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**What this consultation is about**

Torbay needs thousands more homes over the next 20 years and we are asking local residents to help us decide where they should go.

The consultation is about housing in the Local Plan Update. Specifically, it is a consultation on the level of growth, and options for sites which can potentially be developed on. We published a previous growth option consultation in January 2022. We have considered this feedback. This further consultation provides more detailed proposals about where the housing growth should go, and we are asking for your input on this. The updated plan period runs between 2022 and 2040 (for 18 years)[[1]](#footnote-2).

This document is the wording and questions which are set out in the online questionnaire that is available at [Consultations - Torbay Council](https://www.torbay.gov.uk/council/consultations/). Please fill in the questions via the online questionnaire wherever possible. Thank you.

**How to respond to this consultation**

Please let us know your thoughts on the Local Plan Update. You can have your say by:

* Completing the survey via the council’s Engagement HQ consultation platform: [Consultations - Torbay Council](https://www.torbay.gov.uk/council/consultations/)
* You can answer just the Quick Question, or you can complete the full survey which covers the key aspects of the Local Plan Update. The survey questions also include summaries of the policies in case you do not have time to read the Draft Policies document.
* While our preference is for responses via the online survey and map, if you need to submit written responses, these can be sent by email to [future.planning@torbay.gov.uk](mailto:future.planning@torbay.gov.uk) or by post to Strategy and Project Management, Spatial Planning, Tor Hill House, 2nd Floor North, Castle Circus, Torquay, TQ1 3DR. However, please could you respond via the online survey wherever possible. This will make it much easier for us to consider your comments.
* **Please submit comments by 12 Noon on Monday 21 November 2022.**

**Some key messages**

We do want to have a genuine debate about the housing sites put forward in this consultation. Please let us know if there are other suitable alternatives. However, please take into account the following:

* The Local Plan is already struggling to meet housing need. Providing less land will make the housing crisis, and affordability for local people, worse.
* The Local Plan already sets out a strategy to make the most of brownfield regeneration sites that are available for development, so we are going to need to look at other, non-brownfield sites to be able to deliver more housing. It is important to emphasise that we are not proposing compulsory purchase of greenfield land. This would take significant resources away from urban regeneration efforts. Therefore, we need to ensure that appropriate development sites are available.
* We are committed to protecting the local environment as much as possible, but we know that we have to balance this need with addressing the housing shortage. There do not appear to be any easy housing options left. All remaining sites will have some environmental impact. The Local Plan seeks to avoid major development in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), even though we know that sites in this area are being actively promoted by some landowners.
* There is an expectation that all development sites will be properly landscaped. The effects on wildlife etc. must be mitigated and development should achieve a biodiversity net gain.
* This **is** a genuine consultation. Whilst we know we need to provide as many homes as possible, if you strongly believe we have a site wrong and that it should not be included please do let us know. It would however be appreciated if you can put forward an alternative that you feel has more opportunity.
* Also, if you think we have missed any sites that have potential for development, please do let us know.
* There are no easy answers but we believe that what we are proposing is the best available option under the circumstances with the land that could be developed on.

**Some more detail on this consultation**

The Local Plan is about much more than housing. This consultation also sets out an overarching strategic policy and suggests targets for employment land (which need to be subject to further assessment). It then suggests more detailed policies for neighbourhood plan areas. But the focus of this consultation is on growth levels, proposed development sites and housing policies. We will carry out further consultation on non-housing policies early in 2023. The last section of this consultation suggests a layout for the whole Local Plan. It also suggests policy titles.

This consultation proposes housing numbers and draft policies relating to housing. The Local Plan's priority is the regeneration of brownfield sites, particularly where these are in or around town centres. The consultation does propose some greenfield sites for development. A key aim of the Plan is to protect the most important environment around Torbay. It resists major development in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and close to the most environmentally sensitive sites.

This consultation is at Regulation 18 of the Local Planning Regulations[[2]](#footnote-3). This means it is at the ‘issues and options stage’, where decisions are not set in stone. It is a genuine consultation on options. A “preferred option” will be published in 2023.

That said, the government does set clear rules for what Local Plans **must** do. This includes the National Planning Policy Framework[[3]](#footnote-4), which sets out a “Presumption in favour of sustainable development”. More detailed government advice is provided in the online Planning Practice Guidance[[4]](#footnote-5). The NPPF has a quasi-legal status in assessing the “soundness”[[5]](#footnote-6) of local plans.

**Consultation questions**

Please note that fuller options are provided in the online questionnaire [Consultations - Torbay Council](https://www.torbay.gov.uk/council/consultations/). This also contains questions on equalities and related matters that it is very important for us to collect. Simplified versions of the questions are shown here for information. (They are not numbered in this document as the online Engagement Platform applies numbers automatically).

**Quick question**

The rest of the survey covers various aspects of the Local Plan Update in more detail. However, if you would prefer to state one issue, please do so below. If you are making an objection to a particular development site, please bear in mind that Torbay has no easy unallocated sites left, and that the Local Plan is already seeking to maximise urban regeneration opportunities. If you wish to object to a particular site, please can you recommend an alternative development site (in addition to those that are already proposed) that you consider would be more suitable.

**Quick Question**: Please make your comment on the Local Plan Site Options paper.

**Key elements of this consultation and more detailed questions.**

**Aspirations**

The main purpose of the Local Plan is to provide the legal starting point for determining planning applications. It should set a positive vision for the future and a framework for addressing housing needs and other economic, social and environmental priorities. Plans should be succinct. The existing Torbay Local Plan 2012-30 is over 250 pages long and contains a lot of text that doesn’t assist decision making. We think that there is scope to reduce the amount of supporting text. However, it is important that the Plan sets out aspirations and that these mirror the wider community and council’s aspirations[[6]](#footnote-7).

The existing Torbay Local Plan 2012-2030 included the following aspirations:

* Aspiration 1: Secure economic recovery and success
* Aspiration 2: Achieve a better connected, accessible Torbay and essential infrastructure
* Aspiration 3: Protect and enhance a superb environment
* Aspiration 4: Create more sustainable communities  and better places
* Aspiration 5: Respond to climate change

On this basis, we are interested in views on whether the Local Plan’s aspirations should be updated.

