INTRODUCTION

1. A joint representation on the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan (the “JLP”) was made by Ivybridge Town Council and Ivybridge Neighbourhood Plan Group in April 2017. This is a brief update to that joint statement.

A STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

2. Endeavours were made by South Hams District Council, Ivybridge Town Council and the Neighbourhood Plan Group to agree a Statement of Common Ground. It has not proved possible to complete that statement but it may be helpful for the examination to set out the gist of the statement which was being drafted:

3. There appears to be agreement in the following matters:
   a) Policies TTV1 and TTV2 – the broad strategy for thriving towns and villages, and that accordingly:
      1. growth is allocated to Ivybridge for the plan period;
      2. this should help to reinforce sustainability and deliver prosperity for Ivybridge and across the plan area;
      3. Ivybridge should accordingly sustain and strengthen its role in providing a broad range of services for the wider rural area (JLP measure of success p.172);
   b) Strategic Objective SO7 – that a strong network of main towns be maintained, and that Ivybridge should accordingly:
      1. deliver new homes in response to needs;
      2. see appropriate infrastructure needs identified and met;
      3. build self-sufficiency and resilience;
      4. see local distinctiveness and character protected and maintained;
      5. see transport services and infrastructure maintained;
      6. enjoy enhanced links with other towns and the surrounding countryside.
   c) Policy TTV7 – the spatial priorities for Ivybridge, and that accordingly the town’s vibrancy and sustainability be enhanced, including:
      1. mixed use development to meet needs and support long term resilience;
      2. investment to enhance identity and economy alongside stronger connections to Plymouth;
      3. improvements to roads and junctions south of the town, looking for solutions to manage traffic flow in and around the town with new and improved access to the A38 for the east of the town;
      4. maintaining the retail offer, protecting the town centre’s integrity and enhancing its character;
      5. maximising the potential of the A38 and investing in rail connections to Plymouth and Exeter;
      6. building on the opportunities of proximity to Dartmoor whilst protecting the
national park;
7. improving air quality in the Western Road AQMA; and
8. ensuring appropriate infrastructure accompanies development.

d) That there is already substantial development to the south of the A38 at Ivybridge, including a variety of sports and leisure facilities, employment premises, the recently opened recycling centre, and the extensive Endsleigh Garden Centre;

e) That there are existing links in place across the A38, including the main junction with the trunk road, an underpass to good highway standards, and a footpath adjacent to the river; and

f) That a new link road and associated infrastructure to the south of the A38, aimed at alleviating traffic and environmental pressures elsewhere in and around the town, will be more readily affordable in association with development of that area than in any other way.

4. There appears not to be agreement in the following:

a) Policies TTV8, TTV9 and TTV10 – these policies set out the principal JLP development proposals for Ivybridge. The matter primarily in dispute is neither the scale nor nature of the policies but the proposed locations of the development.

b) The JLP refers to the natural boundaries of Ivybridge being constrained by Dartmoor to the north and the A38 to the south (JLP para 5.42). These have long been considered to form natural boundaries for the town. It is agreed that Dartmoor does indeed form a significant boundary precluding any major development to the north, but the Town Council and the Neighbourhood Plan Group believe that the A38 should no longer be considered as a natural boundary to the south. They argue that further development south of the A38 will create a more sustainable pattern of development in the long term and more readily deliver the road and traffic measures required in order to maintain and enhance transport services and infrastructure and to more successfully address the matter of the Western Road AQMA.

c) Ivybridge Town Council and the Neighbourhood Plan Group therefore consider that the development sites proposed in the JLP are not the most suitable and sustainable available and favour an alternative site south of the A38 based on:
   1. the fact that the necessary land is now known to be available and is suitable to deliver a significant proportion of the development allocated for Ivybridge; and
   2. the way in which its development would bring forward key parts of the new road and traffic infrastructure required in the town as an integral part of the development, thereby helping to assure delivery of those improvements (which are also required as part of other policies, particularly through clause 9 of Policy TTV8).

d) The Town Council and the Neighbourhood Plan Group consider that land south of the A38 should be proposed in place of the most peripheral and least sustainable of the JLP site proposals. Their position is based not on resistance to the amount of development proposed, but on their belief that the sites proposed at the town’s extremities (particularly in Policies TTV8 and TTV10) are not the most sustainable or suitable options.
THE IVYBRIDGE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

5. The neighbourhood plan examination has taken place and the examiner's report was issued on 11th September 2017. The examiner found the plan, subject to some modifications, to meet the basic conditions and accordingly it proceeded to referendum on 30th November 2017. The result of the referendum was overwhelmingly in support of the plan and it has now been 'made'. The final version of the plan is available on the District Council and the Town Council websites.

CONCLUSION

6. It is recognised that the inspectors have advised that they will not be considering omission sites. However, the position being argued is not that the site south of the A38 is an omission but that it is so very significantly better than other major sites being proposed in the JLP that it ought to have been proposed in their place.

7. On the basis that therefore the JLP's proposals for Ivybridge are not sound it is hoped that the inspectors will require the District Council to undertake further work and to give consideration to the allocation of the site south of the A38.

8. We are grateful to have been given the opportunity to put the case.