

Summary of responses received to the Sustainability Appraisal Update 2018 consultation

(Mid Devon District Council, April 2018)

Amendment Ref.	Summary of main comments	Comments made by (customer ID in brackets)	Response
Schedule of Amendments (General)	Natural England is satisfied that the SA process is fit for purpose as set out in consultation documents.	Natural England (6242)	Support noted.
	Supports the addition of new tables and text which add clarity and demonstrate that the SEA requirements have been met and consistent with LUC recommendations.	Aviva Life and Pensions UK Limited c/o Rapleys (3781)	Support noted.
	The representation concurs that there are no other realistic or deliverable reasonable alternatives to deliver the basket of uses set out under Policy J27 and agrees that the proposal cannot be disaggregated.		Comments on adverse effects on the integrity of the Culm Grasslands SAC are beyond the scope of this consultation as they do not relate to the Schedule of Amendments made to the SA Update 2017. However, Mid Devon District Council is aware of the findings of the latest North Devon and Torridge Councils HRA and is currently in dialogue with Natural England about this.
Schedule of Amendments (General)	The representation also identifies that further information is available through the North Devon and Torridge Local Plan Examination which concludes that the proposed modifications to the NDTLP and the Mid Devon LPR (including Junction 27) in combination would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Culm Grasslands SAC. The SA Update 2018 should incorporate these findings accordingly.		
Schedule of Amendments (General)	The incorporation of the appointed consultant's amendments arguably goes beyond the requirements set out in PPG. There was a clear option of recommending further work in relation to the assessment of reasonable alternatives, but the advice	Placeland (4654)	Comments noted.

Amendment Ref.	Summary of main comments	Comments made by (customer ID in brackets)	Response
Schedule of Amendments (General)	from the appointed consultant was that this was not required. This is sound advice to the LPA.		
	No comments at this stage.	Devon County Council (139); Winkleigh Parish Council (1396); Bradninch Town Council (86)	Noted.
	<p>The documentation presented for consultation is dense and the changes made to the SA are purely procedural and largely unfathomable. No changes to anything tangible arise.</p> <p>The remainder of representation comments on the process by which the Council commissioned LUC to undertake the independent assessment and the current planning application at Higher Town, Sampford Peverell.</p>	Individual (6404)	<p>Comments noted. The changes were made following LUC's independent review of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Update (January 2017) which recommended that the Council makes amendments to the SA Update (2017), through the inclusion of additional information and re-ordering, in order to make the SA process clearer in relation to the proposed modifications made to the Local Plan Review. It is considered that these amendments provide clarity and help demonstrate that the SA Update 2018 is proportionate and appropriate in meeting the legal requirements of the SEA Regulations.</p> <p>The process of commissioning consultants and the planning application at Higher Town, Sampford Peverell are outside the scope of this consultation.</p>

Amendment Ref.	Summary of main comments	Comments made by (customer ID in brackets)	Response
Schedule of Amendments (General)	<p>The way that the latest appraisal has been prepared requires cross reference to a number of earlier documents which make it difficult for the average member of the public or local councillor to understand.</p> <p>The document is difficult to read and understand in places, with different coloured typescripts, underlining and striking through.</p> <p>The remainder of the comments raised relate to the scope of the commission, selection and allocation of SP2, proposed allocation at Junction 27 of the M5 and alternative site options in rural areas.</p>	Willand Parish Council (44); Halberton Parish Council (58)	<p>The SA is a multi-staged process. Cross-referencing is necessary to the previous documents and was recommended by LUC. Reordering and signposting aids clarity and understanding.</p> <p>The comments raised in relation to the scope of the commission, site selection and allocation of SP2, proposed allocation at Junction 27 of the M5 and the alternative site options in rural areas are outside the scope of this consultation.</p>
	<p>There is nothing in the Schedule of Amendments which would appear to steer the Council to a different conclusion to that reached in its previous decisions on the proposed modifications made to the Mid Devon Local Plan Review Submission Version.</p> <p>The remainder of the comments raised relate to the Local Plan review and suggests that the Council considers allocating land at Yeoford.</p>	SG Brimacombe & Sons c/o McMurdo Land Planning and development Ltd (6806)	<p>Agreed. The amendments proposed seek to make the SA process clearer in relation to the proposed modifications made to the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>The comments raised in relation to the unchanged elements of the Local Plan Review and the suggestion to consider allocating land at Yeoford are outside the scope of this consultation as they do not relate to the Schedule of Amendments made to the SA Update 2017.</p>
	<p>The updates to the SA seek to provide retrospective justification for a Plan that is of very different complexion and incorporates major new proposals that have not been subject to robust and comprehensive SA</p>	Landsec c/o Rocke Associates Ltd (6269)	<p>Not agreed. The conclusions of the LUC report state that the work carried out and presented in the SA Update (2018) document (taking into account the amendments MDDC has made to</p>

