

COMMENT FORM

Final Draft Local Plan Consultation: 16 September – 1 November 2019

Your comments will help us and the Inspector to identify any issues with the Plan relating to soundness, legal compliance and compliance with the Duty to Cooperate, and any changes to the Plan which may therefore be needed prior to adoption. Please carefully read the [accompanying guidance](#) before answering the following questions.

Responses must be received by 5pm on Friday 1st November 2019 for your comments to be taken into account. View the Dartmoor Local Plan (2018-2036) Final Draft at www.dartmoor.gov.uk/localplanreview.

PART A - About You

Personal details

First name *	Jeremy						
Surname *	Thres						
Address	[REDACTED]						
Post code	[REDACTED]						
Email address *	[REDACTED]						
I am completing this form as (choose one)	A resident	x	An agent		A Town / Parish Council		An organisation
	A business		A visitor		A statutory agency		Other (specify below)
Other							
Job title (where relevant)							
Organisation (where relevant)	2						
On behalf of (where relevant)							
Did you submit comments on the Regulation 18 (First Draft) Local Plan?						Yes	No

* Required field

Data Protection Act 2018

Your personal data will be securely held by Dartmoor National Park Authority for the purpose of assisting with the Local Plan Review process. To ensure an effective and fair examination, it is important that the Inspector and all other participants in the examination process are able to know who has commented on the plan. For the purposes of the examination, we will share your personal details and representation with the Inspector appointed, and publish your name and representations as part of a report on our website. For more information please refer to our [Forward Planning Privacy Notice](#).

Tick the box below if you would like to be added to our Local Plan consultee database and kept up to date with the Local Plan Review process and other planning policy matters.

☐ I would like to be added to the Local Plan consultee list

PART B - Your Comment

Please carefully read the [accompanying guidance](#) before answering the following questions.

Your comments should relate to specific areas of the plan, so please tell us the policy or paragraph number that your comment relates to. If there are areas which you believe not to be sound or legally compliant, please tell us why, and what changes you deem necessary, sharing any evidence you have to support your proposed changes.

If this is a report or any other document which cannot be shared via this form then you can email it to us at forwardplanning@dartmoor.gov.uk.

1. Please tell us which paragraph or policy your comment relates to

Paragraph (enter number, e.g. 4.5.1)	1.32
Policy (enter number, e.g. 4.5)	
Policies Map	

2. Please carefully read the accompanying guidance and tell us if you consider the Local Plan to be:

	Yes	No
i) Legally compliant		x
ii) Sound		x
iii) Compliant with the Duty to co-operate		x

3. Please tell us why you have answered **yes** and / or **no** to the question above. Fully explain your reasoning and try to be as precise as possible.

DNP declared climate emergency in July 2019, and though 1.6.9 states “There is overwhelming and unequivocal evidence that human induced climate change is occurring.”

There is not a single mention of this new “**emergency**” situation in the plan, nor so far as I can see does the local plan make any mention that we are **also in the middle of what some call the 6th mass extinction** (loss of 60% wildlife on top of previous losses, since 1970, that is in many of our lifetimes: link to wwf report <https://www.worldwildlife.org/press-releases/wwf-report-reveals-staggering-extent-of-human-impact-on-planet>.) – and this loss is anthropocentric ie of our own making, vastly affecting insect, bird and animal quantities everywhere, so that includes significant loss and impacts within the park (take curlew down to one breeding pair, Ringed Ouzel on their last legs, skylark, one of its iconic essential quality of Dartmoor species, predicted will move north in one dnp doc as temperatures increase..)

What these climate and ecological breakdowns clearly indicate is **that current ways of thinking and living** are fundamentally flawed and not sustainable. As a consequence to carry on “business as usual” following the declaration of climate emergency and, if there is understanding of it this ecological breakdown, would just not be in the service of either the park’s residents, biodiversity or wider community.

