessary to fund it directly be acceptable, though it could still be explored in the longer term.
- Views expressed that there is a need to meet the needs of older downsizers in Yelverton (and link with DNPA's statement around the ageing population in the National Park).
- Query around deliverability of sites, and an explanation from DNPA that sites would be further scrutinised, and that the Neighbourhood Plan will also need to be satisfied of the availability and deliverability of any sites it identifies.
- DNPA described the basic concept of affordable housing, and how housing numbers are estimated, but the DNPA does not have a government set housing target to meet.
- Query around the scrutiny of LAA submissions (and the declaration of legal agreements on the land). DNPA described that it was for LAA submission to submit the correct information, but that any site potentially being taken forward would be further scrutinised.
- There was a discussion around whether a site additional to that identified in the draft Neighbourhood Plan is needed.
- DNPA described how the Neighbourhood plan would be considered in planning decisions, and its structure/linkage with the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan, and the Dartmoor Local Plan.
- The Chair of the Neighbourhood Plan Group described their own timescales and how housing numbers work in respect of the two overarching Local Plan.

Location	Princetown Community Centre
Date/Time	23 November 19:30 -
Officers	Chloe Thomas and Alex Gandy
Attendance	Approx 28 (Approx 6 Parish Councillors)

- Discussion around how housing need is calculated in the National Park, social housing and other affordable housing delivery models. DNPA described the process and the role of Housing Needs Assessments.
- Attendees emphasised the need to facilitate opportunities for local builders to develop small sites which can in turn support the local economy.
- Importance of using local materials and vernacular design to improve design on all types of housing, including affordable was raised. DNPA agreed but noted the balance needed to bring affordable homes forward.
- Attendees queried the size of new homes and expressed concern about the size of bedrooms
- Concerns expressed around parking charges and its impact on parking in residential areas.
- Specific questions regarding the Bellever garage site were raised e.g. construction traffic access, parking for any new homes, the garages are currently being used
- Public attendees suggested DNPA should approach landowners on surrounding land and that greenfield sites should be prioritised over brownfield sites because development of brownfield sites can disrupt existing residents
- HMP Dartmoor was discussed and DNPA described its potential approach (as in the Historic Environment Topic Paper).
- The affordability of affordable housing, and of land and self-build housing was questioned.
- It was suggested that many of those identified as in housing need were located in small villages around Dartmoor Forest and would resist taking up properties in Princetown. It was that there may be potential for very small scale and tightly restricted development in areas currently classed as open countryside, such as Hexworthy. DNPA described the issues around mortgageability and the national policy context on development in the open countryside.
- The need for key worker housing was raised and the benefit this could have support key employees who wouldn't usually be able to afford to live locally, such as carers
- The option of being able to purchase a flat, rather than just homes, would make development more affordable to local people
- It was suggested that at any one time there are approximately 10 houses for sale in Princetown at a low price point and there was uncertainty that new housing could be significantly less than that price point.

Location	Endecott House, Chagford
Date/Time	27 November 19:30-21:30
Officers	Dan Janota and Alex Gandy
Attendance	Approx 30 (8 Parish Councillors)

- Discussion around the existing elderly people's housing development by Blue Cedar and a Councillor asked what lessons could be learnt from the poor take up experienced. Another Councillor stated development had come about from a long-term identified need and it was regrettable that take up had not been as quick as expected. DNPA emphasised the same and highlighted the development had also made a contribution to affordable
- It was noted that lessons need to be learned before a similar development model is supported in Chagford or elsewhere in the National Park, in particular around property sale prices.
- There was discussion around the principle of providing public benefits from development, such as affordable housing and infrastructure. DNPA described the Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study and Infrastructure Delivery Plan which needs in the National Park's settlements and identify where development could help support improvements.
- There was discussion around housing need, how it was calculated and the current mechanisms available for delivering affordable housing. DNPA stated that it was expected that the current development at Bretteville Close would likely meet much of Chagford's present housing need and that any significant further development would need to be based on evidenced housing need, via a Housing Needs Assessment or other means.
- There was general acceptance that the current allocated site at Lamb Park could be reallocated. There was discussion around what development type should be delivered there to meet local needs at the appropriate time, in particular self-build was raised.
- The employment site at Crannafords was discussed and there was overall support for the potential benefit of providing some further employment development there.
- The current policy approach to barn conversions was discussed and a Councillor expressed that the current restrictions were preventing opportunities for affordable rural dwellings which could support rural workers. The commenter felt it was unfair the current policy favoured holiday lets. DNPA confirmed they are reviewing the policy, but needed to be mindful that any opportunities created favoured the community and didn't have any undesirable effects, such as increased second home ownership.

Location	Horrabridge Village Hall
Date/Time	28 November 19:30-21:00
Officers	Dan Janota and Alex Gandy
Attendance	Approx 30 (4 Parish Councillors)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attendees had concerns that Horrabridge suffers from highways issues around parking and traffic flow in the town. To the extent they felt Horrabridge had limited capacity to accommodate development. Attendees were interested to hear what the driver behind the need to deliver new housing in the National Park was. DNPA summarised how housing need is calculated, the criteria used to determine eligibility and emphasised the focus on affordable housing delivery. Flooding issues were raised on both of the potential development sites – particularly DNP14-110 where there was anecdotal reports of considerable surface water flooding and complicated below ground mine shafts which complicated. Query as to why one site (DNP16/028) was not included as a site option. DNPA explained it was largely within the flood zone and therefore would not be considered when alternative sites exist outside the flood zone. Attendees were not overly supportive of the site options, including the current allocated site, and requested the opportunity to approach other landowners. A further site has been suggested via Horrabridge Parish Council and will be considered by DNPA. The current policy approach to barn conversions was discussed HMP Dartmoor was discussed and DNPA set out the proposed approach described in the Historic Environment Topic Paper. 	

