

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 0024	I 3001	Ivybridge												<p>Primarily, Network Rail wish to see a health and safety plan as part of any project and a risk assessment of all possible impacts on the railway with mitigation measures applied. It will be important to ensure that the railway boundary is not compromised and that support zones of the railway embankment and structures are not compromised, through design. The design must ensure there will be no risk of trespass or vandalism from development (i.e. windows or openings which will overlook the railway which could introduce these risks).</p> <p>The development must be maintainable without encroachment onto the railway line side. If it is envisaged that piled foundations may be employed then the foundation design should consider utilising only bored end bearing designs to eliminate impacts on the railway embankment and support to the railway formation which may be induced by vibration techniques. Title deeds for the area should be consulted for any railway specific covenants where restrictions may apply.</p> <p>It may be necessary to consider specific fencing requirements of the site exclusively for the development.</p>		
SA 0027	I 3002	Ivybridge												<p>Adequate sewage treatment works capacity will be available to meet the allocations up to 2016. Whilst capacity will also be made available to meet the development proposals beyond 2015 the timing of any improvements that may be required to meet the demand will be subject to approval of future business plans by OFWAT.</p> <p>Investigations to establish available capacity within the localised public sewerage networks are likely to be necessary which would need to be developer funded as would any resultant improvements deemed necessary. Water supply is available at source to meet the demands of the allocations although the need for some localised improvements cannot be ruled out.</p>		

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		
SA 0040	I 3003	Ivybridge	5.1		Vision for the South Hams								<p>In order that the police can attract funding for CIL or request facilities such as CCTV where appropriate, there needs to be a statement in the LDF which endorses designing out crime. Requests the following words to be added and suggests that it could be placed in the "Vision for South Hams" section.</p> <p><i>Sustainable Developments is one of the core principles underpinning planning. Crime, the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour has the power to destroy communities, undermine the quality of life and damage community cohesion. To ensure a better quality of life for all, every opportunity within the planning system must be taken to design out crime. Ensuring designing out crime is considered at the pre-planning discussions will reduce crime, save on the costs of crime and reduce the carbon footprint of that area. In addition this statement will demonstrate compliance with Planning Policy Statement 1 paragraph 36 and 37 and ODPM Safer Places The Planning System and Crime Prevention.</i></p>			
SA 0114	I 3018	Ivybridge											<p>The DPD identifies an area to the south of the A38 to deliver a sports hub. This is crossed by National Grid's high voltage YF overhead electricity transmission line. National Grid do not own the land over which the overhead lines cross. However, potential developers should be aware that it is National Grid policy to seek to retain our existing overhead lines in-situ, because of the strategic nature of the national network. Advise that developers and planning authorities take into account the location and nature of existing electricity transmission equipment when planning developments.</p> <p>National Grid prefers that buildings are not directly beneath the overhead lines for two reasons. Firstly, the amenity of potential occupiers in the vicinity of lines, and secondly, because National Grid needs quick and easy access to carry out maintenance of its equipment to ensure that it can be returned to service and be available as part of the national transmission system. The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground and built structures must not be infringed.</p> <p>Land beneath and adjacent to the overhead line route should be used to make a positive contribution to the development of the site. National Grid, in association with David Lock Associates has produced a "Sense of Place" guidelines which look to create high quality designs near overhead lines.</p>			