**Question:** Are the Local Plan’s Aspirations still appropriate?

**Question:** While the order of the five aspirations is not intended to imply their level of importance, we intend to move 'Respond to climate change' to Aspiration 1 as this is an overarching aspiration for the Local Plan Update. Do you agree with this?

**Question:** Please say how they could be improved.

**Policy SS1 Growth Strategy and Responding to the Climate Emergency**

This consultation sets out draft policies on housing related matters. It also contains draft policies for Torbay’s four Neighbourhood Plan areas[[7]](#footnote-8). As noted above, the plan is at an early stage, and we welcome views on the proposals and ideas set out in this consultation.

**Policy SS1 ‘Growth Strategy and Responding to the Climate Emergency’** is an overarching policy. It sets the minimum number of homes that Torbay must provide, at least 5,400 new homes over the next 18 years (2022-40), equal to 300 dwellings a year.

These are minimum figures that may be exceeded. The proposed growth rate is fewer homes than we need, but reflects our capacity to deliver. It also reflects the number of homes that have been built in recent years.

The proposed growth rate is driven by the environmental constraints and shortage of suitable land in Torbay. Applications that exceed this number of homes will be supported where they are in sustainable locations such as brownfield sites in town centres and elsewhere in the built up area.

The Local Plan also seeks to promote affordable housing. The strategy places a strong emphasis on brownfield regeneration. However, there is also a pressing need to improve the environment in central areas and to build homes and environments where people want to live.

In order to try and keep pace with the level of housing need, reluctantly, some additional greenfield sites are proposed for development. These include individual sites and extensions to broader ‘Future Growth Areas’. We are not intending to revisit the principle of development on land already proposed for development in the adopted Torbay Local Plan 2012-30.

However, the Plan resists greenfield development outside of the areas it allocates for development. In particular, it resists major development in the AONB and its setting in the south of Torbay. The south of Torbay is also closest to the South Hams Special Area of Conservation (SAC) which is designated for Greater Horseshoe bats, and rare grassland at Berry Head.

Policy SS1 also sets a framework for seeking low carbon development, and requiring developments to build in resilience to the effects of Climate Change. This is in recognition that the Climate Emergency is the most pressing challenge faced by Torbay. Further updates to planning policy on climate change will be included in a later consultation on updating non-housing policies. In particular, Polices SS14 and ES1 of the current Torbay Local Plan (2012-30) will be refreshed.

**Question:** Do you agree with the growth strategy set out in Policy SS1? Is there anything you would like to add?

**Challenging the Standard Method:**  **How can the council challenge the “Standard Method”? Should it do so?**

This is a technical issue. The ‘Standard Method’ is a formula set out in government guidance that councils are required to follow in order to calculate the minimum number of homes needed in an area. The Standard Method local housing need for Torbay in 2022 is 600 dwellings a year. A 20% buffer must be added to this to calculate what must be built over the next five years. This comes to 720 dwellings a year.

We welcome views on these matters: but for this particular question we do need clear demographic or market signals evidence. Merely quoting the NPPF or PPG, or pointing out that there are environmental issues will not move us forward on this question.

The question about challenging the ‘Standard Method’ is not about Torbay’s ability to meet the need. It is about demographic projections and market signals[[8]](#footnote-9). This figure does not relate to an area’s environmental capacity.

The NPPF indicates that the Standard Method should be used *“unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach which also reflects current and future demographic trends and market signals”*.

Without prejudice to the outcome of this consultation, there is clear evidence of housing *need* in Torbay. The Government does not really define housing need, but it means households who require a roof over their heads. It is different from ‘demand’, which refers to people wanting a home and being able to afford the market price or rent. ‘Demand’ is also boosted by people wanting second homes, holiday homes or investment properties.

The market signals suggest that demand is somewhat sluggish in many parts of Torbay. Key coastal locations and greenfield developments particularly in the AONB, appear to be in demand; but there is evidence that there is an oversupply of small apartments and limited viability in town centres.

**Question:** Are there demographic trends, market signals or other evidence of need that would point to a different level of need than the Standard Method?

If yes, please point to this evidence. (Please note, this question is not about Torbay’s environmental constraints).

**Two issues we have to confront.**

**Issue 1: Why does the Local Plan promote housing on some greenfield sites when most previous consultation responses opposed more greenfield development?**

In terms of the five growth options consulted on in January 2022, it is proposed to pursue a Growth Option similar to Option 3, but with an emphasis on brownfield regeneration, as per the ‘Hybrid Option’.

The Local Plan Growth Options consultation received around 1,500 responses, the vast majority of whom opposed more greenfield development. However, Torbay has a very pressing need for more homes. There are currently over 150 families in temporary accommodation,[[9]](#footnote-10) and over 1600 households on the waiting list for affordable housing. The Housing and Economic Needs Assessment (HENA 2022) finds a need for over 720 affordable homes a year.

Torbay has an ageing population, with more deaths than births. Population growth is driven by people moving into the area from elsewhere in the UK (“net domestic migration”). Some of these people will have moved out of the area when they were younger and are now returning. Inwards migration is a part of housing need and failing to provide for it is likely to push up house prices, making housing even less affordable for local people. It will also be likely to result in fewer people of working age in Torbay.

The Local Plan does need to do all it can to boost housing. Some greenfield land is proposed for development. Greenfield sites often provide more affordable homes than brownfield ones. Whilst we recognise that this will be controversial, we need to try to accommodate people who need a home, as well as trying to protect the area’s most important environmental assets.

The previous Torbay Local Plan was bold in allocating significant land for development. Many of these areas, including Torquay Gateway and Collaton St Mary have not yet been built and will contribute to future supply. We are not recommending that land already earmarked for development should be de-allocated. It is proposed to make relatively minor extensions to these areas. Allocating significantly more greenfield development (even if suitable sites could be identified) would take the focus off the important brownfield regeneration opportunities in Torbay.

In the January 2022 consultation, the sites that were most actively promoted for development were largely located in the south of Torbay, particularly in the South Devon Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This is a nationally important landscape, and the council is seeking to protect it from development. However, we do need to consider the benefits that development could bring against the environmental cost.