Amendment Ref.	Summary of main comments	Comments made by (customer ID in brackets)	Response
	<p>during its preparation (i.e. pre-submission). The consequence is a 'patchwork quilt' of a SA that is almost unintelligible.</p> <p>The Council's position regarding disaggregation is not supported by evidence, is untenable and incorrect. Respondent also questions the regional need for the comparison goods floor space.</p>		<p>the SA Update 2017) is proportionate and appropriate to meet the requirements of the SEA regulations.</p> <p>With regards to the objector's comments on disaggregation, amendment SA15 was incorporated in response to LUC's recommendation to provide a brief statement within the SA to explain why disaggregated options are not considered as reasonable options for the purposes of the SA and how the Junction 27 proposals were selected. It therefore seeks to aid clarity in understanding the SA process in relation to the Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan Review. Submission Document SD11 'Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (January 2017) Consultation Summary Document Pages 104 and 109-111 and the Council's Hearing Statement on Junction 27 consider disaggregation of Junction 27 proposals.</p> <p>The comments raised with regards to 'regional need' are outside the scope of this consultation as they do not relate to the Schedule of Amendments made to the SA Update 2017.</p>
	<p>The document is very poor in the way in which it has been set out.</p>	<p>Individual (6786)</p>	<p>Comment noted. The SA is a multi-staged process. Cross-referencing is necessary to the previous documents and was recommended by</p>

Amendment Ref.	Summary of main comments	Comments made by (customer ID in brackets)	Response
	<p>The revisions in the SA Update (2018) have made it so dense and complex that it is now harder than ever for the public and others to be sure that the sustainability of policies and allocation has been established with all due transparency.</p> <p>Several cross references are made to the Schedule of Amendments particularly in relation to reasonable alternatives (artificially subdividing sites), the apparent synergy in the reasons set out in the Implications Report, the Sustainability Appraisal 2015 and the selection criteria for additional housing sites.</p> <p>The remainder of the representation refers to the Schedule of Amendments however, the substance of the comments made relate to earlier SA work.</p>	Individual (6408)	<p>LUC. Reordering and signposting aids clarity and understanding.</p> <p>The SA is a multi-staged process. Cross-referencing is necessary to the previous documents and was recommended by LUC. Reordering and signposting aids clarity and understanding.</p> <p>Several cross-references are made to the Schedule of Amendments however, the substance of the matters raised relates to earlier SA work and therefore, these comments are outside the scope of this consultation.</p> <p>LUC's professional judgement is that the work carried out and presented in the SA Update (2018) document (taking into account the amendments MDDC has made to the SA Update 2017) is proportionate and appropriate to meet the requirements of the SEA regulations.</p>
SA8	The addition of a table summary is useful and we note this repeats information which has already been set out in the original SA update (2017). However, we question why the option to provide 200 dwellings at Tidcombe Hall has been discounted and is not the appropriate strategy.	Land Value Alliances c/o Walsingham Planning (6740)	Comments noted. However, the comments with regards to Tidcombe Hall are not within the scope of this consultation. Whilst additional references are made to Tidcombe Hall within the Schedule of Amendments, no additional modifications are proposed beyond those subject to public consultation in 2017. The amendments identified were proposed in order to aid clarity in understanding the SA process in