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		
SA 0139	I 3010	Ivybridge											<p>Considers that there are a number of aspirations for transport in the DPDs but consider that the potential outcomes of the plans in relation to transport are uncertain. In particular, it is not clear how the development would may impact on the SRN or whether proposals will assist in minimising and mitigating potential impacts.</p> <p>As a general requirement, require applications which exceed indicative thresholds in DCLG/DfT Guidance on Transport Assessments (March 2007) to be supported by a Transport Assessment (TA) or Transport Statement (TS). In light of the predominantly rural nature of the district, the Local Authority will require a Transport Assessment for all proposals outlined in the DPD exceeding 25 dwellings and for some non-residential floor space schemes falling under the DfT indicative thresholds depending on the site's context. A Travel Plan will be required for all major developments in accordance with Good Practice Guidelines.</p>			
SA 0139	I 3011	Ivybridge											<p>The plan indicates that the A38 is operating at capacity. It also includes an objective to improve the self sufficiency of the town and to ensure that new development minimises the need to travel and optimises the choices between travel modes. When it comes to policies, an approach is set out to improve the self containment and to encourage more sustainable modes of travel for local trips within the town, but it is not clear how this policy approach will influence longer distance trips, transport emissions or congestion. Therefore the Highways Agency is unable to understand the extent of traffic impacts on the A38 arising from development in the area and the extent to which the policies in the plan will minimise traffic demands on the A38, and enable adverse impacts to be mitigated.</p>			
SA 0139	I 3012	Ivybridge											<p>The plan proposes an eastern access and a new junction on to the A38 to encourage mode shift but it is not clear how this will encourage more use of sustainable modes as opposed to encourage more car trips, including greater use of the A38.</p>			

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		
SA 0139	I 3013	Ivybridge	5.3										A vision for Ivybridge that includes reference to sustainable transport links to serve its hinterland, making bespoke reference to an enhanced role for the railway station is fully supported. It is not clear whether new rail or bus services for the park and ride will be provided which may influence mode share of commuter trips to Plymouth and lead to a reduction in traffic impact on the A38. It is also not clear whether improving bus connectivity to Plymouth may also be an option in terms of improving sustainable travel choices and it would be helpful if this could be clarified.			
SA 0139	I 3014	Ivybridge	5.6										The Highways Agency support the objectives for Ivybridge, particularly IO1, which seeks to enhance self containment and objective IO4 which seeks to ensure that development minimises the need to travel and optimises choice between travel modes.			
SA 0139	I 3015	Ivybridge		l1									The Highways have previously raised concerns regarding the proposed urban extension to the east of Ivybridge due to the potential impact of growth on the A38. It now appears that this proposal is considerably larger than previously. The Agency have significant concerns about this strategy and would welcome the opportunity to be involved in the formulation of a masterplan at the earliest opportunity. The masterplan should be accompanied by a robust transport strategy which identifies the likely impacts on the SRN and package of mitigation measures which will reduce the needs to travel and the reliance on the SRN.			
SA 0139	I 3016	Ivybridge		l1									The Highways Agency have particular concern in relation to the suggestion that a proposed new access to the A38 is required. The Agency has not received any evidence to support this proposal and therefore question its need and deliverability until such evidence is presented. Whilst the Agency will adopt a graduated and less restrictive approach to proposals for new accesses on the regional SRN, there will still be a presumption in favour of using existing accesses and junctions. It is important that the SRN is not regarded as a convenient means of dealing with local problems. Does not consider that the proposals are founded on a robust and credible evidence base and raises concerns over the potential outcomes that will flow from the provision of a new junction on the A38 and therefore its effectiveness in delivering the objectives of the plan.			
SA 0139	I 3017	Ivybridge		l2									The Highways Agency have previously identified the central area as a preferred option for development in Ivybridge and is aware that the site benefits from an approved masterplan. Whilst the complexities associated with the sites within multiple ownership are acknowledged, the Agency are nonetheless concerned at the likely delay between the delivery of the new central area and the urban extension.			