Though at DNP there has been active awareness of climate change, this local plan was written in the years prior to the fresh understandings that climate breakdown is moving faster than has been expected and has greater repercussions (a dnp education document speaks of Dartmoor potentially experiencing a four degree temperature increase by 2050 – this is the same paper that also mentions the potential movement of skylarks, yet the repercussions of four degrees temperature rise will effect far more than skylarks – for example in March of 2018 the chair of the governments Environmental Audit Committee writing to Michael Gove the then secretary of state for environment, quotes the insurance and asset management firm Aviva saying that “If you look at the trajectory, even now post Paris agreement we are talking about 2.7 degrees of change is plausible. Many scientists are saying a 4, 5, 6 degree is at least a risk we need to be considering. At 4 degrees the insurance business model fails to exist. We could not underwrite to the price that the economy can afford,” and that at 6 degrees “we are talking about economic meltdown.” (<https://www.parliament.uk/documents/commons-committees/environmental-audit/correspondence/180322-Chair-to-Gove-Climate-change-adaptation.pdf>) Mark Carney the Governor of the Bank of England similarly warns of the risk of economic collapse. The implications of this are clear: climate breakdown will massively effect the economic and social well being of Dartmoor’s residents, which DNP has a duty to care for.

Though the local plan's wording has been put in front of local community **for final tweaks** this autumn, **I do not feel this has been done taking seriously the updated science or DNP's own declaration and the consequent need for its reappraisal and re-consultation. The local plan is a long term planning document and** though a great deal of the plan may well stand, I suggest All policy should now be re-assessed and consulted upon in the light of this freshly understood circumstance otherwise our legacy to our children will be one of failure, failing to take the actions necessary for their and future generation's well being. **It feels crazy to sign it off as valid for such a length of time when such clear new information about the pace of change is just riding in.**

Any plan worthwhile at this time needs **not only fresh co-consideration and consultation in this new light, but also to have built in openness and responsiveness to fresh ideas that take us in the right direction, and also proactively away from the current massively deteriorating ecological direction. This latter is particular the area I feel concern, I read elsewhere that the National Parks are expected to lead the way in adapting to and mitigating climate change as exemplars of sustainability, yet in this plan I read very little that proactively opens to or moves in any real fresh carbon reducing direction.**

The UN suggests we have ten years to things around, and that therefore **the next five are crucial.** I therefore suggest that this plan as it is if not fully reappraised, be **fully understood to be both partial and interim, so as to give more opportunity for reassessment and to be resilient in relation to the unfolding circumstance.**

DNP like everywhere needs to pull out the stops if we want to soften the landing and not just for our children, as Sir David Attenborough argued in December 2018 "if we don't take action, the collapse of our civilisation and the extinction of much of the natural world is on the horizon." Sadly much of the extinction is already happening and well in motion.

Because of this overall feeling that the plan itself needs re-evaluation within the fresh context, I am loathe to make tiny tweaks to wording however, **I offer the following for 1.6.9** to reflect the new scientific understandings:

1.6.9 "There is overwhelming and unequivocal evidence that human induced climate and ecological breakdown are occurring."

With this fuller truth expressed as the context we currently live and work in, and the recognition that business as usual is what has got us into this mess, then one can see why there is the need to give space to creatively revisit this plan with its community before proceeding.

[Additional space on final page]

4. If you do not consider the Local Plan to be legally compliant or sound, please tell us what change(s) (or 'modifications') you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and/or sound, and **why** these changes will make the Local Plan legally compliant and / or sound.

If not taking the true current context more fully into account eg climate and ecological breakdown, and their own declaration of climate emergency and working this through with DNP's residents it is not fulfilling its duty of consultation or care.

[Additional space on final page]

Please note: where changes to the Local Plan are proposed, your comments should provide concisely all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your suggested changes. You may not have a further opportunity to submit this evidence.

5. If your representation seeks a change to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?

	No. I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)		Yes. I wish to participate in hearing session(s)
--	---	--	---

6. If you answered **yes** to the hearing session(s), please tell us why you consider this to be necessary.

If more voices are needed to help understand our predicament and the need for proactive creative ways forward, versus business as usual with its inevitable result. ("if you don't change the way you are heading you will get where you are going," Norwegian philosopher Arne Ness.)

