

neighbourhood plans

From: Andy Proctor <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 19 November 2017 14:13
To: neighbourhood plans
Subject: Paignton Neighbourhood Plan Feedback



Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to submit feedback to you to pass to the independent examiner for consideration in the review.

I do not support the plan in it's current form for the reasons below. I do support the principle of the plan.

1. Lack of ambition. As the plan itself describes, 5000 jobs is the target for growth. This number should be much higher, 5000 shows a short sightedness on what is needed for Paignton. The lack of ambition is also shown in the prioritisation for tourism in the plan, which therefore prioritises low wage, unskilled and insecure employment. This is not what we want to build the future of Paignton on. The plan notes a **current decline in jobs** but makes no attempt to plan to reverse this, in fact it notes itself that the **assumptions on job growth have already been shown to be false**, therefore on this point alone the plan must be re-drafted. A recent FOI reported to the Paignton Neighbourhood Forum, from the Council deliberations on the Economic Strategy shows that 2 years after the South Devon Link Road completion there is little change in the employment situation in Torbay thus turning Torbay/Paignton into a commuter town, contrary to NPPF37. The neighbourhood plan needs to make more provision for employment to reverse this trend.

2. The target for 5000 jobs and circa 9000 new homes shows that it is planning for almost 4000 homes to have no employment in the Paignton area, necessitating travel out of area, contravening the NPPF37 as stated. In addition it makes no provision for improving transport links in and out of the area. Some measures are mentioned but no concrete thoughts communicated. Due to the evidence of the recent FOI, the housing supply in the plan for Paignton should be reduced and the specific planning tools for employment growth increased to reduce the decline of Torbay and Paignton into a commuter town.

3. The plan itself already states there is an over supply of housing in Paignton, therefore the housing growth numbers do not make logical sense.

4. I do not agree with the stated aims of the plan. As a Paignton resident, and never having been consulted, the prioritisation on tourism is madness. Important yes but the wellbeing and sustainable regeneration of Paignton through job led growth should be the priority, not prioritising making the place look pretty for tourists.

5. The plan needs to detail how the garden town concept is to be delivered and presented, including addressing why the current developments in Yannons Farm, Devonshire Park and White Rock (circa 800 houses) do not comply to this concept, thus it makes this concept somewhat moot.

6. Existing developments in the planning process do not comply with the detail on p27 & p28 which brings the importance of this plan to developers into question.

7. The overarching detail of homes v jobs is contradicted in para 6.10 which shows that ~9000 homes and 5000 jobs goes against the NPPF. The objectives noted on p16/17 contradict the overall aims of the plan

(~9000 homes/5000 jobs) therefore either the ambition for jobs needs to be increased or the plan for new homes be reduced.

8. Harbour - the plan focusses on the need of tourists whereas it should prioritise the needs of local residents. Keep the harbour as a working harbour not let it be dragged into the marina style approach which prices out locals is key. The plan authors acknowledge this but there are no specifics within the plan to achieve this.

10. Transport/getting around - The plan does not address the single biggest issue to getting around in Paignton, traffic lights. These should be removed. Evidence shows that these cause more air pollution than other form of traffic control and was on the Mayor's agenda from his election to tackle. (little action seen) Removal of traffic lights, particularly on Brixham Road must be addressed. Also the road planning detail for the Collaton area does not take into account extra homes, or traffic volumes therefore needs completely revising. I understand the neighbourhood plan primarily addressed land use matters and transport is normally part of the "local plan", but land use and transport are linked and cannot be addressed separately, this plan does not address the second biggest issue affecting residents in Paignton. (first being lack of jobs).

12. I disagree with disagree with 7.31 and 7.32 of the plan as these are contradictory to the objectives of more housing and jobs, if the area is forcibly kept the same it will just become a great big car park

13. The plan notes its ambition to encourage employers is noted in para 6.116, but the ones major ones looking to commit so far are retail on Devonshire park. These will be low skill, low paid jobs (the Range etc) - this is not a way to build a sustainable future, the evidence document supports this comment. The EPIC centre is something that will try to address the problem directly but it needs more support and infrastructure, not retail outlets around it. The EPIC centre development is not mentioned, included or referenced, a significant omission to the plan. The ambition to create jobs is not big enough but does not even address the "how" for the jobs it does propose. The Clayland cross development is a start but will not create the level of job growth and sustainability needed.

14. On inclusion document it says that the forum has steady at 400 members. With 43000 residents in Paignton how can this claim to be inclusive or representative? What evidence of wide participation is provided, beyond a 6 week period of folks standing in the town and some adverts in the paper?

I submit these comments to you as per the process noted on your website

Yours Faithfully

Andy Proctor