Location	Meavy Village Hall
Date/Time	8 January 18:00-19:00
Officers	Dan Janota and Kevin Bishop
Attendance	Approx 25 (2 Parish Councillors)

- Attendees seemed reassured at the potential new approach to settlement identification which will take into account not just the services and facilities of a settlement, but it's sensitivity and character. This includes the consideration of a new middle tier of settlements (splitting the current list of Rural Settlements) where there may be a little more opportunity for small scale development.
- No strong views were expressed around the suitability of the site options in the Parish at Yelverton.
- Though it was queried as to why sites previously excluded from the Land Availability Assessment were now included. DNPA explained that in both cases an alternative or altered highway access was now proposed which had meant highway access could now be achieved. This was not to say that the access was necessarily acceptable in planning terms, but that it could be achieved in technical terms.
- Question as to how DNPA would be considering the need to deliver self-build plots to meet the need on the Register. DNPA suggested that this would be likely through a combination of policy tools including opportunities on infill, conversions, and the potential to consider allocation.
- No strong views were expressed on the role of parish boundaries, which were flagged by officers as to a consideration in current planning policy as to how and where housing need may be met.
- Question as to how the recreational impacts of new development are considered. Officers explained that DNPA is currently studying the recreational impact within the National Park, of large scale development outside the National Park. There was support for DNPA's wish to better understand this issue. It was noted the varying perceptions of tourism and tourist impact within farm business in particular.
- Concerns were expressed that Meavy/Burrator residents did not have the opportunity to input or influence the Neighbourhood Plan process at Buckland Monachorum and there was no Neighbourhood Plan' Duty to Co-operate. DNPA suggested this was an issue for the Parish Council to consider through discussion with the adjoining Parish Council.

Appendix 1



DARTMOOR LOCAL PLAN

guiding planning applications in Dartmoor National Park

The Dartmoor Local Plan Review - Moretonhampstead options

We hope you found the meeting helped in understanding the Local Plan Review, the work we are doing, and how you can get involved. Thank you for your contributions.

We thought it would be helpful to summarise the main messages.

- There is not a requirement for 242 houses in Moretonhampstead. There is no national housing target for Dartmoor
- We need to develop a housing strategy for the Local Plan: How do we meet the needs of local people, address community priorities, and consider the ageing population and loss of younger working people and families – all in the context of an important landscape?
- We should identify enough land in the National Park to meet the needs of Dartmoor communities, and to demonstrate that the Local Plan for the National Park is 'sound'
- If we don't have an up to date and 'sound' Local Plan, we may not be able to refuse permission for sites which don't meet communities needs, and could see speculative development coming forward
- Housing policies in the current Local Plan focus on affordable housing for local needs. We expect the new Local Plan would, too. The new Local Plan will need to set out what is meant by 'local', and what is 'affordable' (recognising government already has a definition in national policy)
- If we allocate sites in the Local Plan and the local need cannot be demonstrated when an application is made, the site should not be developed at that time
- No decisions have been made yet. The assessment so far looks just at whether land, submitted by the landowners, 'could' in technical terms be developed, not whether it 'should'. This enables us to talk with you about the options. It is a process all local planning authorities will go through in order to have a 'sound' Local Plan
- The Local Plan must be based on evidence, we are collecting lots of information which informs the decisions we make, and are publishing this online
- We want communities to have their say early on, and to remain involved throughout the Review. We will listen to your views. There will be formal consultation on a draft Local Plan in summer 2018
- The Parish Council, with the community, can now consider the options, and how it would like to feed this into the Local Plan Review. We can help you with this if you would like. Most importantly, would like your views

You can find out more, and keep in touch, as follows:

www.dartmoor.gov.uk/localplan forwardplanning@dartmoor.gov.uk



facebook.com/dartmoorplan



@dartmoorplan



Appendix 2



Moretonhampstead Local Plan Parish Council Meeting Questions and Answers

The following questions were received in relation to the meeting DNPA officer attended on Tuesday 17 October 2017 in the Parish Hall, Moretonhampstead.

As a general reminder, this was not the only opportunity for public comment, nor was DNPA's objective to get feedback there and then at the meeting. Consultation is not a single event, it is an ongoing process, part of which is about ensuring that there is good understanding of what we are seeking your views about to help you to comment fully.

Given the extent to which some of the Local Plan evidence, and the LAA in particular, had been misunderstood it was felt the priority should be to focus upon providing clarity on the situation. This means that the community can then consider its view from an informed point of view, rather than be alarmed at numbers which are not as some have suggested.

Hopefully the meeting achieved this as far as it could. We recognise that there were questions, some of which were specific and technical, that there was not the time for. We agreed with the Parish Council that it would not be the best use of time answering some of these in a large public meeting.

The answers are set out below, publicly, as we promised. In the spirit of transparency we have included the names of those who asked the questions.

You will appreciate that we wish to answer your questions as thoroughly as we can, but hopefully also understand that we are a small team with a significant amount of work to cover across Dartmoor. Hence we have kept our responses brief and informal where we can, and have not repeated answers to the same questions. We hope these responses are treated in the spirit of helpfulness in which they are provided.

As we described, we will continue to support the Parish Council in considering how to move forward in understanding the views of the community, in order for it to feedback to DNPA on the Local Plan, in what it believes to be a representative way.

Please remember you can keep in touch with the review of the Local Plan, and the opportunities to have your say at www.dartmoor.gov.uk/localplan, www.facebook.com/dartmoorplan and www.twitter.com/dartmoor.

(1) (Mike Warner)

Quoting from the DNPA recently published Land Availability Assessment:

“The results of the 2017 Dartmoor National Park LAA show that the indicative housing provision figure for Dartmoor National Park of 50 dwellings per year, as set out in the adopted Core Strategy, for the current 5 year period can be met through sites already in the planning process and those expected to come forward within that period.” “The figure should not be regarded as a target but rather as an indication of the level of development that could be expected to meet the housing needs of Dartmoor communities and which is in line with the need to conserve the landscape, natural beauty and special qualities of the National Park.” “There is significant over supply of sites, within and outside the planning process, to cover the indicative housing needs requirements within Dartmoor National Park in the first five years of the planning period. The adjusted provision figure is 1355 set against an indicative needs figure (DNP Core Strategy) for the five year period of 250 dwellings.” “The figures are 20 to 30 dwellings per hectare, which are set out in the tables as minimum and maximum yields for each site. This density was higher in the 2014 review but was reduced in the April 2017 methodology update. A mid-point yield is also shown in the tabulations and is the figure used in the housing trajectory.”

