

## PLYMOUTH AND SOUTH WEST DEVON JOINT LOCAL PLAN – SCHEDULE OF HEARING MODIFICATIONS (LIST ONE)

Ref	Provision	Draft modification	Type (LPA's view)	Why the modification is being put forward	Follow-up discussions
HM1	Spatial Strategy – Policy SPT1	1 iii <del>Local</del> <b>Strategically</b> important economic assets are protected for the purpose of economic activity.	Minor	Matter 2.1(i) hearing session. Although we don't feel that any change is necessary, we can agree with a modification of wording which is consistent with the relationship of this provision to the LEP's Strategic Economic Plan and related provisions elsewhere in the plan (especially para 6.51, but also PLY3, SO3, DEV14).	Key participants: T. Watton, S. Wagemaker, E Heynes, J Coxon. Agreement has been reached on this modification with 3 of the 4 participants; we have not heard back from one to confirm his agreement.
HM2	Spatial Strategy – Policy SPT1	3i <del>Efficient</del> <b>The effective</b> use of land is made for development <b>through optimising reuse of previously development sites, therefore</b> reducing the need for greenfield development, protecting natural assets and creating opportunities for viable low carbon energy schemes.	Minor	Matter 2.1(i) hearing session. The modification responds more directly with the positive wording of Framework para 17, bullet point 8; and para 111.	Key participants: T. Watton, S. Wagemaker, E Heynes, J Coxon. Agreement has been reached on this modification with 3 of the 4 participants; we have not heard back from one to confirm his agreement.
HM3	Spatial Strategy – Policy SPT1	3ii Overall gains in biodiversity are achieved by protecting and enhancing species, habitats and geological sites <del>where possible</del> .	Minor	Matter 2.1(i) hearing session. We think this change can be justified on the basis of Framework para 7 (3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet) which includes an objective of protecting and <i>enhancing</i> the natural environment and helping to <i>improve</i> biodiversity, and para 9 (2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet) which speaks of moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving <i>net gains</i> . These are the sections of the Framework which establish the overarching principles of sustainable development which the rest of the Framework then amplifies. SPT1 is designed to play a similar role for the JLP, as identified in our Matter 2 Statement. Policy DEV28.2 sets out more detail on the implementation of this high level principle. We feel the words 'where possible' while justified and consistent with national policy are unnecessary, and are happy to promote	Key participant: J. Hodgson. Modification sent to J. Hodgson 1 February (12.42). No response to date.

Ref	Provision	Draft modification	Type (LPA's view)	Why the modification is being put forward	Follow-up discussions
				a sharper focus in SPT1.	
HM4	Spatial Strategy – Policy SPT2	<p>12. Provide positive outcomes in relation to the characteristics, aspirations and measurable standards set out <del>in figure 3.2 and</del> through any supplementary planning document linked to this plan.</p> <p>(This is not technically a new modification but the withdrawal of modification M320 that was proposed - see EXC10Ai)</p>	n/a	Matter 2.1(ii) hearing session. We are no longer promoting modification M320 and instead wish to revert to the text in SPT2.12 as set out in the Submission JLP. We believe a minor modification could be justified but we think it is better instead to provide clarification about how fig 3.2 is used through the modification proposed to para. 3.17 (see HM5)	This was not something that we were asked to work with other participants on, but simply a response to the hearing session discussions where there seemed little support to address the clarity issue through a reference in the policy.
HM5	Spatial Strategy – para 3.17	<p>Figure 3.2 below sets out a series of measures that the LPAs will use in implementing Policy SPT2 and the other policies of the plan. The measures are aspirational, in the sense that they represent sustainability outcomes that are aspired to for an area. <del>However, they also represent standards that individual development proposals will be considered against, as part of the overall planning judgment.</del> <b>The measures are not intended to be applied through an inflexible 'tick box' exercise to determine the acceptability or otherwise of development, given that such an approach could restrict development that is fundamentally sustainable and makes a significant positive contribution to delivering the vision and strategy of the plan. However, the measures do contribute to the overall planning judgement, including the need for appropriate mitigation.</b> Some of these figures will be updated during the life of the plan. The most up to date standards will always be available in the evidence base documents informing the plan and the accompanying Supplementary Planning Documents.</p>	Minor	Matter 2.1(ii) hearing session. The modification sets out more specifically how figure 3.2 will be used in a decision making context as a clarification to the plan.	Key participants: T. Watton, S. Wagemaker, E Heynes, J Coxon. This modification has been agreed with the participants.

Ref	Provision	Draft modification	Type (LPA's view)	Why the modification is being put forward	Follow-up discussions
HM6	Spatial Strategy – new para to follow para 3.17	It should be noted that the measures in Fig 3.2 do not relate to the sustainable villages of the TTV Policy Area. This recognises the more remote rural context of such settlements, which are characterised by limited provision of physical services and amenities, and may depend on a wider networks of villages to the meet their wider service requirements. Local communities are able to produce evidence and develop local policies as part of their neighbourhood planning processes to support the delivery of sustainable development in these villages.	Minor	Matter 2.1(ii) hearing session. This is proposed to make clearer that neighbourhood plans can play a role in defining sustainability measures for those parts of the TTV settlement hierarchy that fall outside of the provisions of figure 3.2. We had considered also including a reference to neighbourhood plans in Policy SP2. However we feel it is a better solution to use extra narrative as now proposed. This is because any policy provision is unnecessary (neighbourhood plans already have freedom to include policies on this matter, subject to the legal and policy tests) and any provision would need to be fairly convoluted provision (given that figure 3.2 applies to parts of the TTVPA but not others).	Key participant: J. Hodgson. Modification sent to J. Hodgson 31 January (15.21). J Hodgson agrees that the new paragraph is helpful but that she was also hoping to see pt 12 of SPT2 itself include reference to neighbourhood plans. Her suggested alternative is: SPT12.12 Provide ... measurable standards set out through <b>the approved local Neighbourhood Plans or any supplementary planning</b> document linked to this plan. We have gone back to J Hodgson explaining the reasons why we prefer the use of narrative rather than policy, but offering too a continued dialogue in an effort to achieve common ground. We have received no further response to date.
HM7	Spatial Strategy – Policy SPT9	The LPAs and the local highway authorities of Plymouth and Devon, working with key transport stakeholders, will deliver an integrated approach to transport and planning; <del>delivering a strategic approach to transport</del> based upon the following key principles. ...	Minor	Matter 4.1(iv) hearing session. Removal of unnecessary words to help clarify the policy.	n/a
HM8	Spatial Strategy – Policy SPT9	1. Sustainable growth as a key driver behind the transport strategy <del>within Plymouth</del> , whilst making sure that transport is delivered in the most health promoting and environmentally responsible manner.	Minor	Matter 4.1(iv) hearing session. The words 'within Plymouth' in acknowledgement that this plan could not commit a different highway authority (Devon) to this principle. However, Devon County Council have confirmed they are happy with the modification proposed.	n/a