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		
SA 0164	I 3062	Ivybridge											No site specific comments			
SA 0209	I 3019	Ivybridge	Para.6.15/ 6.14/ Appendix 1	I1		✓		✓					Proposal I1 generally justified, effective and consistent with national policy UNLESS implication in supporting text is that a replacement recycling depot (para.6.5) is that development should provide for a site for this facility or a contribution should fully fund facility. In this case contrary to C.05.05 and therefore unsound and unreasonable. Any inadequacies in existing facility, whilst may be exacerbated by growth in demand, predate proposed growth area. Any financial contributions to improve capacity of sports facilities in area south of Erme Valley, Rutt Lane and Filham Park (para. 6.14/ Appendix 1) should be proportionate to size of proposed development, considered alongside other community benefits (including affordable housing). Trustees confirm land north of Exeter Road included within I1 is within their control and available for development. Will cooperate with prep. of comprehensive masterplan.			
SA 0245	I 3034	Ivybridge	2.4			✓		✓	✓				Community consultation not wide enough. PF EbD included too few community representatives with some Town/ Parish Councillors, many District/ County Council officers and statutory body reps. Community generally absent.			
SA 0245	I 3035	Ivybridge	3.13			✓		✓	✓				There was not a series of EbD workshops in Ivybridge as implied. The workshops were South Hams wide. Only one in Ivybridge to which limited list of organisations invited.	No		
SA 0271	I 3021	Ivybridge											The Site Allocations DPDs are not in proximity to and do not affect any statutory designated conservation sites. However the South Hams Special Area of Conservation (SAC) interest feature, Greater Horseshoe Bats, use the wider countryside within the South Hams for foraging, commuting to foraging sites and travelling between the constituent roots of the SAC. Some allocated sites could have adverse impacts on the SAC if the developments do not consider the Greater Horseshoe bats during the design and planning of the sites. Natural England was consulted by South Hams during the production of the HRAs and does not disagree with the findings.			

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		
SA 0274	I 3024	Ivybridge											Ivybridge Town Council question whether the Council has met the ambitions of the SCI. The District Council has been hugely reliant on the Town Council in publicising the consultation rather than taking the lead as it would have done previously. The Town Council have received concerns from members of the public who were not aware of the consultation period. ITC make comment that the use of the internet is not the best medium for studying detailed plans. Concern is expressed at the cost of £10 for a hard copy and ITC questions whether this can be classed as a "reasonable charge". ITC feel that there has been limited opportunity for the public to contribute during the consultation.			
SA 0274	I 3025	Ivybridge											The Town Council supports the view that there should be no development on the western side of the town.			
SA 0274	I 3026	Ivybridge											<p>The sports hub to the south of the A38 was an ambition of the Ivybridge masterplan and the EbD. However, things have now developed further with the Leisure Centre being an integral part of the central area, and plans for the redevelopment of the swimming pool are well advanced. Any intention to see an area south of the A38 utilised for a sports hub now seems unlikely and the text committing to the refurbishment and improvement of the leisure centre does not seem to tie up with the vision diagram.</p> <p>It is therefore suggested that whilst the town could develop a sports hub and designating the space south of the A38 might not be relevant, the inclusion of a hotel in that area is important and combined with the enhanced riverside access, could link the area well to Town Centre Facilities. The local sports groups are keen to see a hotel so that they can offer regional/national sports competitions with overnight accommodation.</p>	It is proposed that the land south of the A38 (including the current depot and recycling site) should be renamed Sports/Leisure Hub on the basis that a hotel offers leisure opportunities and it is an essential part of the development of the town.		