**Issue 2: If so many homes are needed why are you proposing so few?**

As noted above, the council accepts that there is a pressing need for homes, but there is also a shortage of suitable land. We are aware of the NPPF’s Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development and Test of Soundness[[10]](#footnote-11). The Local Plan seeks to promote urban regeneration and increase housing densities. However, Torbay has significant environmental limits.

These include the AONB in the south of Torbay, the South Hams Special Area of Conservation and Marine SAC, scheduled ancient monuments, listed buildings and conservation areas. Torbay has substantial infrastructure constraints including some of the oldest shared sewers in the South West, vulnerability to flooding and storm events. Whilst there is some scope to fund some infrastructure through developer contributions, these will not meet all of Torbay’s needs.

Several sites in the south of Torbay are being actively promoted for development. The council needs to carefully weigh up the benefits that development of these sites could provide, as well as the environmental impact. This current consultation is not promoting these sites due to the impact on the AONB and potential biodiversity impact. However, we welcome views on this from all parties.

The Local Plan Site Options consultation draws on the findings of the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) and is also informed by a Sustainability Appraisal. Both of these are on-going documents that assess possible development sites and strategies. They do not make policy, but instead assist us in finding the most “sustainable” option.

The council recognises the government’s policy to boost housing supply. However, the 2021 NPPF forces development into unsustainable locations. The Housing Delivery Test penalises councils for not achieving housing targets, which are largely dictated by a centrally set formula. Councils can do very little to require builders to deliver the homes that they have planning permission for.

Since the 2018 iteration of the NPPF, councils face a very difficult test to show that housing sites are deliverable. Five Year Housing Supply considerations can (and are) used by the development industry to gain planning permission on unallocated greenfield sites, despite there being other sites allocated for development or brownfield regeneration opportunities.

If the government removed or modified significantly the five year supply and Housing Delivery Test penalties, it would allow the council to promote its urban regeneration objectives more strongly, and set more ambitious housing targets based on brownfield regeneration.

**Question:** Are there other factors that affect Torbay’s ability to meet its housing needs in full? (Please note that this question relates to environmental and other constraints)

If “no”, please say how development can be accommodated within Torbay’s environmental capacity.

**Development constraints in the south of Torbay**

As noted above, several sites are being actively promoted in the south of Torbay. This area is closest to the South Devon AONB and South Hams Special Area of Conservation. The south of Torbay is also the least accessible part of the Bay. Development in this area is likely to be deliverable and would provide opportunities to provide facilities and services for the southern part of Torbay. Nevertheless, the council’s recommended approach is to resist major development in the south of Torbay due to its environmental sensitivity. We welcome views on this approach.

**Question:** Do you agree with the proposed strategy of constrained development in the south of Torbay? (Note that this includes housing as well as commercial development).

**Question:** Should development in **the setting** of the AONB be resisted? (The setting of the AONB is the countryside around the AONB). (Note that this includes housing as well as commercial development).

**Question**: Are there other areas or locations within Torbay that development should be directed to? (Please be specific).

**Neighbourhood Plan Targets**

The next section of Policies sets a framework for strategic development in neighbourhood plans. These relate to the four Neighbourhood Plan areas of Torquay (SDT), Paignton (SDP) Broadsands Churston and Galmpton Villages (SDBCG) and Brixham (SDB). The former Brixham Peninsula policies have been divided to recognise the creation of the BCG Villages Forum in 2021. The strategy put forward is similar to the Adopted Torbay Local Plan 2012-30. However, the Plan period has been rolled forward to 2022-40 and housing targets adjusted in line with updated Policy SS1. These policies provide more detail on the Future Growth Area requirements.

The Neighbourhood Plan targets are as follows. These are **minimum** numbers over the Plan period 2022-40 (18 years).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Area | Total net new Homes 2022-40 (18 years)  (total 5,400) | New Homes Per year (net)  (total 300 pa) | Target Amount of Employment Space (Class E(g), B1, B2. Sq. m net.  (total 70,000 sq. m) Note that these figures have been rolled forward from the current Local Plan and will be reassessed though an updated Employment Land Review. |
| Torquay | 2,400 | 134 | 37,200 |
| Paignton | 2,300 | 128 | 30,100 |
| BCG Villages | 450 | 25 | No minimum target but opportunities to expand businesses suitable to a rural location should be explored. |
| Brixham | 250 | 14 | 2,700 this includes development in and around Brixham Harbour. |

**Question:** Do you agree with thebroad distribution ofhomes and employment space recommended for the neighbourhood plan areas?

If you disagree, please say how they could be changed, (To meet or exceed the totals)?

**Housing and Regeneration Policies**

The next section deals with housing and regeneration Policies**. Policy SHS** sets out a housing strategy. Key to this is a proposed **Presumption in Favour of Urban Regeneration**. This policy makes clear that the Local Plan seeks to focus development in town centres, waterfront areas and the built-up area. This is in accordance with the “Hybrid Option” in the previous consultation. This will require bold decisions about allowing taller buildings in these areas, and redeveloping parts of town centres or nearby areas that do not meet modern needs. However, the policy does acknowledge the need to protect and enhance the historic environment, provide a high quality of design and be resilient to the effects of climate change.

**Question:** Do you have any comments relating to Policy SHS?

**Investment Zones**

The Government has announced Investment Zones to “speed up development to streamline and accelerate delivery of high-quality development for jobs and homes”. Information on the government’s proposals is available at [Investment Zones in England - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/investment-zones-in-england/investment-zones-in-england)

**Question:** The council is submitting an expression of interest for Investment Zones. Do you agree that Investment Zones would help deliver urban regeneration in Torbay?

Please add any comments.

