Appendix 4: Plymouth City Council Feedback on Draft Policies

Policy No	Sub-group	Policy Area	Policy Objective	Policy description	Related Community Action	Relevant JLP Policies	Is this a planning policy (something that affects planning decisions on planning applications) or something else?
01	Blue and Green	Sporting and cultural spectator events.	To increase use of the Hoe for the enjoyment of free sporting and cultural events linked to our waterfront setting. To raise the profile of Plymouth as a 'destination city'.	Physical improvements to enhance the use of the Hoe & the Sound for sporting and cultural spectator events will be supported provided: a) the scale of the proposal is appropriate to the context and meets the requirements of policies in respect of heritage and design POLICY CROSS REF; b) there is safe and convenient access for potential users; c) events are subject to set-up, curfew, and noise restrictions agreed in collaboration with residents; d) events are designed with sensitivity to the natural environment and achieve an overall balance between human and ecological needs.	HNF with and alongside PCC to develop appropriate media and signage for promoting events and activities that take place in the Hoe Forum area.	PLY21 (Supporting the visitor economy)	This is an example of a policy that mixes planning policy with points which are not covered by planning. Please see covering e-mail which encourages you to keep this separate so it's clear what you're trying to achieve. Also please see e-mail re. the relationship between the JLP policies and the neighbourhood plan. In general we agree with the point being raised here and the recognition of the important role the Hoe plays in sporting and cultural events. However we do questions some of the points here as they seem to be already covered in the JLP or under licensing policies which can't be affected by the planning process. We also note that the policy objective is about promoting free events, a NP won't be able to determine this and this can only be linked to community aspirations. There are also many events which take place on the Hoe which are chargeable to the benefit of the Hoe and the wider city which we wouldn't want to inadvertently restrict. As you look at this policy it may be worth distinguishing what is meant by physical improvements to enhance the use of the Hoe for events. i.e. does this mean temporary structures like marquees or stages? Or does it mean permanent changes? Or are you talking about events in general which would seem to be the case with point C and D?
02	Blue and Green	Public recreation, exercise, sport and wellbeing.	To protect spontaneous recreational enjoyment of the Hoe Park whilst supporting its use for formal and informal sporting activities for well-being and enjoyment. To protect existing recreational and sporting facilities and public spaces from redevelopment.	Proposals that facilitate and enhance formal and informal recreational activities and exercise in the Hoe Forum area will be supported provided they: a) do not have an adverse effect on existing uses and assets in the vicinity; b) the scale of the proposal is appropriate to the context and meets the requirements of policies in respect of heritage and design POLICY CROSS REF.	HNF with and alongside other interest groups and stakeholders to support or develop proposals that promote formal or informal recreational activities and exercise.	PLY20 (Managing and enhancing Plymouth's waterfront)	This is a laudable objective, but could this one be rolled into the one above? It could also be that this is already in the JLP, PLY20 seems to cover some of these points. As mentioned in the covering email I think it's worth making clearer distinction between the JLP and the NPPF. Also, what is the aim of this policy? Is it to safeguard the Hoe for formal and informal recreational uses and sporting activities rather than any other land uses, or something else? With regards to point a) existing uses, one of the aims of the Council is to promote a wide variety of different uses of the Hoe – does this point inadvertently restrict new uses?
03	Blue and Green	Citizen participation in asset management	To increase resident understanding of and participation in the management of assets in our area.	N/A – Community Action only.	HNF to work with and alongside PCC to develop and improve opportunities for resident participation in the management of assets in our area.		This is an agreement needed with the landowner, we recommend including reference to landowners here and to the owners of the assets. It may also be worth specifying what you mean by asset.