My question is:

Considering only the ‘three tick’ sites in Moretonhampstead covering “suitable, available, achievable” the following figures are tabled in the report:

DNP08/017A (Thompson’s) 2.24ha = 19 units
DNP08/018 (Courtenay Park) 2.1ha = 31 units
DNP08/019 (Forder Farm) 9.9ha = 100 units
DNP14/095 (Chagford Cross / Bradford Meadow) 1.3ha = 25 units
DNP 14/102 (Brinning Road) 4.26ha = 60 units
DNP 14/121 (Queens Road) 0.82ha = 7 units

The densities cited in the report do not seem to have been applied to these parcels correctly or consistently. The unit totals are said to be derived from midpoint assessments and so adjustment for site constraints is already incorporated for site factors. The Thompson’s site is demonstrably capable of accepting 40/42 units so why is a figure of 19 units being included? Courtenay Park is smaller yet carries 50% more units and equates to a density of 14.76 dwellings per hectare. The size of Forder Farm does not appear to correspond with the plan of Forder Farm shown in the Moretonhampstead Housing Study and is given a density of 10 units per hectare. A similar discrepancy is noted with Chagford Cross/Bradford Meadow

With the application of the DNPA approved densities, the presently allocated sites will more than meet Moreton’s anticipated local need which has been assessed as 14 households in bands A-D. Please confirm the capacity you envisage being delivered by these two sites?

The Parish Council has recommended allocating Courtenay Park because of lack of progress in bringing the currently allocated sites to planning stage. Investigations reveal good progress is being made with both these sites. Please confirm that from DNPA viewpoint the discussions are proceeding well and given the report quotes a 'significant oversupply in years 1–5' what is creating the urgent time pressure for these sites?

The Moretonhampstead Housing Study used the previous SHLAA map from the 2014 call for sites as its starting point. This was the best available information at the time as the 2016 LAA had not been completed. The boundaries now shown are those submitted by landowners in the 2016 LAA call for sites.

The LAA yield is calculated as 44 units (19 at Thompson's and 25 at Forder Farm). Para 6.1 of the LAA Methodology states "The panel may also wish to adjust the housing yield for sites due to constraints or advise on the likely number of dwellings that can be accommodated". Table 15 of the LAA Report notes specific constraints identified by the Panel (normally as flagged by corresponding Area Report), and then in the final column whether the Panel advised to reduce the potential yield of the site as a result.

This potential capacity is a product of the LAA methodology and Panel assessment only. It may not necessarily be the view of DNPA as planning authority, having taken into account other factors which may be considered were a proposal to come forward. These might include for example, at a more detailed stage, the character of the site in relation to the surrounding grain of development, specific landscape, open space, or highways mitigation or provision, or the consideration of properties sizes as part of affordable housing delivery.

DNPA is advised by the Agent representing the landowner of Forder Farm (MTN1) that an outline application for planning permission is to be expected before the end of 2017. We understand some progress is also being made with a view to progressing the Thompson's site (MTN2).

As we are currently reviewing our Local Plan we need to consider the future need for housing in Moretonhampstead. The Local Plan should be 'positively prepared' and 'deliverable' and therefore reasonable consider the ability to meet development needs for the whole plan period, which is 15 years, rather than just 1-5 years.

It is also important to note that there is a difference between *supply* (i.e. land which is available) and *delivery* (development which has been completed). Whilst there is the potential land supply, delivery of development has not happened

(2) (James Gething)

1) The DNPA core strategy document states a target for the delivery of new housing across the DNP of 50 units per year. Since 2000 how many units have been delivered across the DNP and how many of these have been in Moretonhampstead?

The Core Strategy describes the figure of 50 units per year as "an estimate of provision against local needs only", not a target. The Core Strategy was adopted in 2008, since then 374 units have been completed across Dartmoor (averaging 42 per year). A total of 26 units have been permitted and completed in Moretonhampstead since 2008 (3 per year) and a further 1 has planning permission. A total of 58 net units have been completed since 2008 (this includes units which received planning permission before the Core Strategy was adopted).

2) The local housing need for Moretonhampstead has been assessed as 13 new units and there is an allocation for 43 new units within the existing local plan. Given local need can be more than satisfied within currently allocated sites how can the DNPA justify allocating any of the greenfield sites around Moretonhampstead for development?

Although the currently allocated sites will provide some units towards the current need we have to consider the future requirements of the community. The Local Plan runs for a 15 year period, the need for 13 units covers a 5 year period, therefore the need over the whole plan period is likely to be greater.

Government now expects affordable housing to be delivered largely via 'cross subsidy' (market housing to deliver affordable housing) the overall number of units would be greater than the affordable need alone. Current sites in the Local Plan are allocated at 50% affordable, though again government expectations on viability mean this proportion is rarely met, and will need to be reconsidered in the next Local Plan.

We would also refer to the above, that development at MTN1, and MTN2 may come forward under the current Local Plan. Were this to be the case the next Local Plan should be able to show it can reasonable meet future need in Moretonhampstead. That is why it is considered necessary to ask the community where it thinks the next appropriate site for housing delivery may be.

The Local Plan currently takes a 'brownfield first' approach, this is reflected in a number of brownfield allocations, such as MTN2. Brownfield sites can take longer to come forward (particular where these is a current use), and there are only limited options before greenfield sites may need to be considered.

(3) (Bill Hardiman)

How many of the social housing stock of Teignbridge Housing Authority in Moretonhampstead parish that have become available in the last year been allocated to residents of the parish?

In the last 12 months four units have become available, three of these were allocated to an applicant with a Moretonhampstead connection and one with a connection to Bridford. (Answered by Teignbridge District Council)

(4) (Graham Dimmock)

1. Since housing projects in Moreton over the last 10 years have taken a long time to sell (Sawyers Walk and the six houses built to the north of Forder Meadow), why does the National Park feel there is either demand for another 242 houses in the next 15 years or that this will in any way support local housing and employment needs in Moretonhampstead.