Thank you for sharing your comments on the final draft Local Plan for Dartmoor. If you have more comments to share, please complete parts C-F below.

Following this consultation, the final draft Plan along with all comments made will be submitted for examination by a Planning Inspector. The Inspector will consider whether the plan complies with the relevant legal requirements and whether it is sound (see guidance). Keep up to date on our progress by [signing up to our Local Plan consultee list](#), and following us on Twitter [@DartmoorPlan](#) and Facebook [/DartmoorPlan](#)

PART C - Additional Comment (1)

1. Please tell us which paragraph or policy your comment relates to

Paragraph (enter number, e.g. 4.5.1)	3.96
Policy (enter number, e.g. 4.5)	
Policies Map	

2. Please carefully read the accompanying guidance and tell us if you consider the Local Plan to be:

	Yes	No
i) Legally compliant		x
ii) Sound		x
iii) Compliant with the Duty to co-operate		x

3. Please tell us why you have answered **yes** and / or **no** to the question above.
Fully explain your reasoning and try to be as precise as possible.

As we look to find a better way than that which has led us into climate and ecological breakdown we need to examine those factors that have led to ways of management that damage our ecology and those that enhance. In terms of economics **we must stop legitimising an economics that doesn't take into account social and environmental costs**, and evolve to one both that does and also recognises ecological and social profits. For example food first ecological farming, where the focus is growing for oneself and then selling surplus and subsistence low or zero carbon farming are predominantly **ways of living**, rather than ways earning a substantial living/"profit" and these ways are historically the ones alongside which our wildlife evolved, not the fossil and artificial fertilise fuelled intensive ways that have degraded so much both locally and further afield, and even so still need subsidy.

There is a deep interest among many young people to live and work close to the land (for example an annual fair on traditional scything consistently sells out with over 2000 people attending, and also the growth of the landworker alliance representing an aspiring new generation of small growers demonstrates this), and a deep need for **a new generation to learn the wisdom and skills of living and working with the land**, learning ways both innovative and historical in **both a pre and post fossil fuel way**. I suggest DNP needs to be lessening hoops and removing obstacles that stand in the way of this, and in doing so strengthen not just local food sovereignty, contribute not just to the appearance but actively to the biodiversity of the landscape we know and love today (green fields may appear healthy but nowadays are too often regularly cut monocultures sustained by fertilisers, versus the hay meadows that sustained abundant diversity at the park's inception).

Pre and post fossil fuel agriculture will be more reliant on labour and this labour needs to be able to live on site versus travel both Co2 wise and for the very many skills there are to practice and learn.

Though one tweak that could aid this resilience might be for 3.97 needs to say **"profitable ideally financially but definitely ecologically for at least one year"** - for it is the accounting to nature that is

becoming recognised as the imperative that really counts (“nature bats last” as they say), the main thing I feel is the need for an additional point here supporting a new wave of needed agricultural workers and learning, and for the farms and small holdings they work, on through greater and easier temporary permissions for shepherd huts, pods and other innovative basic but low impact structures tied to the land. It is widely recognised that **such** alternative forms of accommodation are low impact and far more sympathetic to the landscape in terms of their colour and materials to old style workers caravans. In the past when families had more children far more people lived in Dartmoor’s farmsteads and as a consequence could contribute to what was needed, as families have shrunk numbers have dwindled and fossil fuel has taken the place of people, pony and even oxen power that created much of our beautiful landscape and conditions for the vestiges of wildlife. My 96 year old neighbour in Manaton was a “land girl” in the war, and through that learned to work with shire horses, keep pigs and no doubt numerous other rural skills that enabled us then, and can enable us again to work with life when the extravagance of fossil fuels use fall away. For food sovereignty and ecological well being what I am suggesting is DNP lead on preparing the ground for a healthy movement like this to be received with all the benefits it can offer.