**Housing Allocations**

**Policy SH1** identifies areas in which development and regeneration will be promoted. It suggests “clusters” of regeneration opportunities in the town centre and waterfront areas. An indicative list of likely sites is included below. However, the list does not prevent other urban regeneration sites from coming forward. A key element of the plan is to view urban development as acceptable in principle, subject to detailed assessment of matters such as design, heritage, and flood risk.

|  | **Town Centre Regeneration Area/Site** | **Yield (Numbers are approximate and subject to further assessment)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Torquay** |  |
|  | Castle Circus Area |  |
| TCR T01 | Town Hall Car Park | Subject to review of parking |
| TCRT02 | Magistrates Court | 10 |
| TCRT03 | Municipal Chambers | 12 |
|  | Union Street, Union Square, Lower Union Lane, Temperance Street, and Market Street, Pimlico |  |
| TCRT04 | 14 Market Street | 30 |
| TCRT05 | Union Square | 250 |
| TCRT06 | Land rear of Castle Circus House | 30 |
| TCRT07 | Former New Look Store | 20 |
| TCRT08 | Former Blockbuster/Morrisons, Pimlico | 40 |
| TCRT09 | 3-9 Pimlico | 20 |
| TCRT010 | Pimlico | 10 |
| TCRT011 | Telephone Exchange/Offices Lower Union Lane | 70 |
|  | Abbey Road, Rock Road, Roebuck House |  |
| TCRT012 | Roebuck House | 49 |
| TCRT013 | Adj. Abbey Hall (former Laundry Site) | 15 |
|  | Fleet Street, Torquay Harbour: Living Coasts, Strand, and Marina Car Park |  |
| TCRT014 | Swan Street | 10 |
| TCRT015 | 30-34 The Terrace | 12 |
| TCRT016 | Former Debenhams | 15 |
| TCRT017 | The Marina Car Park (adj. The Pavilion) | 30 |
| TCRT018 | Living Coasts | 20 |
| TCRT019 | The Imperial Hotel | 50 |
|  |  |  |
|  | **Paignton** |  |
| TCRP01 | Paignton Harbour | Subject to review of parking |
| TCRP02 | Crossways | 89 |
| TCRP03 | Victoria Square | 60 |
| TCRP04 | Station Lane, Great Western Road | 30 Subject to review of parking |
| TCRP05 | Station Square, Opposite Railway Station. | 10 Subject to review of parking |
|  |  |  |
|  | **Brixham** |  |
| TCRB01 | Town Centre Car Park Middle Street | 25 |
| H03-10 | Oxen Cove (employment) | Employment |

**Question:** Do you have any comments relating to Policy SH1

**Expanded Future Growth Areas at Collaton St Mary and Long Road Paignton**

**Policy SH2** proposes housing on sites outside of the town centres and central areas. **Future Growth Areas** are broad locations which are proposed for development in principle. On the council’s assessment such areas (or clusters of sites) are able to provide more than about 200 dwellings.

The Future Growth Areas are already allocated in the existing Local Plan 2012-30 (Policy SS2). It is not proposed to re-consider the principle of development in the areas that are already allocated. This consultation is about the opportunity to expand the Future Growth Areas at Collaton St Mary (SH2.2/ SDP3) and White Rock, Paignton (SH3.3/ SDP4). This does not mean that every part of Future Growth Areas can be built on. They will require landscaping, wildlife mitigation, public open space etc. However, it appears that there is scope to develop areas beyond those currently shown in the masterplans for these areas. Updated Masterplans will need to be prepared for these areas.

As we have stressed, this consultation is carried out at the “Issues and Options Stage” because we are seeking views about the best ways to meet needs, rather than presenting a fait accompli. The west of Paignton is being promoted for future growth based on evidence in the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) and Sustainability Appraisal. Based on the HELAA, it appears that there are no easy development sites left in Torbay. Expanding existing allocations to the west of Paignton appears to be the least bad option for achieving relatively strategic development.

Note that it is not proposed to change the boundaries to Torquay Gateway (TH1), although additional land within the current Future Growth Area may be considered for housing development.

**Question:** The council is not proposing to change the overall Edginswell/Torquay Gateway Future Growth Area (SDT3). However, do you have comments on this area? Y/N

**Question:** Do you agree with extensions to the Future Growth Areas at Collaton St Mary and Long Road, Paignton as broad locations for development

**SDP3 Collaton St Mary (extension to Masterplan area) Y/N**

**SDP4 Long Road, White Rock, and Berry Acres, Yalberton, Paignton Y/N**

**Standalone Housing Sites**

Policy SH2 also proposes housing on several relatively standalone sites. As a general rule, the Local Plan only proposes sites likely to deliver major development. This is defined by the NPPF as being 10 or more homes, or half a hectare in size (for commercial development it means 1000 sq. m floorspace or 1 hectare). Sites proposed for allocation under Policy SH2 have been assessed in the HELAA (2022) and Sustainability Appraisal as having relatively minor constraints. As with the Future Growth Areas, we recognise that some of these are sensitive in terms of landscape or other impact.

Sites need to be **suitable** for development in terms of their environmental impact and being able to provide good quality living environments. They also need to be **available**, in terms of having a landowner who is willing and able to see their land developed. Lastly, they need to be **achievable**, which means that they will produce a profit after they have been developed and are relatively free from other development costs such as complicated land ownership, steep topography etc.

As with Future Growth Areas, it is intended to roll existing allocations from previous plans and extant planning permissions forward. These are shown in Policy SH2. However, we have not brought forward allocations where sites are in use and there is no evidence of sites being promoted. In addition, we have taken into account comments made at the previous consultation stage about the likely number of homes sites can achieve. This has in some instances (e.g., Hollicombe) reduced the estimated number of homes that can be achieved.