As described above the figure of 242 units is not demand or a requirement. Any need identified in Moretonhampstead would be that of affordable housing need, not open market housing. Both of the developments referred to were granted permission prior to the current Local Plan, one being only open market housing.

2. Does the National Park recognise the importance of the Moreton Parish Council Study undertaken earlier this year which concluded that 85% of respondents supported the building of new houses specifically as genuinely affordable for young and older people with local connections and that Moreton's strong sense of identity should be preserved along with the high quality of the natural and historic environment.

Yes, we worked with the PC in putting this together, and will give appropriate weight to information put forward by Parish Councils, particularly where this is supported by evidence.

(5) (Ian Mortimer)

As you know, I am no lawyer, but I have checked the insertion in the 1990 Act, numbered section 244A, as shown on the government's database of legislation in force:

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/8/section/244A/2002-03-27?timeline=true>

The first paragraph reads: 'A National Park authority shall, on being authorised to do so by the Secretary of State, have the same power to acquire land compulsorily as the local authorities to whom section 226 applies have under that section.' It adds, helpfully, 'Sections 226(1) and (7), 227, 229, 230, 232, 233 and 235 to 242 shall apply with the necessary modifications as if a National Park authority were a local authority to which those sections applied and as if the Park in relation to which it carries out functions were the authority's area.'

In case of doubt, Section 226 gives powers to make a compulsory purchase for planning purposes. It may be viewed here: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/8/section/226>. To be precise it gives the following power:

(1) A local authority to whom this section applies shall, on being authorised to do so by the Secretary of State, have power to acquire compulsorily any land in their area

(a) if the authority think that the acquisition will facilitate the carrying out of development, re-development or improvement on or in relation to the land,]

(b) which is required for a purpose which it is necessary to achieve in the interests of the proper planning of an area in which the land is situated.

But a local authority must not exercise the power under paragraph (a) of subsection (1) unless they think that the development, re-development or improvement is likely to contribute to the achievement of any one or more of the following objects—

(a) the promotion or improvement of the economic well-being of their area;

(b) the promotion or improvement of the social well-being of their area;

(c) the promotion or improvement of the environmental well-being of their area.]).

Those caveats are all satisfied in the case of local-need housing. And the Park Authority expressly does not have to be the developer itself.

It follows that – unless I am missing something – the National Park Authority does have the means to resolve the issue of MOR1 not being developed. It therefore does not need to allocate or identify as potentially developable large swathes of the area around Moreton, extending to an area for 242 houses (as I see by DNPA's officers own reckoning), when we only have a clear and identifiable need for thirteen houses, which can easily be accommodated within MOR1. This policy of threatening to allocate yet more land before the last two sites have been developed is very alarming locally, proving a catalyst to much disquiet and (in some cases) anger, and unnecessary.

I hope the Parish Council will push this matter further with the Authority, as neither I nor the 147 local people who have signed up to Moretonhampstead's Special Qualities, nor many other local people are happy with the way that the Authority is leading the way in advocating the overdevelopment of our part of the Park, through extra allocations, when it could use its existing powers with precision and much less local concern.

Given the advice from the Agent working on behalf of the landowner of MTN1, that an application will be made in outline before the end of 2017 this question may not now be relevant. However for completeness, the advice from DNPA's legal service is as follows:

Scope for powers which are available is to facilitate the carrying out of development, redevelopment or improvement of land which is in the interests of proper planning, and provided always that it is likely to contribute to achieving

- the promotion or improvement of the economic well-being of their area;
- the promotion or improvement of the social well-being of their area;
- the promotion or improvement of the environmental well-being of their area.

However given small scale of change it would be questionable whether it would represent good use of public money (particularly given need for 'full and fair' compensation to landowner). The funding needs to be available for the acquisition of the land, and also the landowner's costs. The legal hurdles of securing CPO are formidable and confirmation by the Secretary of State is never certain. The costs and financial risks are significant. It should be seen as very much a last resort where all avenues have been explored, and there is compelling evidence that the benefits are so substantial as to outweigh the risks.

Given the above, if it were the case that a site was proven not to be coming forward, the most appropriate planning response would normally be to consider *alternative* sites (not *additional* sites). This is perhaps why CPO powers are largely used only in relation to brownfield redevelopment, regeneration, infrastructure provision or land assembly situations, where by definition no alternative to that site exists.

1. The National Park Authority's process of identifying what could be developed is the major force for development in this part of the Park. I am well aware that it is a technical exercise and not a consultative one, and required by law from every local planning authority in the country. Nevertheless, it is opening the door to development by stating land is 'suitable' and 'achievable' within a specific timeframe, as well as 'available' now. It is thus advertising the developability of land. Furthermore, in Moretonhampstead, it is doing this on a truly alarming scale. Identifying sites for 242 houses in this parish simply because they could be developed prioritises the potential for development over the first purpose of the National Park. This cannot even be justified on the basis of the socio-economic duty, for Moretonhampstead only has an identified need for thirteen houses for local people. Will the National Park officer please take this opportunity to state unequivocally that when it comes to stating what should be developed, no more sites will be identified in Moretonhampstead than those necessary for local people?

The LAA is a process we have to complete, as stipulated by the National Planning Policy Framework. We opened our 'Call for Sites' in 2016 and considered all sites submitted. The process allows us to gather a pool of technically feasible sites from which communities can consider the best option for development. We are not suggesting large areas of Moretonhampstead are developed. However the large amount of land submitted through the call for sites does give the community a number of sites to choose from.

In terms of how many homes are likely to be developed you are right in suggesting it will be related to the housing need of the community. However please note that the housing need for 13 homes is not finite, throughout the plan period (15 years) it is likely that more homes would be required and we would need to respond appropriately. DNPA would have no interest in identifying more sites than are necessary, and would wish to work with the community to understand how much *is* necessary, and which the most appropriate location(s) for that may be.