In terms of business as usual here is a link to an article by young people laying bare the draw backs of the commonly used three stool model. <https://theecologist.org/2019/sep/17/what-might-systems-change-look>.

[Additional space on final page]

4. If you do not consider the Local Plan to be legally compliant or sound, please tell us what change(s) (or ‘modifications’) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and/or sound, and **why** these changes will make the Local Plan legally compliant and / or sound.

[Additional space on final page]

Please note: where changes to the Local Plan are proposed, your comments should provide concisely all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your suggested changes. You may not have a further opportunity to submit this evidence.

5. If your representation seeks a change to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	No , I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes , I wish to participate in hearing session(s)
--------------------------	--	--------------------------	--

6. If you answered **yes** to the hearing session(s), please tell us why you consider this to be necessary.

PART D - Additional Comment (2)

1. Please tell us which paragraph or policy your comment relates to

Paragraph (enter number, e.g. 4.5.1)	5.61 - 5.63
Policy (enter number, e.g. 4.5)	
Policies Map	

2. Please carefully read the accompanying guidance and tell us if you consider the Local Plan to be:

	Yes	No
i) Legally compliant		
ii) Sound		
iii) Compliant with the Duty to co-operate		

3. Please tell us why you have answered **yes** and / or **no** to the question above.

Fully explain your reasoning and try to be as precise as possible.

5.6.1 acknowledges likely even further impacts and likely losses for farming on the moor, and it is great it is supporting diversification. However small scale farming was the backbone of the agricultural way of life dnp inherited. This has been eroded by economic and political forces and ideas about how to live. I feel the terms lifestyle and hobby farm are being used in 5.63 derisively and **also new entrants are being actively precluded against**, where as new entrants and these type of farms, small holdings and peasant plots, even if not perceived as economic or profitable (see earlier re the limits to business as usual economic criteria), **need to be celebrated and embraced**. They often practice older slower ways of farming that our wildlife such as curlew (now down to one pair in part due to farming practices such as silage vs hay) have evolved alongside and though they may not employ a full time worker quite a number of local people gain extra income through hedge laying and basic support of such holdings. Small is Beautiful as Schumacher said, so I suggest that these new old forms are not precluded against or undermined.

5.6.3 This policy is ~~only primarily~~ intended to support ~~established and active farms. not lifestyle or hobby farms.~~ Where there is uncertainty, applicants will be required to demonstrate ecological benefits before and after diversification and that they significantly contribute to the income of at least one rural worker. vs ~~the farm contributes to the income supports at least one full-time agricultural worker; and~~ and the business' total agricultural receipts are at least 30% (vs 40, soften it a bit) of the total gross receipts (i.e. before costs and taxes) in the most recent financial year.

[Additional space on final page]

4. If you do not consider the Local Plan to be legally compliant or sound, please tell us what change(s) (or 'modifications') you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and/or sound, and **why** these changes will make the Local Plan legally compliant and / or sound.

[Additional space on final page]

Please note: where changes to the Local Plan are proposed, your comments should provide concisely all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your suggested changes. You may not have a further opportunity to submit this evidence.

5. If your representation seeks a change to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	No , I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes , I wish to participate in hearing session(s)
--------------------------	--	--------------------------	--

6. If you answered **yes** to the hearing session(s), please tell us why you consider this to be necessary.

PART E - Additional Comment (3)

1. Please tell us which paragraph or policy your comment relates to

Paragraph (enter number, e.g. 4.5.1)	3.11.7
Policy (enter number, e.g. 4.5)	
Policies Map	

2. Please carefully read the accompanying guidance and tell us if you consider the Local Plan to be:

	Yes	No
i) Legally compliant		
ii) Sound		
iii) Compliant with the Duty to co-operate		x

3. Please tell us why you have answered **yes** and / or **no** to the question above.
Fully explain your reasoning and try to be as precise as possible.