Amendment Ref.	Summary of main comments	Comments made by (customer ID in brackets)	Response
			relation to the proposed modifications made to the Local Plan Review.
SA15	<p>Comments on disaggregation of Junction 27 and opposes the Designer Outlet Village (DOV) as part of the development at Junction 27. Respondent refers to the conclusions of the 2014 GVA report commissioned by MDDC.</p> <p>The remainder of the representation comments on impact on retail hierarchy, insufficient evidence of regional need for DOV, controls on DOV and unsustainable travel patterns.</p>	Tiverton Civic Society (1410)	<p>Amendment SA15 was incorporated in response to LUC's recommendation to provide a brief statement within the SA to evidence why disaggregated options are not considered as reasonable options for the purposes of the SA and how the Junction 27 proposal was selected. It therefore seeks to aid clarity in understanding the SA process in relation to the Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan Review. Submission Document SD11 'Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (January 2017) Consultation Summary Document' Pages 104 and 109-111 and the Council's Hearing Statement on Junction 27 consider disaggregation of Junction 27 proposals.</p> <p>The other comments submitted by the respondent relate to retail impact and unsustainable travel patterns. These comments were addressed through the 2017 Consultation Summary Document (SD11) and are not within the scope of this consultation.</p>
	<p>There is no evidence to support the assertions that the provisions of the J27 policy cannot be disaggregated. The case law references cited by the Council relate to the determination of planning applications, they do not constrain the ability of plan maker to consider the</p>	Waddeton Park c/o PCL Planning (4675)	<p>Amendment SA15 was incorporated in response to LUC's recommendation to provide a brief statement within the SA to explain why disaggregated options are not considered as reasonable options for the purposes of the SA</p>

Amendment Ref.	Summary of main comments	Comments made by (customer ID in brackets)	Response
	<p>appropriacy of uses, and their mix, when preparing a plan. The representation also states that there are better consequential sites than those proposed at SP2 and TIV16 for the reasons set out in previous representations.</p>		<p>and how the Junction 27 proposal was selected. It therefore seeks to aid clarity in understanding the SA process in relation to the Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan Review. Submission Document SD11 'Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (January 2017) Consultation Summary Document' Pages 104 and 109-111 and the Council's Hearing Statement on Junction 27 consider disaggregation of Junction 27 proposals.</p> <p>The comments raised in relation to SP2 and TIV16 are not within the scope of this consultation as they do not relate to the Schedule of Amendments made to the SA Update 2017.</p>
	<p>Comments on disaggregation and location of Junction 27. Respondent suggests that the evidence is flawed as Rushden Lakes shopping outlet (which was added to existing Nene Wetlands Visitor Centre) cannot be used as a comparison to the Junction 27 greenfield sites.</p> <p>Other comments raised suggest that Full Council has not been given the complete information for decision to be taken, lack of independent evidence. Decisions based on information and suggestions supplied by Eden Westwood and MDDC Planning Department.</p>	<p>Individuals (4446; 643)</p>	<p>Amendment SA15 was incorporated in response to LUC's recommendation to provide a brief statement within the SA to explain why disaggregated options are not considered as reasonable options for the purposes of the SA and how the Junction 27 proposals were selected. It therefore seeks to aid clarity in understanding the SA process in relation to the Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan Review. The Council's response to disaggregation of Junction 27 proposals is set out in Submission Document SD11 'Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (January 2017)</p>

Amendment Ref.	Summary of main comments	Comments made by (customer ID in brackets)	Response
			<p>Consultation Summary Document' Pages 104 and 109-111 and the Council's Hearing Statement on Junction 27.</p> <p>The other comments raised are not within the scope of this consultation as they do not relate to the Schedule of Amendments made to the SA Update 2017. Full Council had access to the complete information for decisions to be taken. Full Council reaffirmed these decisions on 21st February 2018.</p>
	<p>Gleeson's fundamental concern is that the SA 2018 continues an approach that manifestly fails to examine or test the potential for existing, allocated Local Plan Review sites to be expanded to accommodate additional housing development. The SA 2018 identifies in paragraph 3 that <i>'only proposed alternatives deemed 'reasonable alternatives' are considered as part of the SA update.'</i></p>	<p>Gleeson Developments Ltd c/o Chilmark Consulting Ltd (6685)</p>	<p>LUC's professional judgement is that the work carried out and presented in the SA Update (2018) document (taking into account the amendments MDDC has made to the SA Update 2017) is proportionate and appropriate to meet the requirements of the SEA Regulations.</p>
	<p>The representation raises concerns over why sites proposed as contingency allocations in the Local Plan Review have not been considered as reasonable alternatives in this process. It suggests that these should be at the front of the queue in terms of being the most sustainable sites available and could easily be reverted to 'full allocations'.</p> <p>The remainder of the comments raised relate to Policy TIV13 of the Local Plan Review, the Council's lack of a</p>	<p>Land Value Alliances c/o Walsingham Planning (6740)</p>	<p>Amendments SA15 and SA16 are proposed in response to LUC's recommendation to collate work undertaken to date to be used to inform a review of the decision making process regarding which sites to allocate in relation to the Junction 27 proposals. They aid clarity in understanding the SA process in relation to the proposed modifications made to the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>LUC's professional judgement is that the work</p>