2. The Land Availability Assessment has not considered historic significance as a criterion in deeming whether something is suitable for development. This is clear by such indicators as the use of the term

'Courtenay Park' to describe the field that is correctly and historically called Pound Meadow, which is part of the ancient holding of Inner Heale. How can something be deemed 'suitable' for development when no effort has been made to enquire into its historical significance?

There is specialist input from DNPA's historic environment team; DNPAs Historic Buildings Officer and the Archaeologist provide comments on LAA sites submitted through site visits and interrogation of the Historic Environment Record.

The LAA does not consider historic significance as it is a 'policy off' scenario – 'could it' rather than 'should it' be developed?. It is only at this stage, when we have a pool of sites that could technically be developed, that we consider policy implications in detail.

The site is referred to as Courtenay Park as this is the name given to the site in the LAA submission.

3. Is there not a conflict of interest in having eight house builders sitting on the panel that guides the Authority in producing its Land Availability Assessment – one of which has a vested interest in developing Courtenay Park – and not a single heritage agency of any sort, local or otherwise? And no significant input from an environmental agency (given that Natural England does not normally comment on local issues).

The LAA Panel is made up of a number of industry representatives including developers and land agents. This allows an indication of the state of the market and whether house builders consider that the sites could feasibly be developed. Members of the Panel are required to declare interest in any sites and will not participate in discussions relating to any land in which they have an interest.

Natural England is a member of the LAA Panel and as such they were sent all submissions to consider however they were unable to comment on specific sites at this stage. There is specialist input from DNPA's historic environment team; Historic England may offer advice at more detailed stage, though will normally expect DNPAs Historic Buildings Officer and the Archaeologist to provide that advice (as they do for the LAA).

On behalf of Moretonhampstead's Special Qualities

1. The National Park Authority's Land Availability Assessment pays almost no attention to the likely visual impact on the historical character and natural beauty of a site in determining whether it is 'suitable' for development or not. The only site in which a detrimental visual impact is specifically mentioned is Steward Wood. Yet this would have nowhere near as great an impact on the town as other areas deemed 'suitable' for development. Developing several of the sites mentioned here will destroy sightlines to the moor, which give Moretonhampstead its identity and are attractive to tourists. It will furthermore create an unwelcome development fringe around the town; it will increasingly drown the town's historic character; and in one case (the field described as Courtenay Park), it will destroy a major local amenity, namely a beautiful and much-used rural footpath. How can this lack of attention to Moretonhampstead's Special Qualities be justified when the Park Authority's first purpose is one of conservation and its second one is enjoyment of the natural beauty?

The Land Availability Assessment is based on the methodology agreed with the Greater Exeter Strategic Plan Area and is available online. This process adopts a policy off scenario and therefore does not consider any constraints other than those stipulated within the methodology. The next stage is to consider other constraints such as landscape and visual impact in more detail, as well community views on material planning issues. These are more policy judgement rather than technical judgements, thus cannot be considered in detail in the LAA.

2. Courtenay Park is one of the most prized open spaces and long views in the whole area. The threat to develop it is abhorrent to the 150 members of Moretonhampstead's Special Qualities. There is a strong will among some members of the community to try to acquire the land so it can be enjoyed in

perpetuity as a public park. This would be far more in line with National Park purposes than development. Will the National Park Authority consider designating it as a local amenity in the emerging Local Plan? Identifying it as 'suitable' for housing in itself threatens the loss of this beautiful land forever.

The Community Right to Bid is managed by Teignbridge District Council as the Local Authority. They have put together a guidance note on this process available on its web site. This document summarises that an asset is of community value if:

- it is at least partly within the local authority's area
- its main use (i.e. not ancillary) has recently been or is presently being used to further the social wellbeing or social interests of the local community and could reasonably do so in the near future
- it does not fall within one of the exemptions specified in the Regulations

We are unable to designate areas however a voluntary or community organisation with a local connection (e.g. Parish Council) can nominate an asset for inclusion in the list. This nomination would need to be directed to Teignbridge District Council.

(6) (Clive Yallop)

Dear Jane & Dan,

After reading your survey dated May 2017 and other correspondence, I was extremely saddened to find that the Parish Council and others had decided to prioritise building on Courtenay Park. In July I decided to post leaflets in opposition to building on Courtenay Park and posted them by hand through almost every letter box in Moretonhampstead – 730 in number. My main reason for the survey was to protect the beautiful visual approach to Moretonhampstead and of course to protect the environment of the town. My survey also stated that there were other less intrusive sites to be considered for housing.

The result was that I received 235 signed objections to building on Courtenay Park which have been audited and quantified by John Mann, solicitor, at Mann Jenkins.

Both of you were informed of the objections but in reply from Dan's e-mail he said these objections would carry little weight because the participants would not have known the alternative sites which could be used in Moretonhampstead.

I want to know why this was stated by Dan when the SWOT of all sites was published by the Parish Council in May and my survey was in July. Therefore, the residents should have been completely aware of the alternatives. Or was the fact that most of the residents of Moretonhampstead were not informed or contacted with the Council's SWOT - thus, not giving them a valid opportunity to object.

Incidentally, I led a campaign against building on Courtenay Park approximately 15 years' ago followed by planning permission being turned down.

The Government has recently insisted that Parish Councils take more responsibility for their local environment, development and local opinion. My hope is that the Parish Council will reassess their approach to planning on Courtenay Park in light of the amount of signed objections by residents as we all expect and rely on our Parish Council to look after the town and its environments for all Moretonians.

We recognise that the petition illustrates a strength of feeling. DNPA must be able to ensure that it can defend the decisions it makes and officers would apply caution to making decisions on the basis of this petition. For example it states "a great number of very expensive dwellings", which is an assumption without qualification. If a developer was to argue a proposal was actually a modest number of dwellings at average house prices, might this effectively undermine the petition by

responding to the concerns it raises? Would this satisfy the concerns of the signatories? As another example it states “there are other sites less intrusive available in Moretonhampstead which can be used” without describing which the author considers these to be. Are the signatories aware what alternatives may come forward instead? Would they like to express a preference? DNPA should be mindful that if we were to rely too heavily upon this as justification for policy decisions, there is the potential it could be undermined.