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		
SA 0274	I 3027	Ivybridge											<p>Access on to the A38 has been the subject of much correspondence with the Highways Agency. One of the more recent responses makes it clear that achieving an all-movements junction is not going to be easy and in fact more housing than the 325 proposed beyond 2016 would probably be needed to fund any such improvement.</p> <p>One of the reasons previously given for not considering a new junction was that one existing one had to be closed before a new junction could be considered. With the closure of the Lyneham Inn slip road then this would now be feasible.</p> <p>The Air Quality Management issues for Western Road will increase if any new development to the east of the town is proposed. The Town Council wishes to know what measures will be proposed prior to supporting any development, as at this stage, only the provision of a new A38 junction is considered to provide the necessary infrastructure.</p>	The Ivybridge Infrastructure Delivery Programme should be amended to give a priority of "1 - Critical" to the junction.		
SA 0274	I 3028	Ivybridge											<p>The first phase of development (I1 north) looks to the area around the Park and Ride. The importance of the car parking facility to support the increased use of the train station should not be underestimated. Clarity is sought on any development in the area. The wording of the proposal in relation to the retention and maintenance of the car park is a subjective view with no actual car park spaces being specified.</p>			
SA 0274	I 3029	Ivybridge											<p>Councillors have expressed concern at the density of 30-40 dph for new development. There is concern that such densities would be totally out of keeping with the rest of Ivybridge at the entrance to the town within a rural district would lead to an unsatisfactory appearance and making it more making to an urban environment adjacent to farmland and sports facilities. Councillors would remain to be convinced and would want to see other developments where high density development at the entrance to a rural town was successfully integrated before supporting that approach.</p>			
SA 0274	I 3030	Ivybridge											<p>The development of I1 (north) and I1 (south) are supported in principle, subject to the provision of a new A38 junction and a masterplan which reflects the community infrastructure needs of the town, including sufficient green spaces.</p>			

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		
SA 0274	I 3031	Ivybridge											<p>Whilst the redevelopment of Glanvilles Mill (Part of I2) is an aspiration, it is in the hands of private developers and will largely rely on the economic situation and the ability of the owners to see a way of getting more financial benefit from the site.</p> <p>The concern remains therefore that if 50 homes are anticipated from this area, then the car parks cannot be considered safe so the masterplan would be critical to establish how any development could be achieved.</p> <p>The boundary of I2 should be extended to include the Scout HQ as that facility was previously anticipated as being enhanced as part of a complex to meet more of the towns needs. The zoning of the area for a masterplan is welcomed to enable better use of the space but a loss of car parking should not be supported and potentially a smaller number of dwellings should be earmarked for the area as it is not ideal for affordable accommodation based on past experience.</p> <p>In respect of I2, the work undertaken by the Ivybridge MCTI process should be reflected along with a comprehensive masterplan for the area.</p>	The boundary of I2 should be extended to include the Scout HQ		
SA 0274	I 3032	Ivybridge											<p>In the Infrastructure Delivery Programme, it seems that some agencies have been better placed to respond so that some elements seem extremely limited (e.g. health and education) whilst others (e.g. landscape and leisure) are more comprehensive.</p> <p>Questions have been raised about the enhanced pedestrian, cycle and public transport linkages as it is unclear what land is available and in the case of public transport is unlikely to attract the necessary budgets to offer the service which this Council continues to aspire to.</p> <p>One minor correction in the text is that that the number of primary schools should read 4 and not 3.</p>			

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		
SA 0282	I 3023	Ivybridge	6.10-6.17	I1		✓		✓					The allocation includes land immediately adjacent to Dartmoor National Park boundary south of the railway line. Most of the land allocated adjacent to DNP is well screened with mature trees, though the most easterly extreme is less so and will be clearly visible from the moorland slopes below Western Beacon. DNP welcome the recognition in the plan that suitable strategic landscaping measures will be required in order to not adversely impact on the NP. Suitable landscaping will be important to ensure that the amenity of the NP is protected and new development is suitably linked to the existing built form. The provision of substantial landscaping at the north eastern extremity of the site and the retention of the existing mature tree cover in the whole area to the north of the B3213 will be important elements to this. It is important that DNPA plays an active role in the preparation of the masterplan.			
SA 0428	I 3033	Ivybridge		I1		✓		✓					Proposal I1 generally justified, effective and consistent with national policy but concerned that policy requires a masterplan for the area that provides a replacement recycling depot (para.6.5). If this implies that the development should provide for a site for this facility or a contribution should fully fund facility. In this case contrary to C.05.05 and therefore unsound and unreasonable. Any inadequacies in existing facility, whilst may be exacerbated by growth in demand, predate proposed growth area. Any financial contributions to improve capacity of sports facilities in area south of Erme Valley, Rutt Lane and Filham Park (para. 6.14/ Appendix 1) should be proportionate to size of proposed development, considered alongside other community benefits (including affordable housing). The agent confirms land south of Exeter Road included within I1 is within their client's control and available for development. Will cooperate with prep. of comprehensive masterplan.		✓	
SA 0491	I 3034	Ivybridge		I1									Concerned that large part of the Ivybridge RFU training ground, car park an entrance are included within the proposal. Loss of these facilities would impact the running of the club, so they wish to see that the club worse off in terms of present playing/training surfaces squire meterage and parking. Ref to SHDC SPD on open space made in covering email.		✓	
SA 0491	I 3035	Ivybridge											Concerned about consultation processes- deadlines and on-line portal comments. As landowner they were not involved in SHLAA.			
SA 0774	I 3043	Ivybridge											GOSW welcome the publication of the DPDs which appear to be in accordance with the adopted Core Strategy, based on robust evidence and which also appear to be based on a robust and in depth engagement with the communities served by SHDC.			