The Local Plan usually only allocates sites for major development (as defined above). However, non-major sites can remain allocated in the existing Neighbourhood Plans. Neighbourhood Forums/ Brixham Town Council are encouraged to allocate appropriate, additional sites in their updated plans.

| **Ref.** | **Site** | **Estimated number of homes already where the principle of development is established.** | **Estimated number of additional homes proposed in this Plan (Subject to further assessment)** | **HELAA Reference** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Future Growth Areas: The following broad locations are proposed for development. They are in part currently proposed, but it is proposed to extend the areas of development.** | | |  |
| **SDT3** | **Torquay Gateway, Edginswell, Torquay** | **350** | **0** |  |
| **SDP3** | **Collaton St Mary, Paignton (Extension** | **460** | **150** |  |
| SDP3a | Land adj. Bona Vista Holiday Pk, Totnes Rd |  | (20) | 21P042 |
| SDP3b | Land adj. Beechdown Farm Bungalow, Totnes Rd |  | (10) | 21P043 |
| SDP3c | Plot 1 & 2, Totnes Road |  | (8) | 21P041 |
| SDP3d | Western half of Taylor Wimpey Site, North of Totnes Rd |  | (75) | 21P041 |
| SDP3e | Land North of Totnes Road (Bloor now Cavanna Homes) |  | (40) | 21P077 |
| SDP3f\* | Torbay Holiday Motel, Totnes Rd, Collaton St Mary | (39) |  | 21P080 |
| SDP3g\* | South of Totnes Rd, Collaton St Mary | (310) |  | 21P015 |
| SDP3h\* | Land to the North of Totnes Road (Taylor Wimpey) | (73) |  | 21P008 |
| SDP3i\* | Land North of Totnes Road (Former Bloor Homes now Cavanna) | (100) |  | 21P010 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **SDP4** | **Long Road, Yalberton (Extension)** | **450** | **200** |  |
| SDP4a | Yalberton Holiday Park/Berry Acres 'Link' |  | (50) | 22P001 |
| SDP4b\* | Land South of Yalberton Road (Berry Acres) | (137) |  | 21P003 |
| SDP4c | Land North of Lower Yalberton Holiday Park, Long Road |  | (150) | 21P067 |
| SDP4d\* | Land off Bxm Rd (Devonshire Park) | (255) |  | 21P001 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Standalone Housing Sites** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Torquay** |  |  |  |
|  | **Housing Allocations: The following sites are proposed for development.** | | |  |
| H2T1 | Sladnor Park, Maidencombe. Due to High Court decision the principle of development has been established, see application P/2020/0315\* |  | 120 | 21T064 |
| H2T2 | Brunel Manor, Conversion of buildings only |  | 15 | 21T148 |
| H2T3 | Land at Kingskerswell Road and r/o Barton Hill Road |  | 10 | 21T056 |
| H2T4 | Babbacombe Business Park, Babbacombe Rd, Torquay |  | 12 | 21T072 |
| H2T5 | Land North of Bottompark Lane, Barton Hill Road |  | 20 | 21T145 |
| H2T6 | Torbay Hospital campus. (or directly adjoining) consistent with hospital masterplan and principal use of the site for healthcare. Accommodation for key workers. |  | 50 | 22T002 |
| H2T7 | Hatfield House (site of), Hatfield Cross |  | 12 | 21T069 |
| H2T8 | Grand Hotel Garage Block |  | 10 | 21T138 |
| H2T9 | Land adjacent to Broadley Drive, Livermead, Torquay |  | 50 | 21T050 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Existing allocations brought forward: The principle of development has already been established on the following sites (either through planning permission or allocation in the previous Local Plan/Neighbourhood Plan). It is proposed to roll forward their allocation to the new Plan.** | | |  |
| H2T10\* | Watcombe Hall, Watcombe Beach Road. | 12 |  | 21T159 |
| H2T11\* | Site 1 Higher Cadewell Lane | 18 |  | 21T021 |
| H2T12\* | Site 2 Higher Cadewell Lane | 12 |  | 21T020 |
| H2T13\* | Hatchcombe Lane, Scotts Bridge/Barton | 50 |  | 21T129 |
| H2T14\* | Westhill Garage, Chatto Road | 15 |  | 21T131 |
| H2T15\* | Exmouth View Hotel, St Albans Road | 12 |  | 21T101 |
| H2T16\* | Seabury Hotel, 11 Manor Road, Torquay | 12 |  | 21T080 |
| H2T17\* | Quintaville, Junction of Reddenhill Road | 10 |  | 21T023 |
| H2T18\* | Stoodley Knowle, Ansteys Cove Road, Torquay | 90 |  | 21T085 |
| H2T19\* | Palace Hotel, Babbacombe Road\* | 38 |  | 21T006 |
| H2T20\* | 18 Babbacombe Road | 10 |  | 21T096 |
| H2T21\* | Former Dairycrest, Parkfield Road |  |  | 21T002 |
| H2T22\* | R/O Edinburgh Villas, McKay Avenue, Torre Marine (Specialist housing) | 75 |  | 21T095 |
| H2T23\* | Shelley Court Hotel, 29 Croft Road, Torquay | 11 |  | 21T003 |
| H2T24\* | Brampton Court Hotel, St Lukes Road South | 14 |  | 22T003 |
| H2T25\* | Conway Court, Warren Road | 14 |  | 21T060 |
| H2T26\* | Sheddon Hall Hotel Site, Shedden Hill | 11 |  | 21T124 |
| H2T27\* | 21 Old Mill Road, Torquay | 11 |  | 21T004 |
| H2T28\* | Bancourt Hotel, Avenue Road | 10 |  | 21T054 |
| H2T29\* | Hollicombe (former gas works) | 50 |  | 21T015 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Paignton** | | |  |
|  |  | | |  |
|  | **Housing Allocations: The following sites are proposed for development.** | | |  |
| H2P1 | Sandringham Gardens West of Preston Down Road, Paignton |  | 20 | 21P009 |
| H2P2 | Land at Preston Down Road North, Paignton |  | 50 | 21P017 |
| H2P3 | Land at Preston Down Road South, Paignton |  | 50 | 21P018 |
| H2P4 | Hilltop Nursery, Kings Ash Road. |  | 10 | 21P051 |
| H2P5 | Land off Fishacre Close, Great Parks, Paignton (former Local Centre) |  | 10 | 21P081 |
| H2P6 | Summerhill Hotel, Braeside Road |  | 10 | 21P055 |
| H2P7 | Former Kia Garage, Totnes Road |  | 25 | 21P088 |
| H2P8 | Land R/O 24 Grange Rd, Paignton |  | 25 | 21P039 |
| H2P9 | Land rear of Local Centre, Waddeton Close, White Rock Paignton |  | 60 | 21P053 |
| H2P10 | Land off Limekiln Close, White Rock, Paignton |  | 20 | 21P079 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Existing allocations brought forward: The principle of development has already been established on the following sites (either through planning permission or allocation in the previous Local Plan or a Neighbourhood Plan). It is proposed to roll forward their allocation to the new Plan.** | | |  |
| H2P11\* | North of Luscombe Lane, Great Parks | 80 |  | 21P014 |
| H2P12\* | Great Parks Phase 2 (Allocation H1.12) | 60 |  | 21P068\* |
| H2P13\* | 38-40 Palace Avenue, Paignton\* | 11 |  | 21P007 |
| H2P14\* | White Rock (remaining development area) | 52 |  | 21P060 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Broadsands, Galmpton, Churston (BCG) Villages** | | |  |
|  |  | | |  |
|  | **Housing Allocations: The following sites are proposed for development.** | | |  |
| H2BCG1 | Gliddon Ford Filling Station, Dartmouth Road, Churston Ferrers.  Access to the Archery Field |  | 10 | 21B001 |
| H2BCG2 | Archery Field, Churston |  | 50 | 21B005 |
|  | **Existing allocations brought forward: The principle of development has already been established on the following sites (either through planning permission or allocation in the previous Local Plan or a Neighbourhood Plan). It is proposed to roll forward their allocation to the new Plan.** | | |  |
| H2BCG3\* | Inglewood (South of White Rock) | 373 |  | 21B002 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Brixham** |  |  |  |
|  | **Housing Allocations: The following site is proposed for development.** | | |  |
| H2B1 | Wall Park Extensions (R/O Wall Park Farm, 39 Wall Park Rd), Brixham |  | 20 | 21B026 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Existing allocations brought forward: The principle of development has already been established on the following sites (either through planning permission or allocation in the previous Local Plan or a Neighbourhood Plan). It is proposed to roll forward their allocation to the new Plan.** | | |  |
| H2B2\* | Brixham Paint Station, Kings Drive | 10 |  | 21B007 |
| H2B3\* | Site of Northcliff Hotel | 15 |  | 21B008 |
| H2B4\* | St Kildas (Specialist housing) | 20 |  | 21B011 |
| H2B5\* | Torbay Industrial Estate Part 1 | 10 |  | 21B053 |
| H2B6\* | St Marys Road (Old Dairy Buildings) | 15 |  | 22B001 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