For this reason we would recognise it as an illustration of the views of those residents, and would seek to move this forward by encouraging the community to engage in a positive way with the process. Whilst the petition has been verified by a solicitor, a petition of 235 signatories who are unknown to the rest of the community might be considered by some in Moretonhampstead to be against the spirit of open community engagement and discussion. DNPA would encourage those with views to enter into discussions with their community about what it considers the most appropriate options to be in Moretonhampstead. We will help the Parish Council to facilitate this discussion and hope the community can move forward positively in expressing its views.

(7) Peter Murphy

- In pounds and pence, what is the value of an “affordable house” in Moretonhampstead:

- a] to buy?
- b] to rent?

Teignbridge District Council had provided this information:

Rents in Moretonhampstead (2 Bed House)

	Rent/Calendar Month	Above or Below LHA
Local Housing Allowance	£612	
Affordable Rent Tenancy	£538 (£124 pw)	below
Private Rented Sector	£675 (Zoopla Queens Rd)	above
Teignbridge average 2015/16 NHF/VOA	£688	above

Sale Price in Moretonhampstead (2 Bed House)

	Price	Income needed 80% mortgage at 3.5 x income
TDC Average 2016	£244,000	£56,000 pa
Zoopla Oct 17	£240,000 Sawyers Close	£55,000
Zoopla average in past 5 years	£251	
Zoopla average paid in last 12 months	£265	

- How will you prevent affordable houses being purchased or rented by non-Moretonians, such as second home owners, or landlords?

Please see the below comment regarding how homes are allocated to 'local people'.

- If the Moreton housing NEED is 13 and the affordable housing proportion of any development is 50%, why is the REQUIREMENT 242 and not just 26?

There is not a requirement for 242 houses within Moretonhampstead.

The figure of 242 has been taken from the LAA report and incorrectly referred to as a requirement. This process identifies all land within a community that could be developed however it does not consider what should be developed. The large areas of land surrounding Moretonhampstead within the LAA report are effectively the potential site options.

DNPA is not suggesting all or many of the sites are developed however we are giving the community the opportunity to consider what sites they would prefer to be developed.

It is correct, though, to recognise that the land requirement would be greater than the need alone given the need to 'cross subsidise' the affordable housing.

- What is the anticipated benefit to Moretonhampstead of building 242 new houses:

a] in terms of quality of life for town residents?

b] in pounds and pence?

- If 242 houses are built, adding a third or more to the town's population, what provision will be made concurrently to upgrade Moretonhampstead's infrastructure: roads, parking, health centre, hospital, school, shops, recreation etc? Where will the money come from? How will the drip feed approach to such a build be mitigated over time to so that infrastructure is not overlooked by default?

There is no proposal to build 242 houses in Moretonhampstead.

Setting this aside, DNPA is completing an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), and has asked Parish/Town Councils, Local Authorities, statutory agencies and other service providers to input to the process, in order that any infrastructure requirements are understood. The IDP will be available online, and will be updated as we firm up sites and numbers through the local plan review.

(8) Julian Edwards

Re: QUESTIONS for - Potential for 242 housing plots identified by the National Park Authority in Moretonhampstead. FAO 'Dan Janota

While there might be potential benefits in such a high number of additional households in Moretonhampstead to local retailers and certainly a benefit of additional council tax revenues, I do have a concern.

Moretonhampstead does have some local business and local employees, but I am unaware of any significant employment opportunities in the coming years, indeed at some stage we will see Thompsons close and lose one of the larger local employers. This means that 242 possible houses will create up to around 500 commuters who will need to drive to Exeter or Plymouth every day. This is a vast increase in traffic and pollution. Yes there is an infrequent bus service, but not one suitable for reliable commuting and of course no rail option.

To generate employment for 500 people it would be necessary to have at least 50 small businesses. What plans has DNPA included to generate local employment?

There is no proposal to build 242 houses in Moretonhampstead.

The point regarding employment is an important consideration. Unfortunately no employment sites within Moretonhampstead were submitted through the LAA process. However this does not mean that sites might not come forward in the future. Equally, this does not mean that land could not be identified for employment uses if it is needed.

We have taken part in an 'Economic Development Needs Assessment' which aims to understand the employment needs across the wider area. We will combine this with an Employment Land Review, currently in progress, which will enable us to understand existing sites and premises and opportunities which may exist there. This would then feed into the formulation of economic development policies in the Local Plan. We welcome comments on the economic development policies in the local plan.

(9) Caya Edwards

1. Why do you need to consider building so many new houses in Moretonhampstead in Dartmoor National Park when a housing need for 13 has been established? Why can't you find a way to build just the homes that fulfill the housing need?

Government funding for affordable housing has dropped significantly, with the onus now being on 'cross-subsidy' to provide funding for affordable housing. Whilst we always seek to get as much public funding as we can, we need to allow market housing in order to provide affordable housing.

2. Will you take account of the Keep Moretonhampstead Special group who have graded each potential site for its landscape value?

We have received the views of this group. We would suggest this feeds into the Parish Councils considerations, along with the advice of the DNPA's Landscape Officer (which fed into LAA), and the Landscape Character Assessment, and Landscape Sensitivity Study which were both completed and published by DNPA earlier this year.

3. It seems to me that National Parks are given no more protection than areas outside National Parks when it comes to planning. Is this correct? If not what special protections are there in place to avoid housing development within the National Park?

No this is not correct. However, it is important also to understand that National Park designation is not about avoiding housing development.

There are a number of ways in which National Parks are different. The Environment Act 1995 sets out National Park purposes, and also the fact that these should also be taken into account by other relevant bodies. Our purposes are to

- conserve and enhance Dartmoor National Park's natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage
- promote opportunities for the public to understand and enjoy the special qualities of Dartmoor National Park.

We also have a duty to:

- promote the economic and social wellbeing of local communities in Dartmoor National Park.

National planning policy states 'great weight' must be given to the conservation of the National Park landscape and scenic beauty, that the conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks.