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		
SA 0774	I 3044	Ivybridge											Paragraph 2.6 makes reference to the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). A letter from the Secretary of State for Communities dated 27th May 2010 sets out that the Government is committed to the early abolition of the Regional Strategies. This will apply to RPG10 as well as the emerging RSS for the South West. The Secretary of State has asked that LPAs and the Planning Inspectorate to have regard to this intention in decision making. Therefore the text in the DPDs may need to be amended once an announcement is made. The intention to abolish Regional Strategies is not in itself likely to be a soundness issue for these DPDs. The context for the plan is an adopted Core Strategy which provides the plan's essential framework to 2016. Planning for the delivery of homes remains an important objective. National policy will continue to provide the framework for local authorities in the absence of Regional Strategies and the evidence gathered to inform their preparation will be available to authorities. As you bring forward the DPD, you may wish to use this evidence or have your own.			
SA 0774	I 3045	Ivybridge											In the context of the DPDs, GOSW supports the approach which provides certainty of the allocations for the first five years, within the framework of the adopted Core Strategy, followed by an indication of the direction and quantum of development following 2016. The review of the Core Strategy will be achieved by 2016.			
SA 0774	I 3046	Ivybridge											Subject to the scrutiny of the Planning Inspector, the evidence base in support of the allocations appears to be robust and appropriate for the purpose. The Design Review Assessment process is very interesting and it appears to have enabled significant engagement with the people in the neighbourhoods served. It is noted by GOSW that the DRA has informed not only the choice of allocations but those smaller villages that might be more appropriate to accommodate development. The form of bottom up engagement in plan preparation is supported.			
SA 0774	I 3047	Ivybridge											GOSW note that there appears to be robust evidence on the type of infrastructure that is needed to support development and neighbourhoods. This evidence has been prepared with the County Council and other infrastructure providers. The Council will want to satisfy itself that the infrastructure expectations set out in appendix 1 of each DPD, particularly for 'big ticket' items such as schools, reflects or are flexible enough to respond to any funding programme changes that might be forthcoming following the Governments Budget announcements to significantly reduce public sector spending.			