Appendix 4: Plymouth City Council Feedback on Draft Policies

Policy No	Sub-group	Policy Area	Policy Objective	Policy description	Related Community Action	Relevant JLP Policies	Is this a planning policy (something that affects planning decisions on planning applications) or something else?
04	Blue and Green	Trees and hedges	To increase the amount of tree cover and hedge habitats in the Forum area. To safeguard existing trees, hedges and habitats which make a significant contribution to the environmental quality and character of the area.	1. Proposals that result in the maintenance, protection, or increase in the provision of trees and hedges will be supported provided that meet other policy requirements. 2. Proposals that result in the loss of trees or hedges will not be supported unless they provide equivalent mitigation based on opportunities identified by HNF Tree planting plan.	HNF to work with partners to: complete accurate Tree and hedge Mapping in the forum area; undertake research and future proofing in respect of climate change impacts on biodiversity in the forum area; prepare a Tree planting plan for the forum area; engage the community to build awareness of the value and benefits of trees.	DEV28 (Trees, woodlands and hedgerows)	This again is a laudable aim and we support protecting trees and hedges on the Hoe where appropriate. However, there is already a mitigation policy within the JLP for trees and hedgerows – are these policies to give greater weight to tree protection/enhancement in the policy balance? (Again please see e-mail re. relationship with the JLP). We also question the status of the HNF tree planting plan. Is this something which already exists? We have concerns about a policy referring to a document/plan which doesn't exist yet. If this already exists we would be interested in seeing this, although as a general point, this evidence would have more weight if it was included as part of the plan itself, whether as a map, plan or appendix. There is also a danger of expectation here. The Council are unlikely to be able to refuse an application if the mitigation doesn't fit with a planting plan that hasn't been produced and adopted by the landowners.
05	B&G H&GD	Crime & anti-social behaviour	To reduce opportunities for crime & anti-social behaviour, and foster a pro-social code.	Proposals for new development should meet the requirements of Secured by Design and Designing Out Crime guidance, and should not give rise to opportunities for anti-social behaviour.	HNF to produce and display an Honour the Hoe code. HNF to work with partners to address antisocial behaviour – littering, graffiti, intoxication, BBQ burns.	DEV20 (Place shaping and the quality of the built environment)	Again, the policy and guidance is already within the JLP and SPD so we question what this policy is adding. Re. the community action – is this a way of trying to address people's behaviour? It would be useful here if it was clear what you are trying to achieve, are there any particular areas of the Hoe where crime is a problem? A type of crime which is being committed you would like to address?
06	Culture, Economy and Tourism	Economy & Tourism	To increase use of the Hoe area for overnight stays and tourism activities. To support the interests of locally-based hospitality providers, to sustain a robust local tourism economy. To support the development of high-end high quality accommodation including conferencing facilities.	High quality accommodation proposals, and businesses aimed at providing tourism activities, will be supported provided: a) the scale of the proposal is appropriate to the context and meets the requirements of policies in respect of heritage and design policies; b) the proposal fulfils a requirement not already met by current developments / accommodation providers.	Investigate the feasibility of providing a community-led community owned hotel facility in the Hoe Forum Area.	PLY1 (Enhancing Plymouth's strategic role) PLY21 (Supporting the visitor economy) both look to support and grow the tourism offer on the Hoe.	We recommend including evidence to support this. Perhaps the Hotel Demand Study would be a good starting point? I think this policy (and some others) would really benefit on making it clear what it is adding to the JLP policies and, if you're looking to challenge the JLP policies through your neighbourhood plan, be really clear on what you're trying to achieve. Without this there's a real danger that your policies will be interpreted in a way you're not expecting/wanting and will make things more difficult for planning officers to make planning decisions. For example, is this a policy to stifle competition/avoid over-supply, or is it more about encouraging diversity because you've identified a gap in the market? Point b) in particular as is currently worded is very constraining and we feel like this isn't the aim of this policy? The way this policy has been worded may mean that anything which isn't offering something unique could be refused. What about B&Bs for example?