Reflecting this, policies within the National Park differ from those outside, and the scale of change and development differs significantly. Also, some permitted development rights do not exist within National Parks, which exist elsewhere.

National Park Authorities are also standalone planning authorities, meaning that there is a local plan for each national park, and that decisions are made in the best interests of the area, rather than as a consideration within a district council local plan.

The NPPG states development must meet the needs of the community. The need has been established as 13 affordable homes. It has not identified a need for many new expensive homes.

The special qualities of a Dartmoor National Park, most importantly its landscape value are eroded by the building of more houses. This is not taken into account in Table 3: Stage A assessment criteria. So it is not until the end of stage B that the landscape value is considered. By this time money has been spent and the planning process has reached a stage of no return. So whatever the views of the community, the project will be given the go ahead.

LAA is not a point of no return. It is the first step in understanding the options from which potential sites may be considered. It is a step DNPA should go through in order to understand the options and have a positively prepared and deliverable local plan. The outcome of LAA is a technical one, and is not a decision of DNPA.

It is unclear what project is referred to.

We have not made any decisions yet, and are keen to understand communities' views. There will be further formal opportunities for anyone to comment on the local plan as it is published.

The lack of attention to the value of landscape and views in Dartmoor National park is underlined in your Sept 2017 Land Assessment report you site 'Constraints to development'. At no point do you mention that the landscape value of Dartmoor National Park, as a constraint, when the landscape and views (not to mention traffic on narrow roads and environmental costs) are damaged each and every time new houses are built.

The LAA is completed in a 'policy off' scenario and so *detailed* consideration regarding landscape is not included at this stage. However that does not mean that it is not considered. DNPA's specialist officers input to the Area Reports, this includes the Landscape Officer, Archaeologist, Historic Buildings Officer, as well as Highways Officers etc. Many of whom visit every site.

The LAA is the first stage of the site option process. There are many more elements that consider landscape character. Please see our [Housing Quick Guide](#) for more information on the process. This states that following the LAA the next stage is an Environmental Assessment which looks at other factors such as location and landscape impact, which may affect whether a site is suitable for development. We also have completed and published a Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Sensitivity Assessment which inform how policies are put together, and form an important part of the evidence base for defending decisions on reasons of landscape impact.

(10) (addressed to Parish Council) Louise Adams

I am unable to make the meeting next week but wish the following points to be considered:

Irrespective of which green field sites are intended to be built on, what strategies are in place to increase the Police presence in the town; what plans are there to better the road infrastructure (classed as an 'A' road but technically a 'B' road at best in any other part of the country); what safeguards are in place to allocate the 'affordable' housing to locals?

(This is raised due to the recent claim that Birmingham City Council has bought up new build houses in Kingsteignton to reduce their housing wait lists).

However, with regard to the Courtney Park site, why is this site even being considered? Access is not good on either side (Station Road and Pound Street) no matter what any planner/ engineer/developer will say and as a member of the public, I ask is this not farmland? There are always cattle grazing in these fields. I appreciate that the landowner can use his/her asset as they so choose and any profit made will be taxed nicely for the Government, but the community deserves an input into the final say, as an increase in population will affect those services already available to us.

Green field sites should stay as just that. Once that field has been concreted over, it can never be returned to its original form. Has the Council looked around the town and looked for brown field sites?

Please see the below response which goes into the detail of how we secure affordable housing for local people.

The Courtenay Park site came through our 'Call for Sites' for the Land Availability Assessment (LAA) process. The LAA (previously known as Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment or SHLAA) is a technical exercise to help identify land that could have potential for housing, employment and gypsy and traveller uses. All local planning authorities carry out a LAA (a requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework). It enables them to ensure there is enough land for new homes to meet the needs of communities. Landowners are able to submit their sites to be considered for the LAA.

The access to this site was considered achievable by Devon County Council's Highways Officer who considered all the sites submitted. It is important to recognise that this is just in technical highway engineering terms, and does not take into account the impact of the works required to achieve access.

We agree that it is very important that the community has a say in where development happens in the future and that is why we are having the meeting with the Parish Council. This will allow us to consider the sites submitted and gain community opinion on preferences.

The LAA also asks for Brownfield sites to be submitted. We have just one site in Moretonhampstead which has already been allocated; this site is currently being used by Thompson's and is allocation number MTN2.

I have a friend who works for a Housing Association in another part of the country; she is aware of the local housing need and what is trying to be pushed through in her area. Despite being given facts and numbers of what is required for local residents, one Parish Council is planning to build 5-fold the number of houses. She has even given examples of her clients not wanting to live 'in the country', they want to be in big towns/cities. Still the PC continues on its mission to dig up green field sites to meet a nationally produced target. I REALLY HOPE THIS IS NOT WHAT IS HAPPENING IN MORETONHAMPSTEAD!

In my opinion, Moretonhampstead is overpopulated already, with existing services stretched. The lack of a Police presence is my main concern; when my relationship with the town started over 30 years ago, there was a Police Sergeant with two Police Constables. Crime still happened, but more often than not, it's escalation was averted due to the continuous Police presence.

Finally, I hope that the Councillors of Moretonhampstead will listen to all sides of the argument, as the electorate have long memories and will express their opinions at the next local election.

Please see comments above regarding Dartmoor not having a national housing target.

(11) Sarah Hayden

Question for Moretonhampstead Parish Council and the Dartmoor National Park Authority at the meeting due to be held in Moretonhampstead Parish Hall on Tuesday 17.10.2017

I feel sure the DNPA and Moretonhampstead Parish Council will be determined to meet the DNPA's stated aims, including the need 'to conserve and enhance the biodiversity, cultural heritage and landscape of Dartmoor'. As such, a meaningful framework must surely be prescribed for, and strictly applied to, any further housing development, including assurances that any new-build houses may be sold only to people who have lived and/or worked in Devon for at least three full, consecutive years immediately prior to the proposed house purchase, and then only to those who intend to take up full-time residency in the new-build properties. What reassurance can the DNPA and Parish Council give that such a strategy will be rigorously instigated and implemented?