\*Denotes sites where the principle of development has been established either through planning permission or allocation in the Local/Neighbourhood Plan.

An interactive map showing these sites is available on the council’s consultations website.

**Housing Allocations Policies in Summary**

In summary, the Local Plan makes housing allocations as follows:

* Policy SHS and SH1 sets a broad “Presumption in Favour” of urban regeneration and allocates specific areas for redevelopment. Proposals will need to maximise the use of land, and taller buildings should be encouraged.
* Policy SH2 proposes other housing sites. Where they are likely to provide more than around 200 dwellings, they are classed as Future Growth Areas. Sites of between about 10-200 dwellings are also proposed in Policy SH2.
* The Plan will “roll forward” existing allocations.
* Non-major developments (i.e. broadly sites of fewer than 10 dwellings) are not allocated in the Local Plan. They may be allocated in Neighbourhood Plans or come forward as “windfall” sites.
* The Local Plan does not support “major” development on unallocated sites outside of the built up area unless these are promoted through Neighbourhood Planning.

**Question:** Do you have any comments on the other sites proposed for development in Policy SH2? Please quote the reference number

**Question:** Are there other sites or broad locations that should be included? (Please note that urban regeneration sites are already proposed in Policy SH1).

**Other Housing Policies**

The consultation goes on to consider draft policies relating to other aspects of housing. A particular theme of this section relates to developer contributions to infrastructure. This includes (but is not limited to):

* Physical infrastructure such as roads, cycle paths, flood defences and drainage.
* Social infrastructure such as affordable housing, self-build plots, healthcare.
* Environmental Infrastructure such as open space, landscape planting and habitats for wildlife.

There is an expectation that developers contribute towards the infrastructure needed by developments. This can either be through onsite provision or contributions to provide elsewhere. Such contributions are often called Section 106 Planning Obligations. There are legal restrictions governing what the council can seek from S106 Obligations[[11]](#footnote-12). A similar, but legally different, source of funding is Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), although there are current proposals from government to change the system of developer contributions.

Developer contributions will not be able to fund all the needs generated by development. Detailed policies on developer contributions will be the subject of later consultation. However, it is useful to seek views about what developer contributions should help fund.

We are aware that we have asked similar questions in the January 2022 consultation and on the Planning Contributions and Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document. The results of all these consultations will be taken into account when considering infrastructure priorities.

**Question:**  Out of the following types of infrastructure and services, please list in order of priority the most important infrastructure that developer contributions should contribute towards in Torbay. (With 1 being the highest priority, 2 the second highest and so on). You do not need to count in every item. Please note that the question is asking what the highest priority *for developer contributions* should be. Not (necessarily) what is the most important infrastructure to fund by any means (such as direct taxation)

Affordable housing

Biodiversity enhancement

Communication infrastructure / broadband

Drainage and flood prevention measures

Employment Land

Education

Fire and rescue

Healthcare

Libraries, Museums, and community centres

Police

Public open space

Public transport

Road infrastructure

Self-Build Housing plots

Specialist Housing for older people

Sports and recreation facilities

Stopping Places for Travellers

Theatres and cultural events

Town centre and public realm improvements

Walking and cycling infrastructure

Waste and recycling collection

Other (please specify)

**Question:** Are there any other types of infrastructure not listed above that developers should also contribute towards?

**Primary Residence Policy**

**Policy SH3** proposes a primary residence policy for new homes. This does not restrict who buys or owns homes, but they must be occupied as a main (‘principal’) home, rather than as a second or holiday home.

About 2.3% of Torbay’s housing stock is second homes. Whilst less than the South Hams (where it is 9%), the figure is considerably higher than the national average (about 1%) and the other urban centres of Plymouth (0.5%) and Exeter (0.9%). Moreover, some of the areas where housing is proposed may be attractive to second homeowners. Given the severe difficulties that the council faces in meeting its housing needs, it considers that there is a case to restrict new homes to being primary residences.