Appendix 4: Plymouth City Council Feedback on Draft Policies

Policy No	Sub-group	Policy Area	Policy Objective	Policy description	Related Community Action	Relevant JLP Policies	Is this a planning policy (something that affects planning decisions on planning applications) or something else?
07	Culture, Economy and Tourism	Local Economy	To support the development of a vibrant offer of local experiences and services to enhance tourist experience and the very local economy: created and run by local people, making the Hoe a truly 'welcoming' place.	Support locally-led business, cultural initiatives, and tourism experiences, and link this to Plymouth Visitor Plan.	HNF to offer support to local people wanting to set up initiatives and/or signpost to independent support providers. HNF to initiate/support marketing and brand which promotes the Hoe as the authentic, locally-hosted place to stay in Plymouth.	PLY1 (Enhancing Plymouth's strategic role) PLY21 (Supporting the visitor economy) both look to support and grow the tourism offer on the Hoe.	Support the aim again and what this policy seems to be trying to achieve, but we question whether the 'policy' is a policy here and is rather a community action. It also may be too vague and is something planning has very little influence over. It would be more helpful if there was a specific proposal on a specific site we could support.
08	Culture, Economy and Tourism	National Marine Park	Support the implementation of the National Marine Park, and position the Hoe as its centre for engagement, education and experiences, including capitalising on the global position of the MBA and PML as significant marine biological institutions.	Support the development of a hub for the National Marine Park with the HNF area. Support National Marine Park initiatives provided they meet other policy requirements.			Again, we question whether this is a policy and is not more of a community action? We like the reference and the recognition to the NMP but question what is meant by a 'hub' and query that the Hoe will be the centre of the NMP. Unless there is an identified location that needs to be safeguarded this may be a policy which is pre-empting what could happen rather than what will happen. Is there also a typo? Should the 'with' be 'within'? Support the development of a hub for the National Marine Park within the HNF area.
09	CE&T P&T H&GD	Public access to the Hoe foreshore	To safeguard public access along the whole length of the foreshore, and support improvements in inclusive access. To support the re-use of existing buildings for uses appropriate to the waterside location and heritage.	Proposals for development along the foreshore will be supported provided they: – Safeguard public access; – Deliver improvements to inclusive access; – Are sensitive to / contribute towards the conservation of marine habitats; – Provide facilities that are appropriate to the waterside location and heritage; – Consider the potential future impact of climate change / sea-level rise.	HNF to support or initiate actions to improve the condition and safety of the foreshore to enhance use and access.	PLY1 (Enhancing Plymouth's strategic role) PLY20 (Managing and enhancing Plymouth's waterfront) PLY21 (Supporting the visitor economy)	Again, in general this is a laudable aim, but not sure what it's adding to PLY20, there's a lot of duplication in these policies, which as mentioned, may make it more difficult for planning officers to make decisions and create holes in policies which could be unpicked by a developer. The Hoe Foreshore is also part of the SW Coast Path so already has a lot of protection so it's recommended that this is also considered.

Appendix 4: Plymouth City Council Feedback on Draft Policies

Policy No	Sub-group	Policy Area	Policy Objective	Policy description	Related Community Action	Relevant JLP Policies	Is this a planning policy (something that affects planning decisions on planning applications) or something else?
10	H&GD	Heritage - Historic surfaces	To ensure the preservation of existing historic stone and granite cobbles, setts, paving, kerbstones, walls, and pillars, and ensure the quality and consistency of any new or replacement surfaces where required.	Proposals for development should ensure original materials are preserved and reinstated, according to the guidelines set out in the Aecom Design Guide / Hoe CAAMP.		DEV21 (Development affecting the historic environment)	Please see covering e-mail re. Hoe CAAMP and AECOM design guide. Irrespective of whether this is referring to the current CAAMP or the 'new' CAAMP, as a general point we have no problem with specific historic features being highlighted for protection in the neighbourhood plan, particularly if this is something we can see first to ensure it is supported by our own HE Officers. However, this is a very strongly worded policy and whilst we're not unhappy with the principle here, there does need to be some flexibility/give and take in the policy as there could be very good reasons why this can't be achieved. What this policy would really benefit from would be including the details on the materials within the plan itself, are there specific materials in particular you want emphasised/protected and where? This information could be lifted from the AECOM report and the Hoe CAAMP to be included within your NP. As a reminder though, there is the danger here of cherry-picking the evidence which is being presented in your neighbourhood plan. A lot of extensive work was done for the JLP which was extensively consulted on and tested at examination so holds significant weight and is a resource there to be used (for example the Waterfront Masterplan and the Heritage Impact Assessment) We think your neighbourhood plan would really benefit from taking ownership of these documents and accepting/referencing some of the wider projects and things which are going on (Better Places Framework). At the moment the AECOM report for example hasn't been tested or consulted on, so there's a real danger of referring to external documents which were not written as policy.
11	H&GD	Heritage - Buildings requiring enhanced protection	To achieve the PCC adoption of a local list of heritage assets to secure their protection.	Proposals for development should refer to the local list of heritage assets and respond according to the guidelines set out in the Aecom Design Guide / Hoe CAAMP.	HNF to lobby PCC to adopt local list within one year.	DEV21 (Development affecting the historic environment)	Please see above re. comments to the reference to the AECOM design guide and Hoe CAAMP. At the moment this can only be a community action and not a policy. A local list doesn't exist and a policy can't refer to something which doesn't exist (see similar comments re. tree plan). Currently the Council has no proposals to consider a local list as it considers DEV21 of the JLP is adequate for the protection of non-designated heritage assets and this process is set out in the draft Joint Local Plan SPD. An alternative suggestion could by that your Neighbourhood Plan could include a list of historic assets and your own 'local list' rather than lobbying the Council? We will then be able to look at this and respond through the consultation process. The Council produced a Heritage Impact Assessment as part of the JLP which would be a good place to start, you could set the criteria for the local list and this could be a good exercise and a really useful thing for your neighbourhood plan to do.