In relation to low impact development, though I read in 3.11.1 that the fundamental principle of the NPPF environmental ambition is supporting a transition to the low carbon economy. Historically the Park has been THE major obstacle to such projects even happening, appearing to fight tooth and nail against projects that are low impact and demonstrate significantly lower carbon footprints than other locals.

For generally not wealthy people who just want to live a simple low impact lifestyle, or even move forward community forestry to date, disproportionate energy is diverted from their projects to fighting for even very basic infrastructure and dwellings. Pembrokeshire and the Welsh have led the way with a One Planet Planning Policy which as the root of this idea (recognising current ways of living and house building require more than one planet to be sustained) evolves, it will be actively supportive of applications that live well within the planets bounds and reserves its "rigorous assessment" to those who don't. If 3.11.7 is not softened it appears DNP may just be wanting to prohibit such ways of living through placing too many hoops and obstacles in their way. This is directly contrary to the Vision of the National Parks for 2030 that suggests "They are known for having been pivotal in the transformation to a low carbon society and sustainable living." I suggest James shorten might be an ideal consultant for reviewing what is written here (one of the original authors of one planet planning) so it is not prohibitive and pivotal the wrong way and contributes to the park through its innovation, education and difference. For instance low impact dwellings are, as in the old ways, built organically drawing both on materials at the location and in a new ecological way, recycled and reuse centres. This is low carbon yet undermined in its very nature by demands for proof of it being so before it has even come together. Below are some suggestions:

3.11.7 This policy allows for a departure from policy outside of classified settlements, so it is critical that proposals must clearly demonstrate a truly low impact approach, and will therefore undergo ~~rigorous~~ assessment. (reserve the rigorous for non low impact)

The paragraph continues saying that: Proposals must be supported by robust evidence including: ● Business and Improvement Plan: in order to clearly identify the need to live on the site, quantifying how the inhabitants' requirements in terms of income, food, energy and waste assimilation can be obtained directly from the site, and demonstrating that land use activities proposed are capable of supporting the needs of the occupants.

I suggest a change be: Proposals must be supported by robust evidence including: ● Business and Improvement Plan: in order to clearly identify the need to live on the site, quantifying how a **significant proportion of** the inhabitants' requirements in terms of income, food, energy and waste assimilation can be obtained directly from the site, and demonstrating that land use activities proposed are capable of supporting the needs of the occupants.

● Developments should demonstrate that they will achieve an Ecological Footprint consistent with this type of low impact living. ● Landscape and Visual Assessment, Biodiversity Assessments: in order to prove the development is appropriate in its local context, conserving the Special Qualities of the National Park and providing environmental gain. ● Travel Plan and Transport Statement or Assessment: assessing traffic generated by the development, and demonstrating the suitability and sustainability of its location through ready access to other services and facilities by walking or cycling.

3.11.8 In order for proposals to clearly demonstrate the achievability of the project, permissions will only be granted initially on a temporary basis.

[Additional space on final page]

4. If you do not consider the Local Plan to be legally compliant or sound, please tell us what change(s) (or 'modifications') you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and/or sound, and **why** these changes will make the Local Plan legally compliant and / or sound.

[Additional space on final page]

Please note: where changes to the Local Plan are proposed, your comments should provide concisely all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your suggested changes. You may not have a further opportunity to submit this evidence.

5. If your representation seeks a change to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	No , I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes , I wish to participate in hearing session(s)
--------------------------	--	--------------------------	--

6. If you answered **yes** to the hearing session(s), please tell us why you consider this to be necessary.

PART F - Additional Comment (4)

1. Please tell us which paragraph or policy your comment relates to

Paragraph (enter number, e.g. 4.5.1)	6.35 and 6.6
Policy (enter number, e.g. 4.5)	
Policies Map	

2. Please carefully read the accompanying guidance and tell us if you consider the Local Plan to be:

	Yes	No
i) Legally compliant		?
ii) Sound		x
iii) Compliant with the Duty to co-operate		x

3. Please tell us why you have answered **yes** and / or **no** to the question above.
Fully explain your reasoning and try to be as precise as possible.