The rise of un-regulated (by planning) holiday letting though online agencies can cause significant shortages in rented accommodation, but also creates uncertainty and unfair competition in the tourism industry. Moreover, the infrastructure and other needs of tourist and residential accommodation are very different.

Torbay is a holiday resort, and it is likely that some holiday apartments will need to be provided. Under this proposal, planning permission would need to be sought. There would be an expectation that holiday apartments would be approved in ‘tourist’ locations such as Harbourside and Waterfront areas and other “Core Tourism Investment Areas”.

We are aware that this is a policy which could have ‘unintended consequences’ which is why it is being floated at “issues and options” stage. In particular, it could affect viability, and could therefore reduce the other planning obligations that may be secured through development. An alternative could be to leave the matter for Neighbourhood Plans on a more targeted basis.

It is worth noting that affordable housing will effectively be let to local people and as primary residences though Devon Home Choice, so this question relates primarily to market housing.

**Question:** Should the local plan contain a primary/principal occupancy requirement as per Policy SH3 that prevents new housing being used as second or holiday homes unless permission is expressly granted for holiday use?

**Question:** Do you have any comments on this primary/principal occupancy requirement, including any views on how this should be enforced?

**Question:** Would you support a primary occupancy requirement if it reduced the level of affordable housing or other developer contributions that can be secured on a site?

**Affordable Housing**

**Policy SH4** sets a proposed policy on affordable housing. Torbay has a very pressing need for affordable housing. However, the NPPF only allows affordable housing to be required on major sites (except in the AONB). The proposed wording of Policy SH4 has been simplified from the Adopted Local Plan 2012-2030 (Policy H2) and seeks 30% of dwellings on all major housing developments to be provided as affordable housing. Affordable housing should be provided on site wherever possible.

Policy SH4 recommends a threshold of 10 dwellings (“major development” and 1 dwelling in the AONB). It seeks 30% of homes on sites providing 10 or more dwellings to be provided as affordable housing. Councils are permitted to set lower thresholds in specified “rural” areas, which in Torbay means the AONB. Due to the very pressing need for affordable housing a threshold of 1 dwelling is proposed for housing in the AONB (which is lower than the current Local Plan).

The policy also sets out criteria for supporting affordable homes in the countryside as “rural exception sites”. These should be to meet the needs of local people in need of affordable housing, although the policy would allow a small percentage of market homes if it can be shown that these are necessary to support the viable delivery of affordable housing.

This is a conventional approach but means that liability raises from zero on a site of 9 dwellings to 30% on a site of 10 dwellings. We have considered whether it would be practical to seek affordable housing for the number of homes above 9 dwellings (except for in the AONB). This would effectively provide a free allowance of 9 dwellings similar to the way an income tax allowance works. It would result in a lower affordable housing impact on smaller sites. But it would be necessary to increase the headline rate of affordable housing (for example to 40%) to make up for the loss on small sites. Whilst this is not a recommended approach, we are interested in views about whether this would help deliver smaller sites.

The NPPF requires that for major developments, at least 10% of all homes on site should be for affordable home ownership, unless this would exceed the total affordable housing requirement on site. “Affordable home ownership" refers to a range of products such as “First Homes” sold to local people at a discount, and “shared ownership” when households part rent and part buy their home (with the option to buy fully at a later date). In Torbay, First Homes will be subject to local connection/key worker eligibility criteria. Due to low incomes in Torbay, the council is proposing to apply a 40 per cent or 50 per cent discount to First Homes, in order to make them affordable to local people. This will be subject to further viability assessment.

The most pressing need in Torbay is for affordable homes for rent, particularly social rent. Therefore, Policy SH4 seeks at least one third of affordable homes to be for social rent, one third for affordable rent, and for one third affordable home ownership. (One third of 30% equals 10% of all homes on a site).

Policy SH4 deals with affordable housing provided through the planning system (currently through Section 106 Planning Agreements). However, the council will support registered providers and others providing a higher level of affordable housing, subject to other Policies in the Local Plan. This policy provides a basis for allowing “exception sites” where they provide 100% affordable housing.

**Question:** Do you agree with the proposals in Policy SH4?

**Question:** Would you support an approach where affordable housing is only sought on the number of homes above the threshold (10 in most cases, 1 in the AONB), but with a higher headline affordable housing rate (e.g. 40%)?

**Self-build housing**

**Policy SH5** sets out considerations for dealing with self-build housing. This is similar to Policy H3 of the Adopted Local Plan 2012-2030, but we have tried to draw a clearer distinction between self and custom build housing and affordable housing. The Policy sets a target of 2% of homes in Future Growth Areas to be provided as self-build plots.

**Question 17:** Do you agree with the proposals in Policy SH5?

**Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs)**

**Policy SH6** deals with Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs). This also includes “hostels” in sui generis use (that is, in a use class of their own). This policy is similar to the existing policy H4 in the Adopted Local Plan 2012-30, but we are proposing to make the policy stronger in resisting HMOs in the poorest areas, as well as in the most important tourism locations. We have tried to provide more measurable criteria against which an application would be considered.

**Question 18:** Do you agree with the proposals in Policy SH6?

**Sites for Travellers**

**Policy SH7** deals with the requirement to provide pitches for travellers. Two temporary stopping sites for travellers will be provided in Torbay. These should be provided as part of the Future Growth Areas, unless a better site can be identified elsewhere. The policy also sets out criteria for considering the provision of sites elsewhere. These are similar to the criteria in Policy H5 of the Adopted Torbay Local Plan 2012-30.

**Question:** Do you agree with the proposals in Policy SH7 to provide two stopping sites for Travellers?

**Question**: Should pitches/stopping places be provided as part of Future Growth Areas? If not, where should they be located (please be specific)?

**Accommodation for People in need of care**

**Policy SH8** deals with specialist accommodation, including domestic adaptations and annexes, and the provision of specialist accommodation such as extra-care apartments. Again, this policy is an evolution of Policy H6 in the Adopted Local Plan 2012-2030. However, the requirement for dwellings designed to meet the needs of less mobile people has been increased to reflect the needs of Torbay’s ageing population. The wording of the policy has been strengthened to ensure provision is made for local people and to seek contributions from specialist accommodation towards their impact on local healthcare and social services.