We adopt local connection criteria for all new affordable housing build within the National Park. This is stipulated within a legal agreement called a Section 106 agreement. This states that the property can only be occupied by a person who meets the affordable housing criteria. Further information regarding this is included in our Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document. This states that:

"An eligible household is one where there is a clear need for accommodation, an inability to afford local accommodation at current open market prices, and conformity with relevant local occupancy criteria, as set out in the Local Plan.

I) In housing need

This is a household which has been assessed and placed on the Housing Register in Bands A-E

- Emergency Housing Need (A);
- High Housing Need (B);
- Medium Housing Need (C);
- Low Housing Need (D);
- No Housing Need (E) (where applicable)

Where Band E does not form part of the Housing Register, the Authority may consider those meeting the following elements of Band E to be in housing need:

- Any household where the household income is insufficient to enable them to afford or to sustain to rent or to purchase a property suitable to their needs in the parish
- A member of a household working in the parish of provision paid or unpaid for 16 hours or more a week for a minimum period of 12 months (it is important to note that this aspect applies only to (I) 'in housing need' and is distinct from (III) 'a local person')

II) Unable to afford open market prices

The Authority will consider typical measures of affordability used in Housing Market Assessments, linking incomes with lower quartile house prices in the area. This includes the benchmark that no more than 25% of gross household income is spent on housing costs, with a typical measure of a mortgage which is 3.5 times gross household income being achievable.

III) A household including a 'local' person

This is defined in the Local Plan as:

- (i) those people currently living in the parish of provision, or a rural parish adjacent to the parish of provision, and having done so for a period of at least five years; or
- (ii) those people who have lived in the parish of provision or a rural parish adjacent to the parish of provision for a period of five years but have moved away in the past three years; or
- (iii) those people who have a strong local connection with the parish of provision or a rural parish adjacent to the parish of provision by virtue of, for example, upbringing or current employment.

The eligible adjacent rural parishes will be specified in the legal agreement attached to the property (the 'Section 106 Agreement') according to the individual location of the development. It should be noted:

- adjacent parishes containing a Local Centre will not normally be considered to be an adjacent rural parish to the parish of provision;
- parishes lying substantially outside the National Park containing a town or other large community will not normally be considered to be an adjacent rural parish to the parish of provision.

The Authority has not defined what is meant by a 'strong local connection', as this enables a degree of flexibility. It is however recognised that it is helpful to have a measure of the strength of connection the Authority would expect; some examples of a strong local connection are as follows:

- a person with a family member (for example a parent, parent-in-law, son, daughter, step-son, step-daughter, child of partner, brother, sister, grandparent, grandchild, uncle, aunt, nephew, niece) who is living in the parish and has done so for a continuous period of at least 5 years;
- a person whose upbringing or a significant part of their upbringing took place in a relevant parish;
- a person who is employed (for not less than 16 hours per week) in the parish of provision or whose work is primarily carried out within the parish, having done so for a continuous period of at least 2 years;
- a person who has spent a significant length of time (normally more than 5 years) living in the parish in the past."

So for first occupancy and all subsequent lettings the applicant will need to satisfy the above criteria and will not be able to occupy the property without this.

(12) Judy Goelz

Hello - I have a general question re the new-build houses which have been built in Moretonhampstead, starting with the Borohayes estate and coming up to the present. Are there statistics to say what proportion, out of the new housing built, of the houses are actually full-time, owner-occupied? And, what proportion are let out? Also, are there statistics to show whether new-builds are being bought for speculation - ie, bought and sold when the market began/begins to quicken? I realise that there probably aren't statistics for these things, but it would give a good indication as to whether housing built here is actually needed by people in and around the community, or whether we are just "luring" people to come and live here, or speculate on property prices.

Information on the occupancy and tenure of open market properties is not collected. The only information related to this question is available in the 2011 Census.

Of a total number of dwellings within the National Park of 15,537 the number of homes with no usual residents (which provides an indication of the number of vacant properties, holiday homes and second residences) is 1,301 units. This is 8.4%, compared to 4% nationally and an average of 14% across all national parks. More specific data on housing in Moretonhampstead, including figures for the total number of dwellings without a usual resident, can be found in the [Moretonhampstead Settlement Profile](#).

(13) Keith and Mary Townsend

What provisions will be made for what will be expected, a large increase in cars. After the disastrous decision to allow a free for all on the 'showcase development' in Forder Meadow which has now been turned into a free carpark for the town. What will be put into place to stop this being repeated and spoiling even more of this attractive moorland town?

The Local Plan includes policies relating to transport, highways and car parking. There is an opportunity to review these now as part of the Local Plan review, and comments are invited as to what works and what doesn't, and suggestions of any policy change.

The Highway Authority (Devon County Council) would provide advice on specific development sites regarding highway capacity, parking and highway standards etc. This would normally be informed by a Transport Assessment which would accompany an application on a site in order to demonstrate how it meets adopted policy.

(14) Mr R Irving

I have a follow up query on DNP process specifically in relation to LAA site ref DNP08/017 B as it appears on page 33 of "Settlement Profile: Moretonhampstead" dated October 2017. This site is adjacent to Bowring Park (TQ13 8GB). The residents of Bowring Park were relieved to see that this parcel of land (and another site in the same field) has not been included as a Development Site Option on grounds of being neither suitable nor achievable.

My query is whether there are any provisions in the Planning rules which would allow appeals or provide grounds whereby this site could be promoted to the status of a Development Site Option during the current Local Plan exercise. Or, can it be reasonably assumed that the threat has been lifted or at least deferred until the next Local Plan exercise whenever that might be?

The LAA is not a decision of DNPA, it is a technical exercise (see further above). There is no planning appeal process as it is not a planning decision. Where a site is not being considered suitable or achievable by the LAA Panel, it would normally mean DNPA would not take this site forward as a potential option, however a landowner or developer promoting a site may choose to submit information which might overcome the constraints to delivery identified by the Panel. Equally the LAA report outcome does not prevent the landowner or a developer making a planning application for development of the site.