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		
SA 0774	I 3048	Ivybridge											Employment and commercial allocations appear to be generally and broadly described as such in the plans proposals e.g. RA 1 and RA2. The plan might be improved if it was possible to provide more policy guidance of the type/nature of employment and commercial development that would be appropriate at these allocations. PPS4 provides national guidance on these matters.			
SA 0774	I 3049	Ivybridge											Some site allocations include a 'grey' edge rather than a firm line. These appear to reflect that these allocations are development either wholly or partially beyond 2016. All allocations up to 2016 probably should have a firm definition. It might be that intended directions of locations of development beyond 2016 can be indicated, with the intention that they are firmed up following review of the Core Strategy. This might be a matter that the Inspector can provide more clarity on. It does not appear to be a matter which leads to question the soundness of the plan.			
SA 0774	I 3050	Ivybridge											It is presumed that the Development Policies DPD recently found to be sound will provide the framework for ensuring that the proposals emerging on the various allocations will be managed so as to provide for sustainable development. However, if there are any specific actions on sites that might address carbon reduction, the plan might be improved if these are included as part of the allocations.			
SA 0993	I 3042	Ivybridge											South West Councils Strategic Leaders Board and the South West Regional Board will only respond with a further letter if it is considered that there are significant issues relating to the implementation of the Regional Strategy.			
SA 0994	I 3041	Ivybridge											The Coal Authority have no specific comments to make on the document at this stage.			
SA 0995	I 3051	Ivybridge											The County Council is reaffirming the policies set out in the adopted Devon Structure Plan and these strongly support focussing development located at the main urban areas at the market towns. Similarly, it supports the broad scale of development being proposed in the context of the most recent assessments of housing needs within the south west Devon area. DCC has no strategically significant specific policy objections to the proposals.			
SA 0995	I 3052	Ivybridge											DCC has no overall objections to the proposals as Education Authority and increased housing development is not anticipated to require action except where appropriate requirements have been properly included in the Infrastructure Delivery programmes attached to each document.			

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		
SA 0995	I 3053	Ivybridge											A number of sites have potential environmental and/or archaeological interest which will need to be considered when applications for development or the production of masterplans are proposed.			
SA 0995	I 3054	Ivybridge		11									The masterplan will need to address the transport issues as a high priority given that any traffic generated will, at present, have to go through the town. The provision of employment is more desirable in order to reduce the daily commute (especially to Plymouth).			
SA 1015	I 3055	Ivybridge		11									There must be no increased run-off as a result of development taking into account climate change.		L	
SA 1015	I 3056	Ivybridge		12									Must not encroach on River Erme buffer zone. Should explore opportunities for increasing this buffer/wildlife corridor.		L	
SA 1021	I 3059	Ivybridge		11									Concerned the proposal would adversely affect Ivybridge RFU site . They would object to any loss of playing field land.		L	
SA 1021	I 3060	Ivybridge											Flag up concerns about current suggestion to build a health centre on McAndrew Field , which is currently pen space of great recreational value as local residents and junior rugby teams play there.		L	
SA 1026	I 3061	Ivybridge		11									Supports proposal but wishes to see boundary of site extended to include two fields at Filham (south east of crossroads)		L	
Individuals																
SA 0063	I 3004	Ivybridge	6.5										The impact of development on the boundary with DNP will need careful consideration to ensure that the impact on recreational users and the landscape character of the moor are not adversely affected. In this respect, SHDC will have to have regard to their Section 62 duty under the Environment Act.			
SA 0063	I 3005	Ivybridge	6.9										The AQMA and meaningful lack of alternative access to the town and land to the east will mean that any development in the east is likely to worsen the impact on the residents of Western Road.			
SA 0063	I 3006	Ivybridge											More efficient use of the town centre and redevelopment for better shopping, affordable housing, recreation and employment uses is welcome that would bring vitality to the town centre.			
SA 0063	I 3007	Ivybridge		11									With regards to the development beyond 2016, considers that it would be constrained by TPOs along Godwell Lane. It would be short-sighted to link the hamlet of Filham or the cottages on the cross roads. Such ribbon development is not appropriate in such close proximity to the National Park Boundary.			
SA 0063	I 3008	Ivybridge											Until the air quality is improved in Western Road, no future development should be proposed to the east of the existing junction with the A38 other than where there are clear community and visual benefits within the existing town centre.			

