





COMPLETE

Collector: Main Mods Live Survey (Web Link)
Started: Saturday, February 15, 2020 6:04:39 PM
Last Modified: Sunday, February 16, 2020 8:22:00 PM
Time Spent: Over a day
IP Address: 

Page 3: Part A

Q1 Personal Details

Title	Mrs
First Name	Liz
Last Name	Brookes-Hocking
Organisation (where relevant)	Crediton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
Address Line 1	Oliver House
Address Line 2	7 North Street
Address Line 3	Crediton
Address Line 4	Devon
Post Code	EX17 2BT
Telephone	
E-mail Address	

Q2 Agent Details (if applicable)

Respondent skipped this question

Page 4: Part B

Q3 Name or Organisation

Crediton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Q4 To which Main Modification consultation document does this representation relate? Please tick one box only (please complete a separate survey for each document you are commenting on)

Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications

Q5 Please indicate the schedule reference (e.g. MM01) in the above document and the Policy number (e.g. DM1) to which your representation relates (please complete a separate survey for each schedule reference you are commenting on):

Reference Code	MM53
Policy	DM26

Q6 The Local Plan Review 2013 – 2033 is required to be assessed against the tests set out in paragraph 182 of the 2012 version of the National Planning Policy Framework to establish whether it is ‘sound’ and complies with legal requirements. Please refer to the guidance notes above for further information on the tests of ‘soundness’. Do you consider the Local Plan Review to be:

	Response
Legally compliant	Yes
Positively Prepared	Yes
Justified	Yes
Effective	Yes
Consistent with national policy	Yes

Page 5: Part B (continued)

Q7 Please provide your comments below

MM53 needs to be more robust in order to achieve NPPF 175 d) (encouragement of opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity); also to fulfil NPPF 91c) in meeting health and well being needs by ensuring safe and accessible green infrastructure. The current wording allows valuable green infrastructure to be treated as a giant grass verge where no biodiversity is considered, provided for or developed. To remedy this we would like to see a stronger policy that puts the onus of developers to come up with a maintenance plan that looks at opportunities for increasing biodiversity over the long term. We welcome MM53 but feel it doesn't go quite far enough so would like to see it modified for addition to DM26 4.88 as follows:

after 'submit' insert 'suitable'

after 'details' add 'that will ensure the development of biodiversity within, and accessibility to, the proposed green infrastructure'.