Appendix 4: Plymouth City Council Feedback on Draft Policies

Policy No	Sub-group	Policy Area	Policy Objective	Policy description	Related Community Action	Relevant JLP Policies	Is this a planning policy (something that affects planning decisions on planning applications) or something else?
12	H&GD	Heritage - views	To preserve and protect existing iconic views towards and within the Hoe.	New development should preserve and enhance important views as documented in Hoe CAAMP.	Encourage earlier and more responsive consultation in planning procedures and to limit extensive height and mass of new development	PLY20 (Managing and enhancing Plymouth's waterfront)	Please see above re. comments to the reference to the AECOM design guide and Hoe CAAMP. What would give this policy more strength would be if the Neighbourhood Plan itself included the list of views/vistas which the plan aims to preserve. Perhaps on a map? This would be really useful and there is a good example of this in the current Hoe CAAMP. Again, the waterfront masterplan has views and vistas as well as the landscape/seascape assessment. Bringing a map such as this into a neighbourhood plan, using evidence from all documents available would create a robust policy.
13	H&GD	Heritage - Buildings	Buildings to be protected in accordance with conservation best practice and policy documents.	New development should adhere to conservation guidelines set out in Aecom Design Guide / Hoe CAAMP, in terms of façade features, materials, integrity of street scene, and views. Construction applications and variations must include full public and responsive consultation. Design proposals should not be higher than previous or adjacent building height; building lines should be consistent with adjacent buildings and existing street scene; building design should demonstrate good design principles and proportionality, recognise local vernacular and incorporate environmental responsibility.		DEV21 (Development affecting the historic environment)	The policy as currently worded is trying to do two different things. First it is trying to propose blanket design guidance through the CAAMP and the AECOM Design Guide (please see above re. comments to the reference to the AECOM design guide and Hoe CAAMP) and to set a policy on process, rather than planning. We would recommend revisiting the wording of this policy. It is unlikely we could support restrictions on building height as this could be contrary to the JLP and our design guidance and evidence. Instead, we recommend that your policy states that the key issue here is to conserve and enhance the conservation and wider Hoe area and to state that, where buildings are proposed to be higher, that they will need to be justified by a robust design and conservation appraisal. With regards to the sentence "Construction applications and variations must include full public and responsive consultation." We were a bit confused as it is unclear whether you are referring to the consultation undertaken by either Council or the landowner/planning applicant? The consultation conducted by the Council (and what is expected from developers) is written into our Statement of Community Involvement, which was adopted in March 2020 after public consultation. If this refers to the landowner/planning applicant, we recommend this is clearer and justified. DEV33 of the JLP includes a point regarding consultation on applications in relation to renewable and low carbon energy. It may be worth looking at the wording of this and other examples of policies with similar points to try and write something which links more to the planning process if engagement and consultation has been identified as a gap needing to be filled.