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		
SA 0073	I 3009	Ivybridge					✓		✓	✓		✓	<p>Considers that the town has increased in size enormously and its infrastructure has not been increased commensurate.</p> <p>Feels that the town is "full" already. In the past residents were assured that development in the town would be halted and no more properties would be added to increase strain on local services.</p> <p>Considers that given the above, specific assurances were given about the east of the town.</p> <p>Unsound to consider a development that will increase the volume of traffic in Western Road for reasons of air quality.</p> <p>Without the new junction on to the A38, it would be dangerous to grant planning permission for a development of this scale.</p> <p>Sherford has agreements for infrastructure. If more capacity is needed in the South Hams, then it should be found here.</p> <p>The DPD is predicated on the RSS which is now to be abolished. Therefore there is no legal requirement to proceed as it is no longer consistent with National Policy.</p>	Feels that there are no changes which can make the DPD compliant or sound.	No	
SA 0249	I 3020	Ivybridge	1.1			✓		✓					(No comments provided)		No	
SA 0272	I 3022	Ivybridge	6.11						✓				<p>Wishes for the southern end of land at 7 Filham Cottages to be included as part of proposal I1. This land protrudes out into the north-eastern corner of the proposed development site which lies directly to the south of and adjoining Filham Cottages. The land, which has vehicular access, used to form part of the field which is a now part of proposal I1, and as such should be included in any development proposals.</p>	Include land at the southern end of land at 7 Filham Cottages to be included as part of proposal I1.	No	
SA 0566	I 3036	Ivybridge		I1		✓		✓					<p>Landowners confirm 19 acres of land south and east of Godwell included in proposal I1 available for development. Torrhill farmhouse, yard and Galloways bungalow are also within same ownership and have access to highway and land.</p>		Yes	
SA 0593	I 3037	Ivybridge											<p>Problems with online representation - appears to only ask for comments about legality and soundness and not site specific comments. Will exacerbate traffic congestion on east bound approach to Ivybridge along B3213, especially peak times. Impact on infrastructure, including schools and healthcare. Increase in noise, pollution, crime and loss of amenity. Proposal for east Ivybridge will lead to coalescence with North Filham (nb previous rejection of development of west Ivybridge due to coalescence). Reassess needs for Ivybridge after stalled Sherford development completed.</p>			

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		
SA 0697	I 3038	Ivybridge											At the publication stage of the DPD, members of local communities should not feel that they have to make as many changes to the DPD as is the case in the South Hams. This means the consultation process has not been as vigorous or as inclusive as it should have been which means the DPD is unjustified.			
SA 0697	I 3039	Ivybridge											Responding to the DPDs on the portal is difficult as it requires responses to specific paragraphs. This wouldn't be a problem if there were not huge gaps in the DPD which need addressing. Using the portal is frustrating and time consuming and the emails generated by this are significant. Sometimes commenting by paragraph isn't helpful when there are issues running through the DPD. SHFoE found that there are general issues which need to be responded to in all DPDs. It is time consuming and frustrating to get issues and changes across on the portal. Questions the cost of the portal and the number of people who have used the portal to make comments.			
SA 0697	I 3040	Ivybridge											The forms are difficult to complete. People do not feel as if they know what is going on. The DPDs should not be generating anxiety at this late stage because the meaningful community consultation should have been done. There is anger over the sites that have been selected, the building on greenfield sites, the lack of affordable housing and the scale of development and members of the public do not know which test of soundness their concerns relate to. Those who have filled in the form on line have found that there is not enough space to write, which requires an additional document to be attached which is complicated and could easily be simplified.			
SA 1010	I 3057	Ivybridge		l1									Concerned how current infrastructure will cope and what practical economic and social benefits will come from development. Increased noise, traffic drainage issues and loss of farm land trees hedgerows and vegetation a concern	Further consultation is needed.		L
SA 1011	I 3058	Ivybridge		l1									Concerned about need for the level of development, especially in light of Sherford new community. More development could lead to loss of community identity and loss of wildlife particularly rare birds.	Further consultation is needed.		L