This policy raises the issue of NHS contributions. There is a bay wide shortage of GP capacity and other healthcare services. New housing development will place extra demands on these. It may be appropriate to put this part of the Policy into a separate Healthy Bay policy (currently SC1 of the Adopted Local Plan).

**Question:** Do you agree with the proposals in Policy SH8?

**Question:** Should the Local Planmake specific allocations for specialist accommodation for older people? If yes, please indicate where it should be located.

Other Policies in this Plan

The Local Plan will cover a range of strategic policies. The final section of this consultation makes suggestions about the proposed policy titles and running order of the Plan. We have amended the policy order so that the Local Plan contains an overarching policy, followed by neighbourhood area policies. The remaining policies are then grouped into broad topic areas, starting with housing.

Government policy clearly expects Local Plans to focus on more strategic matters[[12]](#footnote-13). Detailed local policies should be contained in neighbourhood development plans, which can also contain design codes. Local Plans should not repeat general development management policies set out in national guidance. However, in practice there may be a case for retaining development management policies in the Local Plan, particularly where the matters are of particular importance to Torbay, or where the NPPF policy does not meet local planning requirements.

The wording and content of the later policies will be the subject of further public consultation. The intention is for all the policies in the Local Plan to be strategic policies. This will mean reducing the level of detail in policies, where possible. But we welcome views on the need for the policies, what they should say, and what they should *not* say.

**Question** Do you have any comments on the proposed content or order of the other Local Plan policies? (Please note that these will be the subject of further consultation.)

**Question:** Is there a need for policies on other planning issues, other than those listed?

**Question 25:** On detailed development management matters, how far should we rely on government guidance such as the NPPF?

**Sustainability Appraisal**

The Local Plan is supported by Sustainability Appraisal. This assesses the proposed growth strategy, and recommended sites and policies against a range of considerations (“SA Objectives”) such as climate change, waste, biodiversity, poverty and health. The current proposals are based on Sustainability Appraisal of the five broad growth options we consulted on in January 2022.

A further sustainability appraisal of possible broad locations is included in this consultation. Whilst this is a tool to help point us to the “least bad” option, the SA does not bind the council or others to a particular area or strategy. In particular, we need to consider how far different sites and approaches are achievable.

**Habitats Regulations Assessment**

The Local Plan will be supported by a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). A high-level HRA screening of the sites has been completed, and work is underway to carry out detailed wildlife screening assessments of each of the sites. These assessments will be used to inform the Local Plan HRA and can be viewed on the [Torbay Local Plan Update webpage](https://www.torbay.gov.uk/council/policies/planning-policies/local-plan-update/). For the purposes of this consultation, proposed greenfield sites where the principle of development has not been established have been assessed as a priority. Work is ongoing to assess the full list of sites in detail, including those which have been rejected at this stage.

**Neighbouring authorities/Duty to cooperate**

Torbay must demonstrate effective and on-going joint working with neighbouring authorities, under the legal Duty to Cooperate. This is particularly relevant given that Torbay has indicated that it is unable to meet its housing needs within Torbay.

Population growth in Torbay, and Devon as a whole is driven by domestic inwards migration from other parts of the UK. The council considers that it needs to be addressed on a sub-regional basis rather than just by our direct neighbours. The council has therefore contacted councils within the Greater Exeter and Plymouth Joint Local Plan areas.

Neighbouring authorities quite naturally need to know that Torbay is doing all it can to meet its needs in-house. More evidence will be published on landscape and ecological issues in due course. However, because Torbay is proposing a strategy of avoiding major development in the AONB, it recognises that it would not be appropriate to expect neighbours to accommodate Torbay’s need within AONB, National Parks or areas with the same level of protection.

**Question:** Do you have any comments about how Torbay should address Duty to Cooperate matters with our neighbours?

**Question:** Do you have any other general comments to make in relation to the Local Plan Update?

**Closing comments**

This consultation is open for comments between 7th October and 12 Noon on Monday 21st November 2022. If possible, please submit your comments via this online platform.

**Thank you for taking the time to make comments on the Local Plan.** We will consider all responses in drafting a Regulation 19 “Preferred Options” draft of the Local Plan for consultation, expected in 2023.

**Would you like to be kept informed about the Local Plan Update?** (If so, please ensure that you have provided your contact details in the first part of this survey.)

1. . The report to Cabinet of 12th July 2022 and detailed responses to the January 2022 Growth Options consultation are available at: [Agenda for Cabinet on Tuesday, 12 July 2022, 5.30 pm (torbay.gov.uk)](https://www.torbay.gov.uk/DemocraticServices/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=741&MId=18609) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. [The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (legislation.gov.uk)](https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/767/regulation/18/made) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. [National Planning Policy Framework - Guidance - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework) July 2021 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. [Planning practice guidance - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)](https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance) [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. [National Planning Policy Framework - 3. Plan-making - Guidance - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/3-plan-making) [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. [Community and Corporate Plan - Torbay Council](https://www.torbay.gov.uk/council/policies/corporate/corporate-plan/) [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. These are Torquay, Paignton, Broadsands Churston and Galmpton Villages and Brixham. These areas all have Neighbourhood Plans in place which are being updated. Neighbourhood Plans are prepared by Neighbourhood Forums, except Brixham which is prepared by the Town Council. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. The Standard Method is currently based on the 2014 based Sub National Household Projections. These are in turn based on the previous 5 years of demographic data i.e., going back to 2009. The age of this data and availability of later information is relevant when considering the robustness of the Standard Method. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. The Devon Home Choice Register is available at <https://www.devonhomechoice.com/sites/default/files/DHC/monitoring_report_july_2022.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. Paragraphs 11 and 35, respectively. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended in 2011 and 2019) sets out that they must be:

    Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;

    directly related to the development;

    and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. See paragraph 20 et seq. of the NPPF. [National Planning Policy Framework - 3. Plan-making - Guidance - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/3-plan-making) [↑](#footnote-ref-13)