Appendix 4: Plymouth City Council Feedback on Draft Policies

Policy No	Sub-group	Policy Area	Policy Objective	Policy description	Related Community Action	Relevant JLP Policies	Is this a planning policy (something that affects planning decisions on planning applications) or something else?
14	H&GD	Housing Mix	To promote a balanced mix of housing uses including owner occupied homes, private rental, social rental, and holiday accommodation; and a balanced mix of occupiers including families, single people, older people, students, and sharers.	Policy to respond to findings of Housing Needs Analysis – TBC.		DEV7 (Meeting local housing need in the Plymouth Policy Area)	Please see previous e-mail sent on the HNA.
15	H&GD	Heritage – hidden heritage	Preserve and promote recognition of The Hoe's cultural and social heritage, including commemorative monuments, statues, signage, trails, artwork, events, and performances.	New development should preserve and enhance physical features / monuments and hidden heritage that reflect the Hoe's cultural heritage as documented in Hoe CAAMP.	HNF to lobby PCC to adopt a local list within one year to include unlisted monuments and other culturally & locally important features. HNF to keep local stories alive through history trails, artwork, and social history events.	DEV21 (Development affecting the historic environment)	Please see above comments re. local list and the Hoe CAAMP – again this policy would be more constructive if your neighbourhood plan included its own local list. Currently the Council has no proposals to consider a local list as it considers DEV21 of the JLP is adequate for the protection of non-designated heritage assets and this process is set out in the draft Joint Local Plan SPD and soon to be adopted. When you're referring to 'hidden heritage', do you mean non-designated assets?
16	P&T	Improving connectivity	To achieve greater connectivity between the city centre and surrounding waterfront areas, both by land and sea.	1. New development that provide improvements in connectivity (pedestrian, cycle, and sea) will be supported provided they meet other policy objectives. 2. New development should contribute towards improvements in connectivity where possible through communication and collaboration with HNF, PCC and transport partners.	HNF to work with PCC and transport partners to support: – improvements in bus services; – Improvements in pedestrian access and footpaths; – Improvements in cycle ways; – Improvements in water access and water transport.	PLY20 (Managing and enhancing Plymouth's waterfront) DEV29 (Specific provisions relating to transport)	Again, we think most of this policy is covered by the JLP. The JLP already includes considerable reference to policy in relation to providing good connectivity. Have you thought about whether your neighbourhood plan could identify where the connectivity is lacking and therefore how the policy can be implemented? Please see above for comments re. including consultation/engagement process within policies. Again, statutory processes are in place already and you need to be clear on expectations and what isn't currently happening so your policy can address this.

Appendix 4: Plymouth City Council Feedback on Draft Policies

Policy No	Sub-group	Policy Area	Policy Objective	Policy description	Related Community Action	Relevant JLP Policies	Is this a planning policy (something that affects planning decisions on planning applications) or something else?
17	P&T	Reducing carbon emissions	To support a low carbon/emissions transport future.	New development should support a low carbon/emissions future through: – provision for cycling and walking as preferred transport; – reducing the number of private vehicles through car share schemes; – provision of electric vehicle charging points.	HNF to initiate car sharing scheme in the Hoe Forum area. HNF to investigate shared electric vehicle charging points.	DEV29 (Specific provisions relating to transport)	Again, we support the principle and commend the forum for looking to include low-carbon initiatives in their neighbourhood plan, we wonder whether this policy could be widened and more focused on creating a policy to work towards a net zero carbon future, rather than just focusing on transport? This could then be linked to wider agendas, such as the Climate Emergency etc. When you're referring to Car Sharing are you referring to Car Clubs? Parking is limited for residents on the Hoe, but it is a sustainable location so we would be supportive of trying to promote car sharing. We have a few Car Clubs already in the city, most have been secured through Travel Plans which is referenced in DEV29 and set out in the JLP SPD. If this is set out specifically in a policy here though this could then be helpful to help steer green travel plans and increase EV charging points.
18	P&T	Parking	To ensure adequate parking for residents, businesses and visitors, and manage the transition towards a low carbon future.	New development should deliver sufficient parking to meet any increased demand that it generates.	HNF to work with PCC to review parking within the Forum area to ensure that parking spaces are: – sufficient to meet current and future demand; – efficiently used and managed; – fairly allocated. HNF to work with private landowners to improve efficient use of private spaces through rental opportunities.	DEV29 (Specific provisions relating to transport)	The need for new development to be self-sufficient in meeting its' own car parking demands is already included in the JLP and the updated car parking standards are listed in the new Joint Local Plan SPD. Again it's a bit unclea what this is adding to JLP policies. It's also worth noting here that within the Hoe there is a 24/7 CPZ in operation from which new developments are excluded in respect of obtaining permits and this can't be influenced by planning.
19	TBC	New Housing	Await Housing Needs Analysis				Please see previous e-mail sent on the HNA.
20	TBC	Site allocations: The Citadel The Register Office The Quality Hotel The Dome TA Millbay Other windfall sites	Await Housing Needs Analysis				Please see previous e-mail sent on the HNA. As a reminder, some of the possible allocations listed here are already allocated within the JLP, please see covering e-mail re. the relationship with the JLP. If you want to include site allocations in your neighbourhood plan which aren't in the JLP, a starter for ten may be to have a look at the Waterfront Masterplan, as this is what the Council uses to highlight its priorities. Any site allocations need to be carefully considered and thought out to ensure they're something we can support. We do think though that it would be helpful to have policies for unallocated sites if support can be given from the landowner and other key stakeholders.