

Reference		Settlement	Paragraph	Proposal	Other	Legally Compliant		Sound		If Unsound			Representation		Appear?	Late Rep?
Respondent ID	Comment ID					Yes	No	Yes	No	Not Justified	Not Effective	Not Consistent	Comments	Suggested changes		
Organisations and Agents																
SA 0139	R 5158	Brixton		RA13									There is no objection in principle to the development of this site.			
SA 0589	R 53067	Brixton	6.81-6.85	RA13		✓		✓					Support for the principle of the site allocation to meet housing needs to 2016 and beyond.	Omit the employment element of the proposal.	No	
SA 0589	R 53068	Brixton	6.81-6.85	RA13		✓			✓	✓			Concerns about the proposed employment element. There is no justification in the supporting text to explain the principle or level of employment proposed.	Omit the employment element of the proposal.	Yes	
SA 0589	R 53069	Brixton	Section 7			✓			✓	✓	✓		The LPA cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites (recently confirmed by the Council at the Stoke Gabriel appeal). However, the AMR suggests that SHDC can demonstrate a 5 year land supply of deliverable housing sites. This suggests that the indicators and targets are flawed and not working.		Yes	
SA 0589	R 53070	Brixton	7.3			✓			✓	✓	✓		Experience has shown that where developers have taken an open book approach with regards to viability and it has been independently assessed, the LPA simply ignore the results (e.g. Lee Mill). This is unacceptable.	A review of the delivery, monitoring and flexibility processes are required and objections remain until such a review has taken place.	Yes	
SA 0763	R 51838	Brixton			Omission								The plan is unsound in light of the requirements of PPS12.			
SA 0763	R 51842	Brixton			Omission								The plan was prepared before the government announced its intention to abolish the RSS. However, the RSS does not affect development requirements in the South Hams pre 2016 as these are set out in the adopted Core Strategy. In proposing sites for development post 2016, the DPD responds at least in part to the draft RSS. It remains to be seen whether there will be an adjustment in the overall housing requirements beyond 2016. However, we have assumed that the headline figure for the rural areas will continue.			
SA 0763	R 51846	Brixton			Omission								Numerous supporting background documents which have been subject to community consultation, have been prepared to inform and accompany the DPD and regard has been paid to the Core Strategy and RSS. The robustness and credibility of this evidence should be tested through the examination process. The SHLAA provides a comprehensive assessment of potential site availability and the STA process should not have given an amber rating to the site at Red Lion Hill. Questions the site selection process and how the SHLAA, STA, DRA and SID have fed into the process. Object to proposal RA13 because land at Red Lion Hill is more appropriate. Objects to the non-inclusion of the site at Red Lion Hill, Brixton. Representation includes preliminary report on landscape and design issues.			

Reference		Settlement	Paragraph	Proposal	Other	Legally Compliant		Sound		If Unsound			Representation		Appear?	Late Rep?	
Respondent ID	Comment ID					Yes	No	Yes	No	Not Justified	Not Effective	Not Consistent	Comments	Suggested changes			
Individuals																	
SA 0077	R 5075	Brixton	6.83	RA13		✓			✓		✓			<p>The RSS is not yet adopted. The change of government means there is no guarantee that it can be adopted in its current broad form. Therefore it is spurious to attempt to identify development requirements beyond 2016.</p> <p>The development at Sherford renders invalid any current forecast of the development requirements for Brixton. There is no detailed rationale for the 50 dwellings. The plan is unsound and there is no need to identify a new development area for Brixton from 2016 onwards.</p>	<p>All development identified as being related to the requirements of the RSS should be removed.</p> <p>Remove the development proposal for Brixton.</p>	Yes	