ENPAA's **Climate change mitigation and adaption in national parks** report acknowledges "on average the emissions from domestic energy use for people living within national parks are **currently 60% higher than average for England.**"

So clearly there is work to be done.... Evidently the authorities **"will take the lead in facilitating energy supply helping to deliver solutions** that do not compromise landscape, heritage and biodiversity. We have suggested a number of demonstration projects including biomass (linking woodland management and wood fuel supply), micro hydro (generating electricity without affecting river ecology) **and small scale wind and solar."**

ENPAA say that **"The vision is to move from "isolated demonstration projects to a situation where renewable energy is the norm in remote rural areas."** Are DNP on board with this wider vision of the Parks? Dartmoor has plenty of wind and some Sun. It is acknowledged that large scale wind or solar farms are unlikely to be suitable within the parks, however that is quite different to a farm, hamlet or isolated settlement benefitting from small scale yet ADEQUATE renewable provision and the omission of wind and solar adversely precludes against them in an area of plenty both: They need to be added to the wording of 6.3.5

6.3.5 Small scale renewable energy development which meets the 33 English National Parks and the Broads UK Government Vision and Circular (Defra, 2010) 34 Energy Efficiency and Historic Buildings: How to improve Energy Efficiency (Historic England, 2018) energy demands of a single property, business or local community can be achieved on Dartmoor without impacting on the National Park's Special Qualities. New and emerging technologies mean that efficient and viable generation can come about from smaller and lower impact installations. In particular Dartmoor has a high potential **for wind, solar** and micro-hydro generation, in locations where biodiversity impacts can be avoided. A range of domestic scale renewable energy facilities can be installed without the need for planning permission, and ground source and air source heat can be a relatively low impact source of renewable energy where a building is already at its most energy efficient. In some instances this can be achieved on a larger community scale to provide renewable energy. Many commercial or agricultural buildings may also be able to incorporate renewable energy development without impacting upon the National Park's Special Qualities. Often this does not need planning permission.

As does the word adequate In relation to

Policy 6.6 (2) Renewable energy development 1. Small scale renewable energy development will be encouraged where it does not harm the National Park's Special Qualities, including: a) landscape character, taking into consideration the cumulative impact with other development; b) biodiversity, geodiversity, and heritage significance; c) tranquillity, dark night skies and residential amenity, taking into consideration noise, lighting, movement, odour and vibration; and d) air, soil and water quality. 2. Small **adequately** scaled renewable energy development should not impact on flood risk or soil stability. Utility connections, such as cables and pipes, should be placed underground. 3. Large scale renewable energy development will not be approved.

Other than the unpleasant sound and smell of diesel generators in isolated properties remaining fossil fuel dependent used to appear invisible, but now we are actively and visibly experiencing the affects of this dependence, and this addiction as said earlier is already affecting DNPs special qualities and biodiversity. Adequately scaled wind and solar could play a significant part in mitigating effect, and with their healthy associations be positively perceived within the park. We all need to play our part and DNP with its abundance of wind is no exception. The EPNAA's Climate report also says: "Addressing climate change requires a shift in attitudes and behaviours across society and that National Parks will be part of this transition."

Nb I feel moved at the awareness that hydro can affect river ecology – in the nineties two of the fish kill sites in devon were hydro plants.

[Additional space on final page]

4. If you do not consider the Local Plan to be legally compliant or sound, please tell us what change(s) (or 'modifications') you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and/or sound, and **why** these changes will make the Local Plan legally compliant and / or sound.

Not consulting in the light of new information, nor leading the way.

[Additional space on final page]

Please note: where changes to the Local Plan are proposed, your comments should provide concisely all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your suggested changes. You may not have a further opportunity to submit this evidence.

