

Notes from January 18, 2022 Conversation with Jo Lee, JLP team.

Current Answer with regard to housing allocation:

JLP is completely up-to-date, it's got a really good land supply, allocations are all being built out or they have permission so NDP team don't need any more land to allocate as JLP team will do that in due course working with NDP team to locate sites in Tavistock if/when JLP team finds that they do need to allocate.

JLP Process:

1. Late Spring 2022:
 - a. Census data begins to be released:
 - i. Household
 - ii. Population
 - iii. Travel to work patterns
 - b. Levelling Up White Papers and Planning Reforms with new guidelines regarding housing numbers
 - i. Should have white papers now but no date set (2nd Feb and end May)
 - ii. Policy options will be influenced by these changes in formula for housing numbers etc.
2. 2023: JLP team looking to understand how places function (bid for funding not yet confirmed or commissioned):
 - a. What exists in terms of community infrastructure
 - b. How do people use infrastructure (has it changed)
 - c. How is retail and town centre use changed
 - d. May 2023 population estimates, ONS Household projections may lead to consultation
 - i. Does JLP need more housing?
 - ii. Does WDBC need more housing?
 1. Still to Tavistock and Okehampton?
 2. Smaller rural areas for sustainability, to support schools, etc?
 - e. Consultation on JLP progresses:
 - i. Key issues for your area (broad, list based)
 - ii. Followed by Broadscale issues in specific subjects
 - iii. Followed by very specific topics or site specific issues (ex. Teignbridge wind and solar energy and gypsy and traveller population.)
3. 2024: Review of JLP:
 - a. Different scenarios possible for example
 - i. Strategic plan hasn't changed, don't need as much housing, population decline, we don't need more people. Current plan goes to 2034 and we have a lot of sites building.
 - ii. A climate emergency plan – don't need to allocate more sites because of planning reforms and levelling up agenda or another reason.
 - iii. Could look at specific growth options and/or focus the review on something else specific – whatever comes up as result of above.

- iv. In the past, all district wide evidence rather than any town specific evidence because of lack of information available (individual surveys that can't be benchmarked difficult to find etc.)
 - b. Sarah Gibson (Placemaking team)
 - i. Looking at towns and town strategy generally.
 - ii. Has economic development officers on team
 - iii. Will work on evidence with NDP team and will be helpful by helping NDP team benchmark with census and other data placemaking team hold.
 - iv. May be developing specific issues for towns that could be comparative across JLP area
 - 1. TTV is very different in Southhams area vs Rural WDBC.
 - 2. Developing town strategy may not be developed enough yet for NDP to use as basis for their questions to business/employment land – worth asking however.
-

NDP process and places to work with JLP:

1. Role of NDP can be around the really specific things that can add value – for instance individual allocations on brownfield sites, setting boundary for sustainable development purposes. landscape protecting, employment and business evidence.
2. A series of questionnaires is best. Start with basic short survey, develop subject matter areas and town vision and then ask and consult on specific subject matter or with targeted questions for specific audiences. (Ex. Green space, affordability, employment land types, town centre, design code)
3. Work with Placemaking team and Duncan to ensure that surveys are robust and to get additional data and benchmark with census data etc.
4. Feedback evidence base to JLP team as this would be useful to inform JLP review as well.
5. NDP evidence base can provide more nuanced information to support JLP. Current JLP is all based on district wide data, which misses the nuances, but there was no other way to do that in terms of reliable sources of data consistent across all three authorities. This is a large gap that would be good to fill.
6. JLP team will work with any NDP that is adopted except in particularly difficult setups regarding preventing any development coming forward, where this conflicts with any new national policy.
7. Already there is interest in Tavistock for development – but land supply is good, so no need to approach landowners.
8. As plan develops it begins to take on weight for new planning applications as well as applications to vary schemes (for instance when a new developer takes on a site and submits a new application). This does not apply where there is already outline approval or reserved matters applications.
9. Developers will want to build in Tavistock, because it is an attractive and sustainable location. The JLP is robust enough to stop speculative development where it conflicts with the Plan. For example, in countryside the only way to stop this is to look at allocating green space that you want to protect, landscapes, etc.

This is then considered in combination with existing planning docs like the conservation plan, heritage, world heritage.

The latest employment evidence is set out in Topic Paper 4 [here](#) and In Evidence base EC8 [here](#).

There is lots of evidence studies relating to economy, retail etc on the webpage here:<https://www.plymouth.gov.uk/planningandbuildingcontrol/plymouthandsouthwestdevonjointlocalplan/evidencebasepastconsultationsandexamination/evidencebaseandexaminationdocuments#Economy>

Town benchmarking report from 2013 [here](#)