Amendment Ref.	Summary of main comments	Comments made by (customer ID in brackets)	Response
	five year land supply and the Council's Sustainability Appraisal for the site (scoring against SA criteria).		carried out and presented in the SA Update (2018) document (taking into account the amendments MDDC has made to the SA Update 2017) is proportionate and appropriate to meet the requirements of the SEA Regulations.
SA16	The respondent refers to Table 5 which states that Cullompton is not considered as a reasonably appropriate location to meet the extra housing need associated with Junction 27. This calls into question MDDC's selection of Cullompton as a preferred growth area.	Individual (5648)	<p>Not agreed. This statement is incorporated into the revised SA Update 2018 to collate work undertaken to date to be used to inform a review of the decision making process regarding which sites to allocate in relation to the Junction 27 proposals. It makes the SA process clearer in relation to the proposed modifications made to the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>The Council's response to the decision making process of the additional housing sites can be found within the Hearing Statements for Policy SP2 and TIV16 (Inspector's Matters and Issues 12 and 17) where comments are provided on the assessment of alternative sites. Furthermore, the Council's response to the issues raised regarding Cullompton as the strategic focus of new development are set out in Submission Document SD10 'Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (February 2015) Consultation Summary Document' (Pages 11-21).</p>
SA17	The respondent comments on the selection criteria for identifying additional sites. If 'sites proximate to the	Individual (6786)	LUC's professional judgement is that the work carried out and presented in the SA Update

Amendment Ref.	Summary of main comments	Comments made by (customer ID in brackets)	Response
	<p>development proposal at Junction 27' was one of the selection criteria, it is unclear why the sites at the eastern end of Sampford Peverell were not considered by the Council at any stage in September 2016. The representation refers to the table in paragraph 5.25 in the implications report and argues that the two sites for 20 and 22 dwellings were not realistic alternatives.</p> <p>The remainder of the representation makes recommendations for alternative sites, raises concerns over process/terms of reference for LUC, key reasons for objection to SP2 in particular, relationship to the Grand Western Canal Conservation Area and discussions at various Cabinet/Council meetings. Respondent also comments on Historic England's advice in relation to heritage assessment and suggests an example of 'best practice'.</p>		<p>(2018) document (taking into account the amendments MDDC has made to the SA Update 2017) is proportionate and appropriate to meet the requirements of the SEA Regulations. The merits of alternative sites are not within the scope of this consultation.</p> <p>Table 6 (Amendment SA17) clarifies which site options met the selection criteria as set out in the Implications Report. Eastern sites in Sampford Peverell were considered as reasonable alternatives, and reasons for their rejection are set out in this amendment.</p> <p>The comments raised in relation to process/terms of reference for LUC, the unchanged content of the SA/Local Plan Review in relation to Policy SP2, Historic England's advice and the Council's Historic Environmental Appraisal (HEA) are outside the scope of this consultation as they do not relate to the Schedule of Amendments made to the SA Update 2017. However, the Council's responses to these issues are set out in Submission Document SD11 'Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (January 2017) Consultation Summary Document' and the Council's Hearing Statement for SP2.</p>

Comments outside the scope of the consultation

Policy/Para	Summary of main comments	Comments made by (Customer ID in brackets)	Response
Policy TIV1 – TIV6 Eastern Urban Extension	Objects to exclusion of 'Sweet Meadow, West Manley Lane, Tiverton' from the Tiverton Eastern Urban Extension.	Nigel Cant Planning (583)	Comments are outside of the scope of this consultation as they do not relate to the Schedule of Amendments made to the SA Update 2017.
Policy SP2 Higher Town, Sampford Peverell	The respondent objects to the allocation of SP2 citing affordable housing need, infrastructure constraints, pedestrian access issues, general safety and wellbeing.	Individual (5251)	Comments are outside of the scope of this consultation as they do not relate to the Schedule of Amendments made to the SA Update 2017. Submission Document SD11 'Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (January 2017) Consultation Summary Document' and the Council's hearing statement for SP2 consider these issues in detail.
	The Independent Review has failed to adequately address the expert representations made with respect to the selection of the SP2 Higher Town site in preference to other far more appropriate sites.	Individuals (6337; 6336)	Comments are outside of the scope of this consultation as they do not relate to the Schedule of Amendments made to the SA Update 2017. Submission Document SD11 'Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (January 2017) Consultation Summary Document' and the Council's hearing statement for SP2 consider these issues in detail.
Historic Environment Appraisal (HEA)	Historic England notes that a Historic Environmental Appraisal (HEA) has been undertaken but has not been able to find this on the website. Encourages use of Historic England's guidance documents in preparing a HEA.	Historic England (1170)	Comments are outside of the scope of this consultation as they do not relate to the Schedule of Amendments made to the SA Update 2017. The Council has prepared a Historic Environmental Appraisal (HEA). This is included within the Core Documents List as submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 31