5. If your representation seeks a change to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	No , I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes , I wish to participate in hearing session(s)
--------------------------	--	--------------------------	--

6. If you answered **yes** to the hearing session(s), please tell us why you consider this to be necessary.

Additional space (please tell us which question you are continuing from):

Lastly in relation to 5.4.12

5.4.12 Camping pods, shepherd huts and other structures which are permanently or seasonally sited on the land have a similar impact to touring caravan sites and proposals for these structures will be considered in the same way as a new caravan site.

This contrasts to Exmoor National Park who in their pre climate emergency draft plan acknowledged the difference between these and the visual impact and scale of caravan sites:

New forms of camping provided: *A wider range of visitors are encouraged to come to the National Park through draft policies to support camping barns, through conversions of traditional buildings, and small scale alternative camping accommodation such as timber camping pods, microlodges, traditional Romany caravans, shepherd huts, yurts, wigwams and teepees in certain locations. **Such alternative forms of camping can be more sympathetic to the landscape in terms of their colour and materials to that of static or touring caravans and provide a wider range of visitor accommodation.***

Currently 5.4.12 by contrast actively precludes against a new and growing form of tourism and visitorship where people want to be much closer to the land, both to experience and learn from it, as well as provide income and other support towards it's care, which is both popular and has great potential to support and compliment changing to low carbon transport patterns eg one can cycle if one doesn't have to bring a tent.

A suggested change is:

5.4.12 Camping pods, shepherd huts and other structures which are permanently or seasonally sited on the land **are more sympathetic to the landscape and road users than** ~~have a similar impact to touring caravan sites and proposals for these structures will be considered on a small scale in the same way as a new caravan site.~~

In Conclusion:

The CEO of insurance and asset manager Aviva in 2018 said: "not acting sustainably is very bad business indeed. Climate change in particular represents the mother of all risks – to business and to society as a whole."

Since then Co2 has continued to climb and emergency declared. It is my hope DNP and the Government take this risk seriously and re-consult and work with communities, ideally through more thorough assemblies and consultations, not just village hall drop ins, and creatively consider this new context, so together the healthiest way can be found. In truth like any crisis it is an opportunity to look deeply at the many causes not just tinker with the symptoms and creatively recalibrate in a healthier low carbon direction, even lead the way, for the benefit not just of us but also other species too.

Best wishes

If you require help, or would like to receive this form in an alternative format, please contact the Forward Planning team:

Forward Planning, Dartmoor National Park Authority
Parke, Bovey Tracey, Devon, TQ13 9JQ

Tel: 01626 832093
Email: forwardplanning@dartmoor.gov.uk
Website: dartmoor.gov.uk/localplanreview

Dear Alex,

thank you for this heads up and care in this - one with content now hopefully attached, please email again if does not come through. Be v happy to consult/talk further as may serve the greater good.

best wishes

Jeremy Thres

“Nature is the healer, the wisdom keeper and the inspiration, and working with Jeremy you couldn't be in better hands.” **Ya’Acov Darling Khan**

On Thu, Nov 28, 2019 at 4:30 PM Alex Gandy <agandy@dartmoor.gov.uk> wrote:

Jeremy,

I am just reviewing your comment on the Dartmoor Local Plan and have unfortunately found that the comment form you forwarded is blank – see attached.

Could you please attach the correct form, so that we may consider your comments as part of this process.

Many thanks

Alex Gandy MRTPI

Forward Planner

Dartmoor National Park Authority

Tel: 01626 831 018

agandy@dartmoor.gov.uk

www.dartmoor.gov.uk

From: jeremy thres [mailto:]
Sent: 01 November 2019 17:02
To: Forward Planning - mbx <forwardplanning@dartmoor.gov.uk>
Subject: dnpreview

couple review comments with best wishes

Jeremy Thres

www.dartmoor.gov.uk

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the named addressee(s). If you are not a named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute, alter or copy this email. Any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and might not represent those of the Dartmoor National Park Authority (DNPA). Warning : Although DNPA has taken reasonable precautions to ensure that no viruses are present in this email, the Authority cannot accept responsibility for any loss arising from the use of this email or attachments.