



**3. History of Representation**

Did you raise the matter that is the subject of your representation with the Council earlier in the process of the preparation of the DPD, i.e. before it was submitted for Examination?

No

Yes (at Issues & Options Stage)

Yes (at Preferred Options)

If you answered 'No' to the above, can you briefly explain why you did not do so:

**4(a). Nature of Representation**

Do you consider the DPD is:

**Sound<sup>1</sup>**

Go to Q.4(c)  
i.e. that you  
support the DPD

**Unsound**

Go to 4(b)  
i.e. you consider  
the DPD should be changed

**4(b). Nature of Representation**

If you consider the DPD is **unsound**, please tick which test of soundness your representation relates to. For more information on any of the 9 Tests of Soundness please see the Guidance Note.

**Please note you should complete a separate form for each test you consider the development plan document fails.**

Please tick one  
Test only

**Failure to meet a Soundness Test**

1. It has not been prepared in accordance with the authority's Local Development Scheme (LDS).
2. (A) It has not been prepared in compliance with the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).   
  
(B) Where no SCI exists, it has not been prepared in accordance with the minimum requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.
3. The plan and its policies have not been subject to sustainability appraisal.
4. (A) It is not a spatial plan, or it has not properly had regard to any other relevant plans, policies and strategies relating to the area or to adjoining areas.   
  
(B) It is inconsistent with national planning policy.   
  
(C) It is not in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy.

<sup>1</sup> The Planning Inspectorate defines 'sound' within its ordinary meaning of 'showing good judgement' and 'able to be trusted' and within the context of fulfilling the expectations of legislation.

- 5. It does not have regard to the authority's community strategy.
- 6. The strategies/policies/allocations in the plan are not coherent and consistent within and between Development Plan Documents (DPDs) prepared by the authority and by neighbouring authorities, where cross boundary issues are relevant.
- 7. The strategies/policies/allocations fail to represent the most appropriate in all the circumstances, having considered the relevant alternatives, and they are not founded on a robust and credible evidence base.
- 8. There are no clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring.
- 9. The plan is not reasonably flexible to enable it to deal with changing circumstances.

For more information on any of the 9 Tests of Soundness please see the Guidance Note

**4(c). Nature of Representation**

To which part of the DPD does your representation relate?

Paragraph

7.92

Policy

SNCG

Proposals Map/Plan/Diagram

5

**5. Changes to the DPD**

Please give details of what change(s) you consider necessary to make the DPD sound, having regard to the test you have identified in response to question 4(b). You will need to say why this change will make the DPD sound. Please be as precise as possible.

The King George V playing field was given to the people of Elburton in 1957 in perpetuity. The land in lieu in the new development is not in Elburton. The road should go out North to join the new development at the old Blue Circle quarry, preferably linking up to Colesdown Hill and Merapfield Road. Then Colesdown Hill could be linked to the Blue Circle Quarry development. I do not agree to the proposal to block off Plympton Hill to through traffic and any future claim to close through traffic in Cot Hill. Please proposals to block traffic would only channel traffic down main A374 roads.

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation. After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

**6(a). Examination**

Can your representation seeking a change be considered by written representations or do you consider it necessary to attend in person at the Examination?

Written Representations     Attend Examination

**6(b). Examination**

If you wish to attend in person at the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

*Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to attend the Examination.*

**Signature**

**Date**

31/7/2006

**Please return your completed Sherford AAP Response Form to:**

**Post:** Major Developments Team, South Hams District Council, Follaton House, Plymouth Road, Totnes, TQ9 5NE

**Fax:** Marked - Major Developments (01803) 861404

**Email:** major.developments@southhams.gov.uk

For any enquiries please call **01803 861234**