

# South Hams Local Development Framework

## Sherford Area Action Plan (Submission Stage) – Alternative Sites Consultation Response Form



South Hams  
District Council

Please read the Guidance Notes before completing this form in black ink.

**A separate form should be used for each matter and should relate to a Test of Soundness for your representation to be properly considered.**

All comments should be received by **4.00pm on Tuesday 10 October 2006** to guarantee that they will be considered:

For Official Use Only

Reference No. ....

Date Acknowledged .....

2962

Please complete this form if you are responding to the Alternative Sites Consultation ONLY

	1. Personal Details	2. Agents Details (if applicable)
Title	Mr	
First Name	Devak	
Last Name	CURTIS	
Job Title (where relevant)		
Organisation (where relevant)		
Address Line 1	3	
Line 2	Brixton Lodge Gardens	
Line 3	Brixton	
Line 4	Devon	
Post Code	PL8 2AX	
Telephone Number	01752 880532	
E-mail		

### Data Protection

The comment(s) you submit on the Local Development Framework (LDF) will be used in the plan process and may be in use for the lifetime of the LDF in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. The information will be analysed and issues raised will be considered by the Council. Please note that comments cannot be treated as confidential and will be made available for public inspection at the Council offices, and available to view on the Council's website ([www.southhams.gov.uk](http://www.southhams.gov.uk)).

### 3. History of Representation

Did you make a representation with the Council earlier in the process of the preparation of the Sherford Area Action Plan ?

No	Yes (Issues & Options Stage)	Yes (Preferred Options)	Yes (Submission Stage)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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 Alternative Site to be:

<b>Sound<sup>1</sup></b> Go to Q.5 i.e. that you support the alternative site	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Unsound</b> Go to Q.4(b) i.e. you do not support the alternative site to the one proposed in the Sherford AAP	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	---	-------------------------------------

### 4(b). Nature of Representation

If you consider the Alternative Site 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 Alternative Site fails.**

#### Failure to meet a Soundness Test

- |  | Please tick one<br>Test only |
|--|------------------------------|
| 1. It has not been prepared in accordance with the authority's Local Development Scheme (LDS).   | <input type="checkbox"/>     |
| 2. (A) It has not been prepared in compliance with the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).   | <input type="checkbox"/>     |
| (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. | <input type="checkbox"/>     |
| 3. The plan and its policies have not been subject to sustainability appraisal.  | <input type="checkbox"/>     |
| 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.            | <input type="checkbox"/>     |

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.

- (B) It is inconsistent with national planning policy.
- (C) It is not in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy.
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*

#### **5. Explanation of Representation**

Please give details of why you consider the Alternative Site to be either 'sound' or 'unsound'. If you consider it to be 'unsound' please have regard to the test you have identified in response to question 4(b). Please be as precise as possible.

The proposed route from the A38 to the A379 joins the A379 at a point East of a narrow railway bridge and could not cope with the traffic that would be generated. It provides for a park and ride at this point but the Plymouth North Plymstock AAP does not provide for a park & ride on the A379. The proposed route does not line up with the Plymouth North Plymstock AAP proposals for dealing with the traffic on H&PT routes.

**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:

[Empty box for providing reasons for attending in person]

*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**

19 Sept 2006

**Please return your completed Alternative Site 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



### 3. History of Representation

Did you make a representation with the Council earlier in the process of the preparation of the Sherford Area Action Plan ?

No	Yes (Issues & Options Stage)	Yes (Preferred Options)	Yes (Submission Stage)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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 Alternative Site to be:

<b>Sound<sup>1</sup></b> Go to Q.5 i.e. that you support the alternative site	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Unsound</b> Go to Q.4(b) i.e. you do not support the alternative site to the one proposed in the Sherford AAP	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	---	-------------------------------------

### 4(b). Nature of Representation

If you consider the Alternative Site 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 Alternative Site fails.**

#### Failure to meet a Soundness Test

- |  | Please tick one<br>Test only        |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1. It has not been prepared in accordance with the authority's Local Development Scheme (LDS).   | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 2. (A) It has not been prepared in compliance with the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (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. | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 3. The plan and its policies have not been subject to sustainability appraisal.  | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 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.            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

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.

- |  |                          |
|--|--------------------------|
| (B) It is inconsistent with national planning policy.  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (C) It is not in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy.  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. It does not have regard to the authority's community strategy.  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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.                        | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. There are no clear mechanisms for implementation and monitoring.  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. The plan is not reasonably flexible to enable it to deal with changing circumstances.   | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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

#### **5. Explanation of Representation**

Please give details of why you consider the Alternative Site to be either ~~'sound'~~ or 'unsound'. If you consider it to be 'unsound' please have regard to the test you have identified in response to question 4(b). Please be as precise as possible.

Until 25 September 2006, which was after the date for comments on the S.H.P.C. A.A.P., there had been no consultation with local communities.

**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:

[Empty box for outlining why attending in person is 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**

29 September 2006

**Please return your completed Alternative Site 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**