Policy/Para	Summary of main comments	Comments made by (Customer ID in brackets)	Response
			March 2017. Please see Submission Document ENV25 Historic Environment Appraisal 2016 for more information.
Policy J27, M5	Objects that amendments made to the SA do not address concerns in relation to Junction 27: traffic, economic, landscape and environmental impacts, redevelopment of good agricultural land and retail impact.	Individuals (6379; 4251; 2804)	Comments are outside of the scope of this consultation as they do not relate to the Schedule of Amendments made to the SA Update 2017. Submission Document SD11 'Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (January 2017) Consultation Summary Document' and the Council's hearing statement for Junction 27 consider these issues in detail.
	Objects to Junction 27 proposals citing retail impact, no need for travel hub, impacts on Junction 27 of the M5, use of taxpayers money/resources.	Individual (4217)	
Cullompton	Comments relate to Mid Devon Local Plan Review, proportion of additional housing planned for Cullompton, proposed commercial floorspace, Town Centre Relief Road, Cullompton Neighbourhood Plan Evidence Base/Consultations, sports and leisure, refuse storage, Culm Garden Village, infrastructure, open space/Green Infrastructure, leisure facilities, Meadow Lane land swap, Cullompton Community Association, town centre development, retail, transport links (including Junction 28 of the M5, Relief Road and other highways improvements).	Individual (5211)	Comments are outside the scope of this consultation as they do not relate to the Schedule of Amendments made to the SA Update 2017. The Council's responses to all of the issues raised are documented within Submission Documents SD10 'Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (February 2015) Consultation Summary Document' and SD11 'Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (January 2017) Consultation Summary Document'.

Policy/Para	Summary of main comments	Comments made by (Customer ID in brackets)	Response
<p>Sustainability Appraisal (prior to Schedule of amendments made to the SA Update 2017).</p> <p>OCRE11 Chapel Downs</p>	<p>The baseline data behind the SA requires updating. This would lead to a greater amount of development in Crediton. Refers to 17/01090/MOUT which was granted planning permissions absent any objections from statutory consultees in respect of transport and air quality. LVIA also confirms that landscape and visual impact will be limited. Therefore, overall distribution of development across the district as well as in Crediton is flawed, unsustainable and artificially constrained.</p>	<p>LRM Planning Ltd c/o Barratt David Wilson Homes (6229)</p>	<p>Comments are outside the scope of this consultation as they do not relate to the Schedule of Amendments made to the SA Update 2017. The Council's response to the exclusion of the site option at Chapel Downs is set out in Submission Document SD10 'Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (February 2015) Consultation Summary Document (Pages 183 – 185).</p>
<p>Sustainability Appraisal (prior to Schedule of amendments made to the SA Update 2017).</p> <p>WI1 Land east of M5, Willand</p>	<p>Further work undertaken in respect of the proposed allocation at WI1 as documented in SA6 of the Schedule of Amendments. SA appraisal for WI1 has not taken into account the most up to date and best available information for the site.</p>	<p>Gallagher Estates Ltd c/o Turley (5763)</p>	<p>Amendment SA6 was incorporated in response to LUC's recommendation to provide a summary of revised appraisal work carried out in the SA Update 2017. No additional information/updates to the WI1 appraisal are proposed within the Schedule of Amendments beyond those that were consulted on in 2017. Consequently, Table 1 provides clarity in relation to the SA process underpinning the Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan Review. The Council's response to the 2017 Consultation is set out in Submission Document SD11 'Local Plan Review Proposed Submission (January 2017) Consultation Summary Document'.</p>